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Abstract

The Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW)¹ was established in 1964 and for nearly 40 years members of the Association debated the merits of statutory registration and its possible forms and processes. In 2003, the Social Workers Registration Act was brought into law. This thesis uses a longitudinal design to analyse interviews conducted on two occasions. In 1996, a sample of Association members was interviewed about their aspirations for the statutory registration of social workers and the role the Association might have in that. Eighteen years later, in 2014, with statutory registration in place, the sample was re-interviewed to establish the extent to which their aspirations for statutory registration have been realised. Qualitative analyses were conducted of all interviews, providing a set of results to address the research questions: To what extent have the aspirations for the statutory registration of social work been realised? In what ways has the introduction of statutory registration changed the face of social work professionalism in ANZ?

The thesis topic lends itself to the examination of professionalisation and occupational regulation and the respective agendas of the Association and the government for the introduction of statutory registration. The research draws on a Bourdieusian framework and examines Foucauldian governmentality and biopower theory as a basis of explanation. An institutional logics perspective is also applied as a basis for discussing the institutional forms of the state and the professional body that are subject to the study. The findings drawn from the interviews are discussed in the light of the conceptual and theoretical threads applied providing a basis to offer some reflections and comment on the consequences and impact of statutory registration as the new kid on the block.

¹ ‘ANZASW’ is an acronym for the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers. Prior to 1999, it was named the New Zealand Association of Social Workers (NZASW). For the purposes of this thesis, ANZASW and NZASW will both be referred to as ‘the Association’.
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Chapter One – Introduction

Introduction

The subject of the thesis is the social work profession in Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ), and the consequences of the introduction of statutory registration for social workers. In 1996, before statutory registration was introduced, I had questioned a sample of members of the New Zealand Association of Social Workers (NZASW) regarding the form of occupational regulation they considered there ought to be for social workers in ANZ and the role the Association might have in that. Eighteen years later, after statutory registration had been in place for ten years, the same sample of members was asked what they considered to be the consequences and impact of statutory registration. Other questions and thinking had motivated me to put these questions to the members. In 1996 I had conducted and published an evaluation of the Association’s competency assessment process (Randal, 1996). The evaluation had shown this process to have integrity and was key to the Association’s self-regulation of its members. One might have assumed, therefore, that with this background in self-regulation the Association would play a part in any process of statutory registration should that ever be introduced. Provision for the statutory registration of social workers was eventually introduced in 2003, primarily in response to recommendations arising from a critical and public review of the government’s social work services for the care and protection of children (Brown, 2000). This recommendation echoed an earlier recommendation social workers should become subject to statutory registration that arose from an evaluation, conducted by Coopers & Lybrand (1995), of a professionalisation strategy introduced by the Children and Young Persons and Service (CYPS) in 1992. As it transpired the enactment of the Social Workers Registration Act (the SWR Act) in 2003 did not give any statutorily prescribed role for the Association in the statutory registration process. This caused me to ponder the different professional and political agendas that may have a bearing on statutory registration being introduced and its form. Who else, other than members of the professional body might have a stake in this?

2 ‘NZASW’ was an acronym for the New Zealand Association of Social Workers. From 1999, it was named the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW). For the purposes of this thesis, ANZASW and NZASW will both be referred to as ‘the Association’.
And so the research questions that inform this thesis are:

- To what extent have the aspirations for the statutory registration of social work been realised?
- In what ways has the introduction of statutory registration changed the face of social work professionalism in ANZ?

Hence the title given to the thesis to establish the parameters of the research and serve as a reference for the advent of statutory registration - *There’s a new kid on the block.*

**There’s a new kid on the block**

‘There’s a new kid on the block,  
And boy, that kid is tough,  
That new kid punches hard,  
That new kid plays real rough,  
That new kid’s big and strong,  
With muscles everywhere,  
That new kid tweaked my arm,  
That new kid pulled my hair.

That new kid likes to fight,  
And picks on all the guys,  
That new kid scares me some,  
(That new kid’s twice my size),  
That new kid stomped my toes,  
That new kid swiped my ball,  
That new kid’s really bad,  
I don’t care for her at all’.

*The New Kid on the Block*  
Jack Prelutsky, 1984
There’s a new kid on the block

Metaphorically, then, *the block* includes the social, cultural, political and institutional environment in which social work is practiced in ANZ as well as the political, statutory, service driven and professional imperatives that influence and determine practice. Thus *the block* includes the sites of social work practice within state, Iwi and non-government social services organisations as well as the policies, knowledge, skills, ethical standards and expectations that shape and influence how social work is practised. In the spirit of the metaphor, *the kids*, the central players on *the block*, are those designated as social workers. For the purposes of the thesis there are other players considered *kids on the block* and include those who play a part and have a say about social work - such as politicians, social service managers, administrators and educators. As the professional association for social workers in ANZ since 1964, and for the purposes of the thesis, the Association is dubbed the professional custodian of *the block*. The attribution and justification for this custodianship becomes evident through my account of its history and role.

The Chapters that Follow

**Chapter Two** accounts for the background and development of the Association as the professional custodian of *the block*. **Part One** describes the emergence of a social work profession in ANZ, beginning with the early providers of social care in the late nineteenth century through to a shared identity formed amongst government and voluntary social care workers in the first half of the twentieth century. This ultimately led to the inauguration of the Association in 1964 and the beginning of its consolidation as the professional body for social workers. **Part Two** describes the second period of the Association’s history from the 1970s to the 1990s. It traces the regularly aired and sometimes opposing views of members of the Association as they debated the criteria for membership and whether it ought to be based on some form of registration. By 1989, the Association had settled on a self-regulatory process with competency assessment as the basis for membership. This became a cornerstone to the Association becoming a key lobbyist for statutory registration. This point in the Association’s history is contemporaneous with my collection of the first set of data in 1996 and prior to the enactment of the SWR Act. A synopsis of the guiding principles
of the legislation is provided to signal the entrance of the new kid on the block being the central point of reference for the thesis.

Chapter Three is in two parts. Part One reviews the literature accessed to describe how the sometimes competing and sometimes colluding aspirations of a professional association and a government department were ultimately forged, courtesy of political sponsorship, into legislation to provide for the statutory registration for social workers. A second thread of the literature search was to understand the function and forms of occupational regulation, particularly as it applies to the professions in ANZ. Literature and studies relating to the credentialing of social work in international jurisdictions were also sought to give insight into models of registration that apply to the social work profession elsewhere. Also accessed were relevant government papers regarding the professionalisation strategy of CYPS, the reports of the Registration of Social Workers Project set up by the Minister of Social Services and Employment (the Minister) and the subsequent introduction, enactment and administration of the legislation. The third focus of the literature review was to discover applicable theories that offer insight into the broader social and political processes at play. This search was extended to include written works that critiqued and illustrated the application of such theories. Part Two introduces the theoretical frameworks elicited from this literature search. The hunches and ideas that were stimulants for the research generated a baseline framework that helped identify applicable theoretical models relevant to the study. For example Bourdieu’s schemata of field, capital, doxa and habitus are introduced to conceptualise the political and institutional roles and influences brought to bear as statutory registration is contemplated and then formed. The Foucauldian socio political explanations of governmentality and biopower provide a means for understanding the motives and agendas of government. Another focal point for analysis is to understand the different vested interests and the organisational make-up of the different institutional forms under study.

Chapter Four describes the research methodology, the approach taken to explore the before and after views of a sample of Association members about the introduction of statutory registration. The chapter accounts for how a longitudinal study became possible, how ethical approval was gained and the sampling frame created. The views of the respondents were obtained through recorded interviews that were subsequently
analysed through qualitative analysis, using NVivo software. In essence, this is a longitudinal study. The analysis is shaped by the themes immersed in the questions posed in the semi-structured interviews. The data generated was coded, using the themes identified, and allowed for the inclusion of emergent themes. At different times, I have undertaken a variety of insider roles as one of the kids on the block and was therefore well and variously socialised into the block. For this reason, and to assure the integrity of the research, some reflected self-inquiry is offered: What personal lens did I bring as the researcher? What impact might this have had on my role in the research processes?

Chapter Five presents the results derived from the research. Four separate analyses are made as the results account for interviews conducted in different periods – 1996 and 2014. The first analysis is the content analysis of a paper I previously authored and published and provided as background to the 1996 interviews. The content analysis of this paper helped form the coding template used in the subsequent analysis of the interviews undertaken at that time. Two separate analyses are made of the interviews completed in 2014. One analysis is made of the second interview conducted with the cohort of respondents originally interviewed in 1996. A second analysis was completed of the interviews conducted with the Minister and the Project Manager for the Registration of Social Workers Project (the Project Manager) administered by the Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP) in 2000. Coding templates were developed as guides for each analysis and the results compiled according to theme. A brief synopsis of additional and supporting data drawn from the analysis was used to contextualise each theme.

Chapter Six is in three parts. Following an introduction Part One draws on the themes identified in the analyses to illustrate and discuss the different agendas that were variously tabled in the 1990s prior to statutory registration being introduced. These included, as described in Chapter Two, the Association and its process of self-regulation and, by that time, its advocacy for statutory registration. Also joining the mix were CYPS, as a government department and employer of social workers, and subsequently the New Zealand Labour Party (NZLP) with its new policy objective to introduce statutory registration for social workers. The different motivations of each stakeholder are discussed within the context of the pervading policies of neoliberalism and new managerialism and the process of professionalisation.
Boudeuisian framework is used to describe the attributes of the stakeholders and an institutional logics perspective applied to explain their respective agendas. Social work is also discussed as a public profession and, in this light, considered within the Foucauldian concept of governmentality, **Part Two** examines the different forms and processes of occupational regulation that set the *rules of the game*, with statutory registration but one option. Central to the determination of the need for occupational regulation is the assessment of risk to the public of practice incompetence. This is discussed, as are the different levels of respect, deference and recognition attributed to professions - those with a long tradition of *public calling* such as medicine and law compared with those *skilled callings* that include the helping professions such as social work. A further comparison is made with the forms of occupational regulation that apply for social workers in Australia, the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA) and Canada, which illustrate an array of different models, all of which share a common purpose as a public safeguard against poor social work practice. The enactment of the legislation for statutory registration in 2003 leading to the arrival of *the new kid on the block* is discussed including the advisory role undertaken by the Project Team and the associated parliamentary process. **Part Three** presents the consequences and impact of *the new kid on the block* as drawn from the findings and considered in the light of the theoretical approaches provided. The emergence of the SWRB as a Crown Entity is discussed as a distinct institutional type and the implications of the introduction of statutory registration considered from macro (socio-political), meso (institutional) and micro (personal) perspectives. **Chapter Seven** returns to the research questions, reflecting on these in light of the findings and making some observations in respect of the challenges and opportunities that now face the profession.
Chapter Two – Setting the Context

Introduction

Chapter Two is in two parts that trace the formation of the New Zealand Association of Social Workers (the Association) and sets the context into which the statutory registration of social workers was introduced. Part One is an account of the development of a social work profession in Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ), beginning with the early providers of social care in the late nineteenth century through to the emergence of a shared identity amongst government and voluntary social care workers in the first half of the twentieth century. This ultimately led to the inauguration of the Association in 1964 and its consolidation as the professional body for social workers. Part Two describes the second period of the Association’s history from the 1970s, tracing the regularly aired and sometimes opposing aspirations of members as they debated the criteria for membership and whether it ought to be based on some form of registration. By 1989, the Association had settled on a self-regulatory process with competency assessment as the basis for membership. This was a cornerstone to the Association becoming a key lobbyist for statutory registration, which became a reality in 2003.

Part One – A Profession Formed

Seeding the profession

‘Social work is a profession with roots in caring for others’ (Dominelli, 2011 p. 2). It is to the establishment of the first formally institutionalised ‘roots in caring for others’ (Dominelli, 2011) in ANZ that we first turn to outline the beginnings of a social work profession in ANZ. These laid the foundation for the establishment of a formal association and the beginning of the Association’s professional custodianship of social workers. Figure 2.1 (see Appendix 1: Building the block: Seeding the profession) describes the institutions, services and roles as they evolved, setting a context for the growth of the social work identity. The distinct and intrinsic nature of social work in ANZ were shaped within these and can be traced to distinct forms of service, recipient populations and different institutional types. This illustrates the various threads of the social work identity as it first emerged.
First peoples/Tangata Whenua

The indigenous population of ANZ are Māori as Tangata Whenua (the original inhabitants – people born of the land (Moorfield, 2005). Their guiding principles for care are Whanaungatanga (relationship, sense of belonging) and Manaakitanga (support, generosity), (Moorfield, 2005). These cultural principles govern the functions of social support and well being of the indigenous population. At the juncture at which the first European settlers arrived, the social care of the indigenous population was provided through Whānau (extended family), Hapu (sub-tribe) and Iwi (tribe) (Moorfield, 2005) networks and processes. There was ‘the absence of existing institutions’, other than Māori. (Thomson, 1998, p.19).

Early history – period of settlement and colonisation

The initial expectation of the first European settlers to ANZ was that they be self-sufficient in respect of their own welfare and fend for themselves, an attitude carried over from their home country, where there was a backlash against public assistance (Thomson, 1998). The Poor Laws of England were not imported to ANZ and, as settlement progressed, the first formal institutions of governance introduced some rudimentary forms of welfare provision beginning with the Destitute Persons Ordinance 1846, which was established to support destitute families and children born out of wedlock (Garlick, 2012; Thomson, 1998). Under this provision, local Justices of the Peace and Magistrates determined the need for support. Unlike the existing situation for Māori, there was no mention of a right to support from the wider community, except from any separate charitable aid that might be available or offered (Thomson, 1998).

Charitable and religious social care organisations

For non-Māori the underlying principle was that any recourse to assistance beyond the family rested on charitable support rather than any formally instituted assistance that might have otherwise been provided by the state. This simply did not exist so any instance of need was treated on an individual basis resulting in ‘rigid discrimination between the worthy and deserving and the unworthy and undeserving’ (Thomson, 1998, p. 28). It was within this context that forms of voluntary and charitable help began to emerge to supplement or assume a caring function where extended family support fell short or had evaporated. For the European settlers there was only a very
basic and relatively weak social structure of families and communities to fall back on. At the same time charity organisation was at a basic level with no system of parishes, unions, or craft guilds, as existed in the United Kingdom (Garlick, 2012). In ANZ these would only be built up over time and in a form that suited the local conditions that were very different.

**Roles, work and practices**

The predecessors of the social work profession in ANZ can be found in the roles, work and practices of the early, localised charitable and philanthropic and church organisations. Administrators, visitors and relieving officers administered the first forms of outdoor relief. As institutional forms for indoor relief came into being for the elderly, destitute, orphaned, abandoned, sick and criminal, the roles of those who worked in such institutions became formalised. In addition, those in the roles of police, nurses and teachers also undertook social control, welfare and mediating functions over those who came to their notice. Referral, help, incarceration and counsel were the predominant tools available as fledgling professionals began to develop their own expertise (Dalley, 1998; McDonald, 1998; Oliver, 1977; Tennant, 1989, 2007; Thomson, 1998).

**Public welfare initiatives**

Between the mid-nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, limited voluntary and private arrangements slowly gave way to a modest system of public welfare based on the discretion of provincial governors, local magistrates, relief boards, and industrial school managers. Delegated to provincial governments and heavily dependent on the courts, this system was conceived and delivered in terms of moral worth. It was supervised reluctantly by a central government that was just as concerned with controlling undesirable elements as it was with helping the needy. As outlined by the historian Oliver, (1977) these welfare activities were based on a system of values including ‘the sanctity of benevolence’, a classification into ‘deserving and undeserving’, and ‘external discipline where self-discipline was lacking’ (p. 9). Other early examples of legislation included the Neglected and Criminal Childrens Act 1867, which was ANZ’s first national child welfare legislation for orphaned, destitute or criminal children, (Dalley, 1998; Tennant, 2007) and the Lunatic Asylums Act 1876, which established ANZ’s first social service department. What was expected of those working within the system was a strong and authoritarian demeanour (Tennant, 1989). Formal work roles were created, such as relieving
officers to manage the system of indoor and outdoor relief under the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act 1885 (Tennant, 1989; 2007). Others worked in charitable aid and in the services provided by the early institutions such as hospitals, industrial schools, asylums, orphanages, female refuges and reformatories (Tennant, 1989). Roles, such as the position entitled secretary/visitor were also created in non-state organisations such as the Society for the Protection of Women and Children, which was established in 1893 (Tennant, 1989). Such work and roles established under state and non-state provisions were the early antecedents to what came to be recognised as ‘social work’ and the role ‘social worker’.

**An identity for social work**

The use of the title ‘social worker’ began to gain currency in voluntary welfare organisations early in the twentieth century and was not initially associated with working in a paid position but rather in a voluntary one. ‘Social work’ became very much a generic term embracing a broad field of practice covered by different work titles. Such practice occurred across a range of social services eventually resulting in the accumulation of knowledge and understanding about community needs and problems – the social dimensions to the individual’s situation. Thus the identity of social work was shaped within the context of early voluntary welfare services (Tennant, 2007). By comparison, and as commented in a 1954 report by the New Zealand Institute of Public Affairs (Green, 1954) on the social services in New Zealand, state welfare services were singled out as being slow to adopt methods of social work that drew on psychology and casework techniques. This was attributed to ANZ’s remoteness from the advancements in social work practice elsewhere (Green, 1954). The catalyst for effecting a change in the perception of, and regard for, the fledgling profession was the growing recognition of the knowledge and skills required of those employed in public social services such as child welfare, probation, Māori welfare and health. In 1950, this led to the introduction of formal training and education for such workers with the post-graduate Diploma in Social Science at Victoria University. Despite this, social work remained a term that covered common work practices and associated knowledge and skills but, in itself, not specifically considered, at least by State employers, as an occupation. A former public servant recollects her experience of that time.

---

3 It was not until 1972 that the Diploma changed to become the Diploma in Social Work.
I was employed in the 1950s as a Child Welfare Officer, and given a gazetted authority to carry out my duties in what was then the Child Welfare Division of the Department of Education. I knew I was a public service employee with duties set out in an appropriate manual. I also knew that what I did could be seen as social work, but I did not see myself as a Social Worker (Kendrick, 2004, p. 7)

The keynote speaker at a national conference in the early 1950s celebrating the inception of the School of Social Science at Victoria University also recalled

The generic term ‘social worker’ had very little real meaning to the people participating at the conference. They were Child Welfare Officers, they were Probation Officers, they were Salvation Army officers, they were Almoners, Māori Welfare Officers (McCreary, 1964, p. 3).

Over time social work became established as a career with an, albeit, broad social science educational curriculum. By the 1950s, with the Child Welfare Division recruiting University graduates or qualified teachers and nurses, the situation and expectations began to change quite markedly. The Probation Service also looked to employing people with higher levels of qualification. The Department of Māori Affairs had tended to recruit Iwi leaders as welfare officers. The Department of Social Security and Hospital Boards began to value the recruitment of tertiary trained people to social work positions, be they nurses, teachers or someone who held a social science degree in psychology, social anthropology or sociology. However, other than the Diploma course at Victoria University, only limited tertiary training opportunities were available. A Certificate in Social Studies (Auckland) and another in medical social work (the Auckland School of Nursing) were two exceptions. In 1963, the State Services Commission established a residential social work training centre for limited numbers of government employees at Tiromoana. Training opportunities for those working in non-government agencies were all but non-existent (Nash, 1998; NZASW, 1964). The Diploma at Victoria University, with very limited entry, remained the only dedicated University social work qualification until 1975.
A professional body for social workers

Between 1949 and 1950, a Child Welfare Workers’ Association was established. Child welfare was, of course, a statutory function and its workers public servants. However, staff sought an external forum of common interest. Initially, this was just for those employed as Child Welfare Officers. Within a few years, networking resulted in four regional associations of social workers becoming established. These were open to those working across a range of agencies, including Child Welfare. This illustrated and reinforced the growing awareness of others doing ‘like’ work and the emerging sense of a common identity (Nash, 1998). A significant outcome arising from this networking and the emerging recognition of a common identity was a Social Workers Study Conference held in Dunedin in 1962. The Editorial Comment that introduces the collection of papers presented at this conference accounts for a developing sense of collectivism by social workers to form ‘a definitive framework in which social workers could operate as a profession’ (Wildman, (Ed.). 1962, p.1). This was reflected in the papers from the conference, which identified a need to agree on the meaning and nature of social work as a basis for developing training in theory and practice. Alongside this was identified the need for a code of enforceable professional ethics that, in turn, would be dependent upon the formation of a professional organisation with agreed standards of professional behaviour (Wildman, (Ed.). 1962).

As subsequently opined

It could certainly be argued that one of the primary purposes of this document (the conference papers) is to assert the case for a national association as part of a wider project for the professionalisation of social work in New Zealand (Ballantyne, 2014, p. 3).

The conference papers provide real insight into the place of social work and social workers at this time. It seemed only a matter of time before a national association was formed (Wildman, (Ed.). 1962).

A national association of social workers

In 1964, a national association became formalised at the Inaugural Conference of the Association in Auckland. It was described in the Keynote Address as an ‘attempt on the part of social workers to increase the self-conscious awareness of themselves as professional people and as members of a profession’ (McCreary, 1964, p. 3).
The generic term ‘social worker’ now has some meaning that is generally acceptable to the majority of the participants of this conference. There is now a recognised body of practice and theory that constitutes the profession of social work (McCreary, 1964, p. 3).

However, within the newly formed Association, the pursuit of a professional identity for social workers had its detractors as well as advocates. At the inaugural conference, this played out in the debate over membership criteria, in particular over whether membership should be open or closed. The place of training and qualifications was central to this. In a commentary on the Association’s organisation and rules of the constitution adopted at the time it was stated:

The Rules could have made membership in the Association open to all who had the slightest interest in helping people; or, at the other extreme, they could – as in many professional associations - have restricted membership to those who had completed a recognised professional training. In fact they did neither. Voting membership, with a few exceptions, is open only to people who are actively engaged in the practice of social work (Luckock, 1964, p. 24).

Central to this assertion was that the definition of what constituted social work and the basis for membership remained quite open. The key determinants for membership were either holding a professional qualification, which applied to a small minority at that time, or being employed by an approved agency within specified categories of employment. A register of the approved agencies for membership of the Association was maintained for this purpose. This was to serve as the basis for membership until 1989. The new Association adopted an interim Code of Ethics and quickly began the work to establish the trappings of a professional body. Public endorsement by the Government of the formation of the Association followed immediately (NZ Herald, 1964). The outcomes from the Inaugural Conference were not achieved without strong debate, however, provoking a sharp rejoinder from the conference chairman, Professor R Winterbourn, at the time, as subsequently reported ‘I can see your proposed Association is going to crumble if these bickering differences are not forgotten’ (Winterbourn, 1964, p.3). This observation was somewhat prescient of the
longstanding debates regarding the pros and cons of professional identity and registration as described in the account that follows.

**Establishing the professional custodianship**

By the early 1970s, the Association was firmly established as a national association with a formal constitution, branch structure and governance by a nationally elected Council. It drew on a membership based upon employment in an approved social services agency and had made links with the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW). A regular journal, *NZ Social Worker News and Opinions*, was published. The Association had lobbied successfully in respect of opening up training opportunities for social workers employed in non-government organisations (NGOs) and, since 1968, had issued a ‘Certificate in the Theory and Practice of Social Work’ in conjunction with the extension studies departments of the Universities of Canterbury, Auckland and Wellington (McDonald, 2004). With its publication of the report *Social Welfare at the Crossroads*, (NZASW, 1971) as a significant submission on government proposals to restructure government social welfare services the Association had also become recognised as a voice for social work resulting in regular meetings with the Minister. The Association’s earliest aspirations were clearly about representing and advocating for those who collectively identified as social workers. At this stage it was not so much about becoming a registered occupation (Fry, 1974, 1989).

**‘Social worker’ defined**

In 1971, a new Department of Social Welfare Act (DSW Act) enshrined in law a statutory title for a ‘social worker’, if only in respect of the purposes of the Act. This title was applied to those working under the new legislation, including all who had been previously employed as Child Welfare Officers in the Child Welfare Division of the Department of Education and Social Workers employed by the Social Security Department. Perhaps it was the imminence of this new legislation that prompted the Association to write its own definition for a ‘social worker’ (Manchester, 1970). This at least put a professional stamp on the occupational title accorded by the new Act. However, the criteria for membership of the Association remained unchanged and the qualities and standards expected of a social worker continued to lie within the position descriptions variously set by employing agencies, both government and NGO. In respect of social workers working for DSW it was observed:
Social workers command considerable power in their dealings with clients …… but such power may often be more apparent than real in that within his agency the social worker is limited to administrative regulations and instructions as to how and under what conditions he may proceed (Jones, 1974, p. 29).

Is social work a profession?
The status of social work as a profession remained questionable and the doubters were prolific with their published assertions examining the claims and counter claims over its status. A thesis entitled *Social Work: the Reluctant Profession* was dedicated to the topic (Jones C, 1979) with others airing their views on the debate in the Association’s publications. ‘NZ social work is not a profession, never has been a profession, and in all probability never will be a profession’ (Jones P, 1974, p. 27). While another commentator wrote:

I perceive this whole subject of professionalism and delineation of boundaries to be fraught with peculiar and particular stress for the Kiwi. You are, if you will not think me rude, the nicest and best collection of do-it-yourself youngsters I know but the other face of that coin….. is a native distrust of professionalism (Treadgold, 1974,p. 9).

The debate reflected the continuing keen interest in a topic that was central to the public perception of the Association and social work. It was also a point on which potential and current members might determine their loyalty to the Association. Without doubt it was a critical discussion particularly in terms of social work and social workers in ANZ forming an identity that was contextually relevant for them and their practice. (See the following discussion pp. 121ff)

Maintaining the status quo
Nonetheless, new seeds for pursuing a fresh approach to membership of the Association based on a form of registration were sown preparatory to the Association’s Conference in 1974, where a National Executive proposal was debated. This proposed a membership register of individual members, rather than the existing catch all for membership based on being employed as a social worker by an approved social services agency. During this debate, the concern that membership of the Association lay virtually at the whim of the recruitment policies of various agencies
rather than any set educational criteria was relitigated (Christchurch Branch NZASW Working Party on Registration, 1977). However, the proposal was defeated and the status quo prevailed (Fry, 1989). The scene for the ensuing wrestle between professional and occupational custodianship of the social work profession was set.

**Figure 2.2 (see Appendix 2: Building the block: Forming the profession)** outlines the activities and building blocks of the social work profession during the 1950s to 1970s, including the contributions of other significant players on the block during that period. The formation of a professional identity is reflected through the professional activities generated, the various themes of particular interest that emerged and the range of outcomes achieved.

**Part Two - The Early Debates 1976-1982**

Part One concluded with an account of the outcome of the Association’s Conference in 1974, when a proposal to change the criteria for membership to one based on a form of registration was defeated. Nonetheless the idea of membership based on registration did not disappear.

**Round One: Begging the question**

By December 1976, the National Executive had reiterated the Association’s commitment to and acceptance of statutory registration as an objective of the Association. The National Executive wished for statutory registration to be fully researched and debated, at the same time recognising the depth of feeling that surrounded the issue (NZASW, 1976). The invitation for debate laid out the principle aims for registration and the questions these raise: the need for minimum qualification standards, the assessment of eligibility, the maintenance of the register, and responsibility for disciplinary action. Some disadvantages of registration were identified as the difficulty defining social work, the lack of qualified social workers, and the devaluation of the unqualified. Furthermore, it raised the question: ‘Is social work more of a ‘movement’ than a profession?’ (NZASW, 1976). The commitment sought was endorsed at the 1976 Biennial Conference (Christchurch Branch - NZASW Working Party on Registration, 1977) and the report of the working party on registration was subsequently submitted to a Special General Meeting (SGM) of the Association in September 1978. In this report, which included an examination of the
unsuccessful efforts of psychologists to achieve statutory registration due to the lack of support of Government, it was deemed unrealistic to expect that it would be any different for social workers (Christchurch Branch - NZASW Working Party on Registration, 1977). The broader recommendation of the report that the Association become a registered body was, therefore, not sustained at the SGM. Instead, the SGM proposed that the report be used as guidelines by an Association group to ‘establish a register of qualified social workers and determine the criteria by which Association members be admitted to the register’ (NZASW, 1978). This watered-down outcome clearly did not reflect the fervour of the original working party recommendations that, should their recommendations fail, the Association should abrogate its original mandate of accepting the principle of registration and that, instead ‘a new body of social workers be formed with the expressed intention of implementing registration’ (Christchurch Branch NZASW Working Party on Registration, 1977, p. 57). The outcome of the SGM put to one side, at least for the time being, any notion that the principle of statutory registration would be carried through by the Association under its present form. However it did raise the possibility of a breakaway Association being established in its place to seek this. The SGM had been held in conjunction with the Association’s Biennial Conference, the keynote speaker being Dr Ivan Illich and his address entitled The Disabling Professions (Illich, 1978b). Introduced as a radical social critic and philosopher with a world reputation, Illich railed against professionalism ‘the professional has acquired political power, and that this political power expresses itself in the ability of the professional to appear as expert on hearsay before the Courts and, increasingly, in the legislature’ (p. 12). He also spoke of social workers as ‘professional need-catchers’ whose task is to make needs and ‘having problems respectable’ (p. 13; 1978a). It seems not unreasonable to conclude that with Illich’s views pervading at the time any lofty aspirations the SGM held for statutory registration were somewhat tempered by what he had to say.

**Round Two: Frank exchanges**

It is perhaps not surprising that the 1980 Association’s Conference reaffirmed the original (1964) position regarding membership and that it remain open to those who are employed in the Register of Approved Social Agencies or have a social work qualification (NZASW, 1980). Thus membership essentially remained open as before and not subject to any test that registration would require. In the light of this, the incumbent President appealed for ‘all social workers in NZ to join THEIR national
association’ (Hannifin, 1981, p.3). As a backdrop to this, Letters to the Editor were appearing in the Association’s newsletter querying an initiative to form a breakaway association:

Unofficial notification informs me that a Christchurch group is attempting to gather support for a professional organisation for trained social workers. Their leaflets are only sent to trained social workers – probably because they think untrained social workers cannot read big words like “in” and “meeting” (NZASW, 1981a, p. 11).

By way of response, another correspondent wondered whether the (aforementioned) letter was for real or ‘some mischief from the Editors?’ (McDonald, 1989, p. 4). Yet another wrote

Unfortunately, I have not been asked to join (the rumoured professional organisation for qualified social workers)[…] which means, I presume, I am not regarded as a ‘professional’ social worker. I am really offended that I am not among the chosen few. I support the idea of such an organisation. It could be called a ‘College of Social Workers’. Eventually Her Majesty may, in her ultimate wisdom, see fit to bestow on it the prefix of Royal. We could then hold our heads up high as members of a Royal College of Social Workers’ and take our place shoulder to shoulder with the true upholders of our society’s values. We could then feel the equal of doctors, accountants and music teachers. Then at last our clients may come to recognise us for what we are – true pillars of the establishment (NZASW, 1981b, p. 5).

Clearly the issue of the Association’s membership criteria, as frankly expressed in these exchanges, illustrates the very lively contention between the ‘open’ versus ‘closed’ camps within the Association. The question became how to move forward while retaining the professional ground the Association had sown. One proponent for statutory registration at the time, having traversed the prevailing arguments, concluded by saying:
We must weigh up greater control, autonomy, competence and credibility against the dangers of expertise, remoteness and abuse of power. I believe that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and that many of the disadvantages are with us already, not in the future (Flowers, 1981, p.86).

His view was immediately countered by another member referring to the writer as a ‘professional monopolist [.....] a favourite of the neo conservative movement (Stenton, 1982, p. 8). The earlier recognition by the National Executive in 1976 (NZASW, 1976) of the depth of feelings and range of opinions that existed amongst the membership about the issue of registration and professionalism was insightful. The opportunities provided through the channels of the Association’s regular newsletters and publications also ensured that both sides of the argument were frankly aired with a better prospect of having membership informed and engaged in the discussion.

**Round Three: The two-year plan**

The issues were obviously complex and had been openly debated with almost monotonous regularity. In 1982, the Biennial Conference revisited the issues again and this time passed a remit laying out a concerted two-year plan to inform and involve members in a wider and managed debate (Hessey, 1983). The plan that was instituted included the distribution of articles through the Association’s newsletter outlining the different aspects of the debate. These included: clarification around the use of the terminology to achieve a common language; the different methods of accreditation through membership and registration; the competencies and attributes of a professionally competent practitioner, including their assessment or examination. The well documented process also allowed for submissions and concluded with a survey of members that was used as the basis for a report and remits to the 1984 Biennial Conference (NZASW, 1984). In respect of their attitude to legislation, 85% of the respondents to the survey ‘strongly favour legislation to restrict the use of the term ‘social worker’, establish entry criteria to the occupation and create a disciplinary structure’ (Section III, p. 5). Remits put to the 1984 Biennial Conference reflected the submissions made by members to the discussion paper, including a ‘push for the introduction of legislation to discipline the use of the term social worker and to establish an independent accreditation body’ (Section V, p. 1). As recalled by two leaders of the Association at the time this period was critical insofar as what was to
eventually transpire ‘the 1984 Christchurch conference was fiery and intense as the issues of registration, professionalism and racism became intertwined. The executive’s proposal for registration was ultimately rejected’ (Fraser & Briggs, 2016, p. 43). In its place, the Association formed yet another working party to report on ‘a system of accountability of social workers and social work services to consumers, the public, employers and the profession’ (p. 45). The issues of registration and professionalism were now reframed to become a system of accountability and judging by the editorial that appeared in the Association’s newsletter, it seemed less likely that statutory registration would feature in any system of accountability established by the Association.

Registration, an imported model, is about status and elitism, largely based on the possession of rigid, formal qualifications …. [It] is a mere smokescreen of the real debate about what social work is and where we should stand in relation to our clients and the state. Registration borrows the mantle of power from other professions while pretending that we will be strong and noble enough to withstand the seduction of the system. Remove the mantle and we stand, not naked, but wearing the grey suit and tie of the oppressor (Beddoe, 1985, p. 3ff).

**Round Four: Biculturalism**

Confronting the Working Party on Accountability were not only the challenges to identify a system of accountability but also to give cognisance to the anti-racism movement of the time. The involvement of members of the Association in writing the report that exposed the institutional racism identified in DSW (Berridge et al, 1985) provided the impetus for this to occur.

It is clear that the policies of our own association must also come under scrutiny. What are the implications of registration and accreditation for Māori and Pacific Island social workers? What will be the criteria for acceptance and who will decide? What about access to social work training, and agency recruitment and selection policies and practices? (Davys & Kemp, 1984, p.1)

The 1986 Conference at Turangawaewae saw the newly formed Tangata Whenua caucus temporarily separate from the Association. This episode ultimately led to a
bicentral partnership being formed between the Manuhiri caucus and the Tangata Whenua caucus of the Association. A bicentral structure was eventually established that was also to be reflected in any system of accountability established (Fraser & Briggs, 2016). A further challenge directed to the Association was made in 1987 by a respected Māori leader.

Social work has never emerged from the world of darkness to take its place in the sun …… surrounded eminently by the aura of sibling professions of law, medicine, architecture and those who took root from the “hard” sciences (Rangihau, 1987, p.1).

This followed an earlier challenge Rangihau had made in respect of the need for social work education ‘to take new points of departure in the future if ethnic minorities designate aspects like economic development, cultural development and language development as key priorities that have to be met’ (Rangihau, 1983, p. 4). Rangihau was the chairperson of the Ministerial review that exposed the extent of institutional racism in ANZ’s welfare institutions. The report, Puao-te-ata-tu, that followed the review was to lead to significant policy and service delivery changes in the social services sector (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988). The implications for the social work profession as a leading edge to these services were profound (Beddoe & Randal, 1994).

**Round Five: Minimum standards and competence**

The definition of the skills, knowledge and values required for social work were shaped by employers and educators rather than through direct professional input from the Association. DSW policy and management had a significant say in what constituted social work, as did the accredited minimum standards for social work courses developed by the Social Work Training Council (NZSWTC) that had been established by DSW in 1974 (Nash, 1998). The SWTC had previously written the resource document ‘Competent Social Work Practice’ in 1982 (NZSWTC, 1986), based on a wide consultation with practitioners, which identified alternative perspectives and, therefore, different expectations of the competencies (values, knowledge and skills) for social work practice (NZSWTC, 1986).
Round Six: Membership attrition and the threat to existence

Ings (1986) drew on comparisons between an independent survey (Rochford, 1981) and the Association’s own membership data (Petre, 1980), and pointed out that the Association’s membership was older, mostly female, mostly employed by government institutions or statutory bodies, mostly in more senior positions in the workforce, and more qualified than the wider populace of social service workers. Such a limited and unrepresentative membership base of the Association raised the question whether the Association had the mandate to make decisions on behalf of social workers whom remain outside the organisation (Ings, 1986). With registration off the agenda as a key plank to the Association’s effort to forge a clear professional identity for its members, and with a faltering membership numbering only 291, the prospect of winding up became a real possibility. ‘In the light of these figures National Executive must continue to consider putting to members the possibility of winding up the Association’ (NZASW National Executive, 1988, p. 32). The Association’s existence had become caught up in the consequences of the DSW’s realignment of its resourcing to community-based services at the expense of the individual focus of social work. This resulted in ‘a crisis in confidence, a tenuous hold on professionalism and the loss of social work professional leadership’ (Barretta-Herman, 1994a, p. 18). The culture of new managerialism had arrived, with social workers prescribed work tasks to achieve outputs and outcomes (Beddoe & Randal, 1994; Randal, 1997a). As it transpired, however, this hiatus and crisis gave new impetus to the social work profession’s drive for professionalisation and ultimately advocacy for statutory registration. However, for the Association’s stamp to remain on the professionalisation project, and not be driven purely by management and educational imperatives, new strategies were clearly needed.

Round Seven: Compromise through competency

At the Association’s 1988 SGM, a compromise solution for Association membership was agreed that established a working party for what became the Board of Competency (Beddoe & Randal, 1994; Interim Board of Competency, 1990). Competency certification as the basis for membership effectively allowed the issues that were raised in the talk of registration, professionalism, academic qualifications and elitism to be conveniently sidestepped (Randal, 1997b). At the time, competency and unit standards had become enthroned in the vocabulary as the guiding lights for professional knowledge and training in the social services (Randal, 1997b).
October 1989, the Minister of Social Welfare launched the introduction of the Association’s Certificate of Competency noting the timeliness of the move for social work to establish its credentials, describing it as a ‘fledgling profession’ (Cullen, 1989, p.29). Competence and fitness to practice had become the catchcry. With competency, the Association had provided a vehicle of accountability, on its own terms, for its members. In doing so, the Association had steered a course on uncharted waters that was, arguably, of its own making, independent of the need for an educational qualification, but with the intent of achieving competent practice that reflected adherence to the Association’s code of ethics and provided evidence of bicultural practice and consistency with the principles of the Te Tiriti (The Treaty of Waitangi) (Barretta-Herman, 1994a, 1994b; Daniels, 1989; Interim Board of Competency, 1990). By 1990, the Association’s membership had steadily increased to 570 members (Briggs, 1990, p. 24), twice the number in 1988 when there had been the real prospect of dissolution of the Association.

**Round Eight: Heading off the dominant player**

The prevailing dominant influence over social work, however, remained DSW, evident in its restructuring in 1989, which saw a significant shift to resourcing community based services and ‘the term social work being superseded in the Department by the more amorphous, generalised, non-occupationally linked designation ‘social services’’ (Barretta-Herman, 1994b, p. 267). More emphasis was placed by agencies, including DSW, on recruiting staff with community based skills and cultural knowledge rather than necessarily those with a qualification. In particular Māori expertise and knowledge of effective ways of working with Māori was sought (Keall, 1993). Since its formation in 1964, when the Association lobbied for training opportunities for all social workers, the profession had become, to some extent, dependent on the patronage of DSW. But it was also at the mercy of policy changes, particularly as they impacted on service provision and practice. To that end, the establishment of the professional status of social workers was as much embedded in the occupational role ascribed to it within DSW as it was to the Association’s own aspirations for the profession. As DSW could be perceived to be ‘deprofessionalising’ social work (Clark, 2005; Specht, 1972), so the Association, through its competency certification initiative, was reviving its bid to professionalise, through a self-imposed self-regulatory system of accountability to the public and consumers. At the same time this initiative, in some ways, served to break the traditional expectation that
being a professional required having a qualification. Now it was a matter of demonstrating what is necessary and sufficient for competent practice (Keall, 1993). The competency assessment programme also offered an alternative pathway in the debate on statutory registration in raising the possibility that registration need not necessarily be based on an academic qualification (McNabb, 1997).

**Round Nine: Becoming self-regulatory**

The introduction of a certificate of competency provided a basis for the accountability of members of the Association but, at the time, the Association lacked any formal and publicised mechanism for managing complaints in respect of a member’s competence. This was rectified in 1993, with the adoption of a comprehensive code of ethics including a bicultural code of practice (Beddoe & Randal, 1994). The code provided a set of standards for ethical conduct as a basis for accountability to the public and consumers for any breaches of the code and complaints about practice. A complete, Association-driven self-regulatory system was now in place (Interim Board of Competency, 1990).

**Round Ten: Back on the agenda**

Social worker registration was back on the Association’s agenda at the 1993 Annual General Meeting (AGM) and the mandate was given for the terms of reference for a working party to be developed.

It was clear … that the Association preferred social work registration in ANZ to mean registration based on competency not qualification. We quickly discovered that this was something that no other profession has implemented to date, (although there has been a Governmental working party recommending development of all industries in this direction) (Blagdon, Taylor & Keall, 1994, p. 24).

In its report the working party reflected on the history of the debate, described the different types of occupational regulation and accounted for the processes and issues involved in setting up a legal registration process. Points for debate were published for the Association’s membership to consider. By this time, membership had increased to 698 (Blagdon, Taylor & Keall, 1994). In 1992 the New Zealand Children, Young Persons Service (CYPS) had launched a professionalisation strategy setting goals to raise the competency and level of qualification of its social work staff (CYPS, 1996).
Following a review of this strategy in 1996 a strategic goal was set to promote the establishment within two years of an independent registering body for the social work profession in ANZ (Coopers & Lybrand, 1996). In the light of this the Association felt compelled to also now work hard to promote the development of statutory registration (McNabb, 1996).

**Looking ahead**

This point in the Association’s history coincides with the time when the first round of interviews was completed with the sample of Association members and the first set of data for the research collected. This was in 1996 and prior to the enactment of the legislation in 2003. Within the intervening period, the Association’s working party on statutory registration had prepared a position paper. (Corrigan et al, 1999; Curson, 1999). At the same time, political endorsement for the Association’s position was forthcoming from the Labour spokesperson for Social Welfare (Maharey, 1998). The Association’s position paper became the basis for its formal submissions (ANZASW, 2000) to the Project Team appointed in 2000 by the government to consult and advise on the form of legislation (Ministry of Social Policy, 2000). Members of the Association’s working party, including its legal advisor, were also invited to meet with the Ministry’s Project Team to discuss the proposals. The Association followed the introduction of the Bill closely making written and oral submissions to the Social Services Select Committee that examined the draft legislation prior to its enactment (ANZASW, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c). Members of the Association were kept informed of progress through regular updates (Corrigan et al, 2002).

**The Social Workers Registration Act 2003 (The SWR Act)**

The following synopsis describes the guiding principles of the legislation that signalled the entrance of *the new kid on the block* - the central point of reference for the thesis. The SWR Act established the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB), which was constituted as a Crown Entity in November 2003 with the responsibility of maintaining the statutory register of social workers. The SWRB appointed by the Minister of Social Services and Employment has ten members, including six who are required to be eligible for registration (Hunt, 2017). The register lists those entitled to apply for and become adjudged as meeting the requirements for registration. The criteria for registration were set by the SWRB following consultation with the social services sector. This included meeting standards of conduct and integrity (the Code of Conduct), holding a minimum qualification, successfully undertaking a competency
assessment and continuing professional development (Hunt, 2017). Applicants were also adjudged whether they were fit and proper to practise social work. Registered social workers subsequently became required to hold a practising certificate, renewable every five years as an attestation to the social worker’s fitness to practise. The SWR Act also established a Complaints and Disciplinary Tribunal to consider complaints about registered social workers. The Tribunal is appointed and administered by the SWRB. The register serves as the basis for ensuring the protection of the public that is the essential purpose of the SWR Act. In addition, apart from creating the framework as described above, the Act is expected to promote the benefits of registration and enhance the professionalism of social workers through the promotion and encouragement of high standards of practice and professional conduct (SWR Act 2003; SWRB, http://www.swrb.govt.nz/). The SWRB is further obliged to ensure the aims and aspirations of Māori as Tangata Whenua are prioritised and to be accessible to the views of Pacific people and other ethnic and cultural groups in ANZ. As a Crown Entity, the SWRB is subject to the Public Finance Act 1989, is required to report annually to the responsible Minister, and may be required to give effect to Government policy. As such, the Board’s ultimate parent is the New Zealand Crown. The Board’s primary objective is to provide public services to the New Zealand public, as opposed to that of making a financial return (SWR Act 2003; SWRB, http://www.swrb.govt.nz/). Nonetheless the SWRB is expected to be self-funding and meet its costs through the income derived from fees and levies collected from registered social workers (Hunt, 2017). Thus, the new kid has arrived on the block.
Chapter Three – The Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Introduction
The thesis topic provides an intriguing platform for studying and analysing the interplay, over time, between professional association aspirations, the emerging institutional imperatives of a government department and a new political agenda in respect of the introduction of statutory registration for social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ). Part One of Chapter Three reviews the literature accessed to explore and explain how these sometimes competing, sometimes colluding, aspirations were ultimately forged into the legislation to provide for the statutory registration for social workers. Part Two sets the theoretical framework that will provide coherence for the different theoretical perspectives that are brought together to analyse the data and draw conclusions from the research. The framework is developed from the basic premise of the research – the idea that there are significant implications at different levels when a self-regulated profession becomes subject to statutory regulation. In the broadest sense, it is a framework for understanding:

1. the institutional phenomena that are implicated, being the profession of social work and the role of the government in introducing a statutory instrument for professional registration; and
2. the theories that seek to explain the social phenomena of the fields under study and their interrelationships

Part One - The literature review
A Framework
To uncover the history of the statutory registration of social workers in ANZ and set the context for the research, the literature search initially focussed on the Association’s own records and other written accounts relating to the development of the social work profession in ANZ and its role as a professional association. The initiative of the Children and Young Persons Service (CYPS) as the service of a government department to professionalise its social workers, also made it relevant to consider the particular characteristics of public professions within the wider socio-
political backdrop of neo–liberalism and the advent of new managerialism. With statutory registration having become the objective of both CYPS and the Association, it is necessary to understand the models and processes of occupational regulation and how they apply in respect of other professions in ANZ and for social work in other national jurisdictions. These provide a basis for comparison and discussion of the particular form of registration that was to become embodied in the Social Workers Registration Act 2003 (The SWR Act). The literature search also sought to identify relevant social theory to provide insight into the broader processes and dynamics at play within the Association as a professional body and CYPS as the service of a government department. The intention was to aid the interpretation and explanation of these and give the research integrity. The final thrust of the literature search was to learn what others had written on the consequences of the arrival of a new kid on the block. A framework was developed to account for the different topics explored in the literature search (see Appendix 3: Figure 3.1 Conducting the Literature Search). The framework accounts for the three distinct phases of the research:

1. Setting the context;
2. The evolution of statutory registration, as it unfolded; and then, by way of theoretical explanation;
3. Reflections on the consequences.

Furthermore, the framework identifies the topics that are the focus of the literature search and central to the subsequent discussion. Specifically these include:

- the Association as a professional body;
- the socio-political context of CYPS’s professionalisation strategy;
- occupational regulation and what it is;
- the process leading to the enactment of the legislation; and
- the social theories selected to provide theoretical insight of the processes and dynamics and identify useful analytical frameworks.

The sources accessed include a wide range of publications and papers, including those made available under the Official Information Act. The sources helped explain the, at times, wavering journey by the social work profession to its statutory registration in ANZ. The intention of the literature search was to ensure that a full account of the agendas of the profession and state was given as a basis for theoretical scrutiny.
Setting the context - the kids on the block

The literature search initially served to inform the narrative account in Chapter Two that established the context of the thesis, in particular the genesis and subsequent development of the Association to the point of statutory registration becoming a reality. Of particular interest were the debates about membership criteria and the position papers written about registration, as well as the formal submissions made in respect of the government’s eventual proposal for the statutory registration of social workers (Corrigan et al, 1999; Curson, 1999; ANZASW, 2000; ANZASW, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c). These papers and submissions represent the culmination of over 30 years discussion and debate within the Association. The next task was to provide some greater depth to the context through the examination of the discourses around the formation and role of professional associations in formalising the profession and advocating for statutory recognition.

The professional body

One challenge faced in the literature search, but an added impetus to the task, was an earlier observation regarding the role and involvement of professional organisations in influencing public policy regulating professional practice. ‘There has been little research into the amount and kind of involvement of professional associations in the process of getting practice acts written, passed, and enforced’ (Akers, 1968, p.464). A subsequent online search found that Evetts and Dingwall (2002) have written on the mutual interconnection they see between the state and the professions in respect of the development and modification of regulatory and licensing systems in Europe, drawing on the work of Foucault and Spencer. Writing somewhat earlier, Ritzer (1975) referenced Weber (1968) regarding the important role of the profession in Western society and Gross (1978) observed that the helping professions were seeking to gain legal sanction through licensing to practise autonomously, just as the health and legal professions had done. Yet Flexner (1915) had even earlier postulated, in his analysis of what characterises a profession, that a clear boundary cannot be drawn around the field of social work as it can for, say, medicine, engineering and law. One can draw from this that such a lack of specificity meant difficulty in recognising social work as a profession, let alone formulating regulations to make the profession accountable. However, in spite of Flexner’s (1915) postulations and the debate he initiated regarding the professionalism of social work, in the United States of America (USA)
the legal credentialing of social work did begin there in the 1950s (Thyer & Biggerstaff, 1989). It is also clear that discussions and advocacy around licensing social work were identified with the efforts of the various associations of social workers in the USA. One piece of empirical research in the USA reviewed the strategies adopted by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) in the pursuit of legal regulation (Gandy & Raymond, 1979). Only a minority of states had achieved licensing and the slow progress was attributed to the under-utilisation of the strategies promoted by the NASW. Statutory credentialing of social workers in the USA eventually followed suit, supported by the American Association of State Social Work Boards (AASSWB), an overarching professional organisation dedicated to achieving legal regulation for social workers (Gandy & Raymond, 1979). On a broader front, Thomas, Hegarty & Macgregor (2012) describe the long history, multiple functions and influence of occupational guilds and disciplines, as the precursors of professional associations, exercising control over their interests, Another study of the role of professional associations at times of deinstitutionalisation and change, argues that associations do indeed play an important part in hosting the debate about change (Greenwood, Sudaby & Hinings, 2002). They also reinforced the view that the study of professional associations, per se, is a relatively neglected topic. The literature search therefore turned its focus to consider the role a national association has in identifying and representing a distinct profession such as social work. In 1969 the Association reprinted in its newsletter a comprehensive article on the role of professional associations (Collis, 1969), referencing earlier writings on the topic (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1933; Collis, 1967; Lubove, 1965; Millerson, 1964; Vollmer & Mills, 1966). In extolling the virtues and attributes of the professional association Collis described its functions in shaping the professional culture and essential to the process of professionalisation. The publishing of the article served as a follow-up to the challenge put to members of the Association to consider how committed they really were to professionalism (Wadsworth, 1968, 1969). This topic was to remain a regular feature in discussions about the Association’s role and purpose with members urged, from time to time, to reject the conventional premises associated with being identified as a profession and adopt a different form of occupational organisation that gains its relevance in the eyes of those it serves (Shannon, 1979; Tonkin, 1984). Defining the attributes of a profession and becoming organised as a professional body were clearly prerequisites for the legal regulation of
the profession. As Barnes & Hugman (2002) suggest: ‘The emergence of an identifiable profession of social work is tied to the development of national professional associations’ (p. 281). One attribute of a profession is the control of admission to the professional body to provide a self-regulatory, if only rudimentary, mechanism for public assurance over standards and conduct (Greenwood, 1957; Matarazzo, 1977). Matarazzo (1977) writes of the typical history of professions toward certification and licensure, which is ultimately attained through governmental machinery following an evolutionary process of collective common interest, loose organisation, defined entry and gradually codified standards and expectations. The history of the Association recounted in Chapter Two closely replicates Matarazzo’s account. Bucher and Strauss’s (1961) emergent approach to the study of professions also signalled the processes of diversity and conflict of interest that were likely to be uncovered when researching the formation of a profession. This gave licence to explore the differential interests that were encountered in the research and are typical of association life. Given the historical nature of the research, it was important to keep in mind the principles that should apply when reviewing literature that covered the different periods of an association’s development. The aim was to form an account that was authentic, reliable and respectful of the specific context in which the material was written (Tosh, 2006) and to provide a balanced treatment through the analysis. As an examination of the history of the Association, it was important to capture the opposing and changing conversations amongst members over time (Thelen, 2003), on the journey to professional recognition. Bitensky (1973) describes the contradictory trends in social work’s development as a profession. ‘Sometimes social work has seemed to be the conscience of society. During other periods it seems to have been an apologist for the status quo, devoting its efforts to adjusting clients to the existing social institutions’ (p. 119). These contrasting trends are illustrative of the scope of conversations elicited from the Association’s minuted records and publications. For example, Older (1975) critiqued, social work’s preoccupation with professionalism thereby effectively turning its back on social reform and social change in ANZ. And as Daniel (2013) commented, not everyone wanted to assume the role of the professional. Professional recognition was, for some, to come at a cost. ‘The transition of “helping”, in the form of charitable endeavours, towards social work as a profession has been fraught with tensions and remains contested’ (p.396). An exploration of the themes of profession, professional, and professionalisation was
therefore important given the historical thread of the research and the changing theoretical terrain encountered over that period. The early analyses and research into professions (Etzioni, 1969; Greenwood, 1957; Wilensky, 1964), which focussed on definition, have subsequently been reconsidered to account for the place of professions within the wider socio-political landscape. Such reconsideration has led to discourses about professional elitism, legitimacy, trust and power and the view that regulatory measures (such as statutory registration) serve to construct professionalism ‘from above’ through the tutelage of the state rather than through the initiative ‘from within’ the occupational group (Evetts, 2006a; Evetts, 2006b). One study (Timmons, 2011) examined how an occupational group of health technicians equated professionalisation with becoming regulated. This reflected disappointment and an ambivalent outcome regarding any elevated professional status from gaining formal statutory recognition. Professional regulation did not ‘generate the kinds of benefits that the professionalisation literature might suggest’ (p. 348). Autonomy and discretion are two such benefits and can be attributed to not only the level of knowledge and skill acquired by the professional but also the status, esteem and identity they may be granted (Evetts, 2002).

The literature search was also tailored to account for the scrutiny of the classical theories of professionalisation and professionalism through the political lens of neo liberalism and power (Freidson, 2001, 1986, 1984; Healy, 2000), the institutional notion of ‘the public professions’ (Howe, 1980; Noordegraaf, 2007, 2016) and the counter processes of deprofessionalisation and reprofessionalisation (Clark, 2005; Healy & Meagher, 2004; Randall & Kindiak, 2008).

The socio-political context and CYPS’s professionalisation strategy

The struggle with the idea of assuming a professional identity, let alone advocating for statutory registration, occurred within a period that witnessed the dismantling of the welfare state (Barretta-Herman, 1994a, 1994b), with a bleak future forecast for social work given the prevailing neo liberal agenda that included regulation (Dean, 2010; Dominelli, 1999) and the advent of residualism (McDonald, 1996). The challenges this brought included more assertive public management and state intervention and a process of management reform (Gray et al., 2015). As a profession identified closely with the delivery of statutory social services, and as a public profession (Howe, 1980; Noordegraaf, 2007, 2016), the management of social work practice standards became increasingly subject to the custodianship of public service managers (Anleu, 1992;
Kirkpatrick, Ackroyd & Walker, 2005). In ANZ, public sector reform was prompted by New Right arguments about inefficiency and lack of accountability and through technological innovation (Uttley, 1994). The result was a redefinition of professional work and the fragmentation of that work into measurable performance-based or output-focused units to achieve broader social policy outcomes (Duncan & Worrall, 2000). The identification and assessment of units of practice competence was one device that made a good fit with the managerialist regime and was central to the professionalisation strategy adopted by CYPS in 1992 (CYPS 1996; Coopers & Lybrand, 1995). When one puts this strategy alongside the Association’s competency assessment programme (see Chapter Two, Round Seven), a central element of what was to be included in statutory registration had become the policy of the profession and the predominant state employer of social workers.

The evolution of the new kid on the block

**Description:** Forging the new kid on the block

The different legislative frameworks of occupational regulation available to government include statutory registration, self-regulation, licensing and title protection (MoSP, 2000; Thyer & Biggerstaff, 1989). Typically, professional regulation is managed by a government appointed or self-regulatory board that includes representation from members of the profession and laypersons. Its function will likely include: the definition of minimum education and entry standards; the accreditation of education providers to issue qualifications; a code of conduct; a complaints procedure and formal disciplinary mechanism; keeping a register of the professionals who meet the requirements set; and management of the process for admission and removal from the register (Rubin, 1980). However the mandate held by a registration board may vary according to the standing in which the profession is held. Moreover that there is a need for professional regulation in the first place is a reflection of the premise that formal intervention through regulation is warranted as a public safeguard against poor professional practice (Trebilcock, 1978). Rubin (p. 33ff) makes a useful distinction between professions as ‘public callings’ and ‘skilled callings’. This distinction will be applied to examine and compare the existing statutory registration for other professions in ANZ including medicine (HPCA Act, 2003; McLintock (ed), 1966), law (McLintock (ed), 1966) and psychotherapy (Cook,
1996; HPCA Act, 2003; Tudor, 2012). The purpose was to provide a point of comparison with the form of statutory registration being considered for social workers, including the relationship between the professional body and their respective registration authority. The credentialing of social work that applies in international social work jurisdictions became another point of inquiry. The statutory and mandatory accountability for social workers in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales (Bibus & Bouette-Queen, 2011; Talboys & Buchan, 2000), the licensing jurisdictions for social workers in the USA (ASWB, https://www.aswb.org/; Bibus & Bouette-Queen, 2011; Biggerstaff, 2000; Garcia, 1990; Marks & Knox, 2015; Talboys & Buchan, 2000), Canada (Swain, 2001; Talboys & Buchan, 2000) and the regime of professional self-regulation of social workers in Australia (AASW, https://www.aasw.asn.au/; Lonne & Duke, 2009; Talboys & Buchan, 2000) were examined as a basis for discussing some of the different forms of occupational regulation that exist in jurisdictions that arguably share a similar social work heritage to ANZ. With statutory registration becoming the objective of both CYPS and the Association, the introduction of legislation for statutory registration rested on the political sponsorship of a politician or a political party. This eventually occurred following the government-initiated reviews of the Children, Young Persons, and Their Families Act, 1989 and social work practices (Brown, 2000; Mason, 1992) and the proposal for statutory registration being included in the Labour Party Manifesto (NZ Labour Party, 1999). The literature search was expanded to form an understanding around the legislative regulatory control of professions (Evetts, 2002; Manitoba Law Reform Commission, 1994; Rubin, 1980; Trebilcock, 1983). The search was also narrowed to identify any policy framework for regulating occupations in ANZ and any requirements this set (Ministry of Commerce, 1999; Working Group on Occupational Regulation, 1989). Ultimately, the ANZ government’s proposal for the statutory registration of social workers was introduced as a discussion paper (Ministry of Social Policy, 2000) and used as the basis for consultation with the social services community prior to the legislation being drafted, debated, and enacted. By 2000, therefore, the three central threads identified in the thesis: the professional, the institutional and the political were woven together. Aside from the aspirational content of data collected from individual members, the Association’s position paper on the statutory registration of social workers, (ANZASW, 2000) and its subsequent submission on the Social Workers Registration Bill (ANZASW, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c)
to the Parliamentary Social Services Committee also reflects the collective aspirations of the Association. These submissions represented the final opportunities for the Association to assert its position on statutory registration. In addition the Department of Child Youth and Family made its representations on the proposal (CYFS, 2000). Ministerial papers, accessed through the Official Information Act (Minister of Social Services and Employment, 2001a, 2001b) and the parliamentary record relating to the progress of the legislation (New Zealand Parliament Hansard, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2003) were central to learning how the government’s strategy and political agendas were played out.

**Explanation: drawing on theory**

The theoretical threads and patterns considered relevant to the study were initially uncovered through literature searches using ‘social work’ as the prime identifier in conjunction with ‘occupational regulation’, ‘statutory registration’ and ‘profession’ with variations on those terms. An important consideration was to ensure that the application and interpretation of theory respected ‘the importance of contextually created difference’ (McDonald, Harris & Wintersteen, 2003, p.191) and ensured that the account was true to the particular characteristics and context of the social work profession in ANZ. The questions that guided the search for social theory explanations included:

- What are the different agendas that lie behind the respective strategies for statutory registration?
- How do theoretical frameworks illustrate the dynamics at play?
- Where does social work lie within a socio-political context?
- What is a useful way of describing and conceptualising the different institutional forms with a stake in statutory registration?

**A Bourdieusian framework**

Bourdieu (1989, 1993), Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992), provide a ‘conceptual apparatus’ which others have found relevant to the analysis of social work and professionalism (Beddoe, 2017, 2013a; Emirbayer, 2005; Garrett, 2007a, 2007b; Schinkel & Noordegraaf, 2011). The thesis seeks to examine the different agendas in the quest for statutory registration and a Bourdieusian framework offers a way to conceptualise and describe the different attributes of each of the institutional types involved – the professional association, the state and parliament – and their respective influences, contributions and roles in creating the Social Workers Registration Board
A Bourdieusian framework also offers the opportunity to think systematically in forming a complete picture of the study (Emirbayer, 2005). Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus, capital, doxa and field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Garrett 2007a, 2007b; Roxborough, 2016) were also expected to shed a new light on the course taken by the Association as a professional body, given Bourdieu’s vehement rejection of the concept of ‘profession’ (Schinkel & Noordegraaf, 2011). The expansion of the Bourdieusian concepts of cultural and social capital to form the construct of symbolic and professional capital was also helpful (Beddoe, 2010; Garrett, 2007). By applying, in Bourdieu’s terms, ‘a science of society’, some anchor points for capturing, understanding and explaining the key elements of this study are provided (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 36). For example, Bourdieu’s concept of field provides the frame for a ‘relational analysis’ to account for the multidimensional positions held by key people within the Association and the SWRB. (Calhoun, LiPuma & Postone, 1993). The aim was to develop a sense of the different elements in terms of the influence, make-up, claim of expertise and particular attributes that each of the major players brought to the field. Bourdieu has also contributed to the understanding of the place of social workers within public sector bureaucracies and the attributes they hold by virtue of their education and accumulated resilience (Garrett, 2007b).

A Foucauldian interpretation

The thesis topic, statutory registration, lends itself to examination at a broader theoretical level given its role in regulating the behaviour of a professional through instruments of assessment, monitoring and accountability established by the state. Foucault’s writings traverse a wide spectrum of matters related to the topic and their discovery and application were central to forming the theoretical framework and analysis that follow. Foucauldian concepts and discourse have already been considered and applied in respect of the elements to this study – the implications arising from the authority vested in the state, the subordination of a profession, as one of the disciplines, to the state through statutory registration and how this can be seen to transcend the role of social work with communities, families and individuals (Chambon, 1999; Cheek & Porter, 1997; Deacon, 2002; Gilbert & Powell, 2010; Gray et al, 2015; Healy, 2000; Hewitt, 1983; Nadesan, 2008; Pitt, 2005; Powell, 2014; Thompson, 2001). Broadly, through the notions of governmentality and biopower, Foucault offers an explanation of how populations are governed (Burchell, Gordon &
Miller, 1991; Foucault, 1977, 1991a, 1991b, 1999; Foucault & Lemke, 1999; Mills, 2003; Nadeson, 2010). Donzelet (1980) provides a supporting thesis in respect of the ‘policing of families’. Given the substantially interventionist role of social work, it is not difficult to see how social work becomes Identified with the practices of surveillance, social inquiry and preoccupation with risk management which are associated with governmentality (Beddoe, 2014; Donzelet, 1980). Wilson (2009, p. 34) refers to these as ‘bio-political techniques’, exercising power through ‘disciplinary gaze’. The thesis will explore how these techniques can be viewed as being applied to social workers through the mechanism of statutory registration, on the one hand, and by social workers over their client population, on the other. In a roundtable discussion that included Foucault to debate the status of social work as a profession, the explicit and implicit functional links between social work and its sources of authority are seen as serving to legitimise social work (Chambon, 1999). Parton (1999) discusses governmentality as the ‘conduct of conduct’ (p.104) and, again, it is not difficult to consider the relevance of governmentality in respect of the practise of social work and the function of statutory registration. As one of the services mobilised by the state to address the social problems identified, social work is also perceived in the parlance of Miller & Rose (2008), as one of the ‘technologies’ of government (Parton, 1999, p 106), and with its status rising through qualification and registration, assumes the mantle of ‘expert’ (p. 112). The investigation into Foucault’s work continued, seeking out original material and also secondary sources where others have applied a Foucauldian lens to explain and expand his conclusions about power, professions, biopower, governmentality and neoliberalism (Douglas, 2011; Larner, 2000; Oksala 2013, 2012). Foucault’s concepts of governmentality and biopower, including his analysis of power, have also found application in professions to which social work is sometimes allied – the helping and ‘psych’ professions, for which the individual is the primary focus (Cornforth, 2011; Holmes & Gastoldo, 2002; Lupton, 1997; Perron, Fluet & Holmes, 2005; Rose, 1996; Tudor, 2011). Such commentary can be expected to inform the circumstances in which the profession of social work is now placed and, will be drawn upon on ensuing discussion.

**Institutional interrelationships**

Finally, in order to better appreciate the interrelationships between the key institutional players involved and help identify their respective institutional attributes, the institutional logics perspective was investigated (Friedland & Alford, 1991;
Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). This perspective offers new insights and an analytical framework for interpreting and understanding the interrelationships among institutions and individuals. As a extension to this theory the notion of institutional hybridity offers a basis for examining the particular institutional attributes of the SWRB as a Crown Entity (Treasury, 2014) and Crown Agent (State Services Commission, 2014). The SWRB, as the statutory body holding social work professionals to account, exemplifies the multiple identities that become apparent in a hybrid organisation (Skelcher & Smith, 2015) with its membership including members of the Association and the profession.

**Reflecting on the impact of the new kid**

Observations made in the literature about the introduction of statutory registration include reflective comment offered when statutory registration was enacted (Briggs, 2003). Additional critical comment includes articles and studies authored by ANZ academics on the impact of the SWR Act on key components of the work profession – education, qualifications, continuing professional education (CPE) and ethics. These include the analysis undertaken by two well-informed members of the inaugural SWRB regarding the intentions of the legislation (Beddoe & Duke, 2009) who, by virtue of the positions held, were also influential in respect of the content and processes of statutory registration. Beddoe (2013c), in a qualitative study, examined the links between CPE, the introduction of statutory registration (which had formalised and regulated expectations for CPE) and the aspirations and beliefs of surveyed social workers from multiple fields of practice in respect of the status of the profession. Beddoe’s question as to ‘whether statutory registration and heightened professionalism are always contiguous’ (2013c, p. 173) underlies this current study.

Other studies have included: the analysis and critique of elements considered central to advancing social work professionalism, namely, the advancement of social justice to meet ethical obligations for competent practice (O’Brien, 2013); the critical appraisal of the technocratisation of social work education through competency based training at the expense of critical analysis (van Heugten, 2011); and a critique of the ‘defensive practices’ of the code of conduct adopted by the SWRB (Orme and Rennie, 2006). Rennie (2013) argues that the process implementing the SWR Act has not been inclusive and, indeed, has exceeded its mandate in raising the bar of the qualification required for registration. Duke (2012), as the Deputy Registrar of the SWRB, outlined and promoted the role of the SWRB in enhancing the professionalism of social
workers, noting that this was a stated purpose of statutory registration. This followed an earlier review of the implementation of statutory registration in ANZ by Lonne and Duke (2009). How the regulatory system in ANZ compares with its global counterparts is subject to a broader review as part of an appraisal of the role of the profession’s ethics within a regulatory system (Hugman & Bowles, 2012). The effect of newly introduced regulation in England at the time of a preoccupation with risk management is more pessimistically reviewed with the introduction and necessity for regulation aligned to the then existing discourses around vulnerability, danger and abuse (McLaughlin, 2007). This, to some extent, echoes the circumstances in ANZ that surrounded the introduction of its own form of regulation. Returning to the paramount question posed by the thesis, whether the introduction of statutory registration has met the aspirations of the profession, one cannot help but acknowledge the seemingly inexorable changes that have occurred to change the face of the profession within recent years. Rogowski’s (2010) analysis, albeit of circumstances faced by the profession in England, and his bigger question as to whether we are witnessing the rise or fall of the profession, causes us to ponder whether the golden age for the profession lies behind us or whether it can become re-enlightened while a recent ANZ study (Beddoe, Staniforth & Fouché, 2017) considers the issue of professional identity. The latter has particular relevance given the introduction of the Social Workers Registration Legislation Bill (2017) to make statutory registration mandatory. Initial reactions to this (ANZASW, 2017; PSA, 2017; Ross, A. 2017; SWRB, 2017) indicate the very real possibility of a return to the debates that surrounded the introduction of the legislation initially and another test for the assertion of a collective professional identity for social workers in ANZ.

**Lessons learned/implications of the literature search**

The literature search has been affirming in terms of discovering internationally and nationally respected authors whose research, although not exactly mirroring the present research, is nonetheless relevant and applicable. The test has been to select, digest, interpret, and apply the material sourced given the large body of work available and the scope and various themes of the thesis. A further challenge was the significant historical element to the study, transitioning between two periods, and taking into account the features of the distinct pre and post statutory registration environments. These included the professional, institutional and socio-political
contexts and recognition of the significant and immediate change to professional culture and obligation that occurred with the introduction of statutory registration. The biggest challenge was that the research task itself spanned two decades. A thorough literature search was conducted at the outset of the study in 1996 and supplemented by another when the research was revived in 2014.

**Analytical skills utilised**

A key skill was to be able to sort and prioritise the records, publications and literature as they were accumulated in order to effectively manage the wealth of material accessed, while respecting the context in which it was written or recorded. With respect to the historical records of the Association, it was important to capture and identify various nuances of the debates and their expression that was at times colourful and at other times more contemplative. By comparison, the various documents accessed from government sources, reports and correspondence were formal and considered; although, as a verbatim record, Hansard, the report on the parliamentary debates was perhaps an exception. Other than seeking to provide illustration and colour, the intention was to provide a rounded account of the episode, circumstance or topic. Letters to the editor, editorials, newspaper reports and minutes were some of the raw material found and used to set the context. An effort was made to integrate sources and themes drawn from academic material in texts and journals) reviewing and organising them as necessary. Synthesising and summarising this material was essential in bringing together and acknowledging the multiple sources, at the same time being prepared to identify contradictions and controversy. The title used for the thesis, *there’s a new kid on the block*, served as a saviour on many occasions to help tighten and maintain the research focus. It served as a simple metaphor, both in terms of describing the research but also in providing a foundation to summarise and reflect upon the literature and records. The metaphor showed that despite the challenge of being exposed to theory, especially new theory, it is possible to reframe it in a way that connects with the heart of the subject. The title was also a key to the development of the different frameworks formed as the research unfolded. Again they enabled the various components to be identified and held, both to keep the research grounded and to explain its central tenets to the reader.

**Literature search tools**

See Appendix 4: Literature Research Tools for a list of the various methods and sources used to engage with the literature and other written and online material.
Part Two – The Theoretical Framework

A Framework

The framework serves to provide a coherent account of the different theoretical perspectives brought together and used to analyse the data and to draw conclusions from the research. The framework is developed from the basic premise of the research – the idea that there are significant implications, at different levels, when a self-regulated profession becomes subject to statutory regulation. The purpose of the framework is:

1. to describe and understand the institutions that are implicated – the profession of social workers, its associational body and the state that establishes and oversees the statutory entity to regulate the profession, and
2. to apply social theory to explain the social phenomena of the fields under study and their interrelationships

Such an understanding is essential to interpreting the findings of the research (Bryman, 2012). The research is shown to lend itself to a number of theoretical perspectives. When applied and analysed, the theories and concepts are expected to stimulate and extend the inquiry and lead to the accumulation of new knowledge to foster further debate on the topic. For the purpose of forming the theoretical ‘backcloth and rationale’ (Bryman, 2012, p. 20), the following schema is offered to identify the levels and themes of the framework (See Figure 3.2.1 below).

Hunches and ideas

- The social work profession’s aspirations for statutory registration have been various and divided and none may be met if statutory registration is introduced.
- Are there are unintended consequences for a professional body when the state introduces occupational regulation for that profession.
- The episode of the introduction of statutory registration for social workers warrants being researched and informed by theory.
- The opportunity to examine such an episode on a ‘before and after basis’ is unique.
- Hence the title – There’s a new kid on the block.
Theories

❖ Setting the Scene – the kids on the block
Using Bourdieusian concepts – field, capital, doxa and capital – to set the scene

❖ Identifying the Processes – the kids at play
Applying Foucauldian principles – governmentality and biopower – to identify the sources of authority, knowledge and power as they apply to the professional and statutory sites for the accountability of social work practice

❖ Creating the Structure – making room for the new kid on the block
Describing the new ‘playground’ using the lens of institutional logic and hybridity to inform how governmentality and biopower is played out over the subjects

Figure 3.2.1: Forming the Theoretical Framework

Hunches and ideas

The theoretical framework has been shaped by the initial ideas and hunches that underlie the research questions and any new themes that have emerged from the literature search. These themes initially covered:

• The distinction between the ‘statutory authority’ of a Crown Entity and the ‘professional mandate’ held by a professional association. How do these apply in respect to the regulatory control of a profession?
• Are these contested or contestable and, if so, how is this contest resolved?
• What views do ‘interested parties’ hold of this contest, such as members of the Association, the professional body for social workers?
• What are the respective merits of statutory registration and professional self-regulation for providing public protection and the professional accountability of social workers?
• Who ought to define and codify the expertise and knowledge, and competence and ethics of social workers?
• Where does the ‘disciplinary control of professional practices by professionals lie’? (Noordegraaf, 2007. p.767)

And following the introduction of statutory registration:
• How does the relative standing of social workers compare with other professions in terms of the legislative controls, prescriptions and accountabilities set by government through statutory registration?
• What are the respective influences of the State and professional association in fostering greater professionalism amongst social workers, given that both bodies identify professionalism as an objective?
• How can the notion of a new kid on the block help inform our understanding of the concepts, processes, dynamics and interrelationships involved?

Theory
A theoretical backdrop is proposed which draws from Bourdieusian social theory and Foucauldian socio-political explanations of governmentality and biopower. The discourses about profession and professionalisation, institutional logic and hybridity provide the means to explain the motives and agendas of the actors and their respective agencies.

Bourdieu
Bourdieu’s framework of ‘field’, ‘capital’, doxa’ and ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Garrett 2007; Roxborough, 2016) are applied to help conceptualise the roles and influences brought to bear as the new kid on the block takes shape. These are described diagrammatically (see Appendix 5: Figure 3.2.2 The kids on the block), with the diagram serving to apply Bourdieu’s concepts to the main constituent elements of the thesis. These include social workers as part of a diverse occupational group, some of who are members of a professional association, working primarily under government policy within government and non-government organisations (NGOs). Other elements drawn into this interpretation of Bourdieu’s framework are those engaged at a political, government, educational and public level in the design and implementation of statutory registration. The interrelationships, seen in Bourdieu’s terms, provide a means for conceptualising the evolution and introduction of statutory registration as a site of interplay between professional/institutional/political/agency/public influences. To locate the contextual elements of the block and attribute the roles to the kids, the illustration in Figure 3.2.2 also sets some parameters for the study as well as providing a means for applying, in Bourdieu’s terms, ‘a science of society’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 7ff). Figure
3.2.2 serves to provide some anchor points for capturing and understanding the respective vested interests of the key players, *the kids on the block*, and what they may contribute to the design of statutory registration.

The purpose of Bourdieu’s concept of field is to provide the frame for a ‘relational analysis’, by which he means an account of the multi-dimensional space of positions and the position taking of agents (Calhoun, LiPuma & Postone, 1993, p. 5).

Column 1 of Figure 3.2.2 gives an account for this, identifying the key roles and positions of all *the kids on the block* and their respective ‘space’ and ‘agency’ in respect of the topic. Further, the position of a particular agent is the result of an interplay between that person’s habitus and his or her place in a field of positions as defined by the distribution of the appropriate form of capital (1993, p.5). Column 2 of Figure 3.2.2 encapsulates not only economic or material forms of capital, but what he [Bourdieu] describes as ‘multiform, convertible capital’ (1993, p. 69). In other words: powers or forms of capital … for appropriation … and distribution … of properties capable of conferring strength, power and consequently profit on their holder (1993, p. 69). The contention is that all the sites of vested interest (see Column A, Figure 3.2.2), that is, each of the sets of *kids*, have a sense of their place, their respective habitus (see Column 4, Figure 3.2.2) in respect of *the block*. And this sense of place, and therefore relationship with their habitus, is borne out of their doxa (see Column 3, Figure 3.2.2) or common belief as derived from their particular agency, space and capital. Bourdieu’s concepts provide a useful basis and prompt for the subsequent analysis, at the same time providing pointers to other relevant theoretical concepts and attributes and processes pertinent to the study.

In Bourdieu’s parlance,

To speak of “profession” is to fasten on a true reality, onto a set of people who bear the same name (they are all “lawyers” for instance); endowed with a code of ethics, collective bodies that define rules for admission etc (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 242).
Here, of course, the set of people under focus are those designated ‘social workers’, who, in 1964, formally established a collective professional body, writing their rules in a constitution and adopting a code of ethics to which members were bound. NZASW became the ‘social product of historical work of construction of a group’ (p. 242) that came to represent and uphold the profession of social work, the kids on the block establishing its own field and habitus, developing its capital and forging its own doxa. This represented a diverse group, including many members who worked in church agencies but also academics and social workers whose duties were designated by statute at the time – Child Welfare Officers and Probation Officers (Nash, 1998). As discussed in Chapter Two, the inaugural conference of the Association in 1964 ‘[was] an attempt on the part of social workers to increase the self-conscious awareness of themselves as professional people and as members of a profession’ (McCreary, 1964, p. 3). This application of a Bourdieusian inspired framework has served to identify and locate the attributes, characteristics and vested interests of those institutions and groups that have a stake in the introduction of statutory registration. This will provide a basis for the discussion that follows in Chapter Six.

**Foucault**

Foucault’s work on governmentality has contemporary relevance and is ‘well-suited to recent changes in the professional lives of workers’ (Binkley, 2009, p. xiv). The following account draws on Binkley’s assertion and describes the relevance of Foucault’s work for this study in respect of the function of social work and the accountability of social workers as a profession.

**Governmentality, biopower and social work**

We may perceive social work as an instrument of governmentality and biopower. According to Foucault:

> Social work is inscribed within a larger social function that has been taking on new dimensions for centuries, the function of surveillance-and-correction: to surveil individuals and to redress them, in the two meanings of the word, alternatively as punishment and as pedagogy. (Foucault, 1972 as cited in Chambon, 1999, p. 92)

Social workers, as the agents who exercise this social function, are themselves just as fully implicated as individual clients ‘under a system of surveillance so persuasive
that they interiorize the disciplinary gaze as part of their subjectivities and ultimately oversee their own personal conduct through self-discipline’ (Wilson, 2009, p. 34). Just as social workers in their practice are seen to exercise power over their clients as subjects, through ‘disciplinary gaze’, so does a professional self-regulatory or statutory registration system act in much the same way over social workers. Social workers, in Foucault’s terms, become bound and obliged to follow the expectations attached to their respective roles. These reflect the expectations placed upon them by virtue of any legal requirement surrounding their conduct. This would include working in accordance with the legal definition of their position and also to the practice standards set by a regulatory body – being morally bound to do so least they incur a complaint or penalty (Wilson, 2009). Neo-liberalism is seen to reinforce this process, through its drive for self-responsibility and self-government, which Wilson (2009) has described as ‘the bio-political techniques aimed at the social, or collective body (that) are characteristic of government society ‘ (p. 34). With the introduction of statutory registration, it is therefore arguable that the state would exercise two layers of biopower. The first is in respect of the population of social workers and the second through the social work interventions made of their client population. The latter may occur through the interventions social workers make as state servants or through the social services of contracted to state-funded agencies. However the device of statutory registration provides additional expectations and sanctions over and above those employment accountabilities and requirements prescribed by the employer and alongside the standards set by their professional body.

Wherever there is social work, the social worker is always tied to the source of authority. Social workers don’t actually possess authority. They have some freedom of action but no actual authority (Thibaud, 1972 as cited in Chambon, 1999, p. 91)

The authority is exercised through both the explicit function of the social work role, whatever that may be, and the implicit function of maintaining order, which, in turn, is defined by the external authorities that sustain and legitimate social work (Julliard, 1972 as cited in Chambon, 1999, p. 91). These external sources of authority are statutory, employer driven and professional. Governmentality or the ‘conduct of conduct’ is ‘to shape or regulate people’s conduct according to certain principles or
goals’ (Parton, 1999, p. 104) and is, in a very practical sense, an aim of occupational regulation and statutory registration, to set the standards and ultimate accountabilities for engagement of the social worker with their client. Therefore, whoever sets the principles or goals for the practice of social work is integral to its governmentality. It is in the light of such assertions that the thesis seeks to examine the respective roles and aspirations of social workers and their professional association as well as the place of the state and its institutions in regulating such engagement through statutory registration. Figure 3.2.3 (see Appendix 6: Figure 3.2.3 The Profession of Social Work) is provided to illustrate the Foucauldian concepts of governmentality and biopower as sources of authority for professional social work practice and the different forms of professional accountability. Professional accountability is shown to be provided through the respective devices and measures of the Association and the SWRB. Taken together these illustrate the pervasiveness of governmentality and the assertion that the overarching role of governmentality is to regulate the population (Parton, 1999). At the heart of social work is its concern and role in respect of those elements of the population that have been ‘policed’ over the ages (Donzelet, 1977).

Figure 3.2.3 illustrates the many facets and mechanisms of governmentality. In respect of social work practice, these mechanisms include the offer of membership of a professional association and statutory registration. ‘Professionals and ‘experts’ are crucial to its operation, but they also have their own interests and priorities’ (Parton, 1999, p. 105). Miller and Rose (2008) identify the mechanisms of governmentality, such as professional oversight (through supervision), qualification (through education) and accountability (through regulation), as amongst the ‘technologies’ available to government’ and part of the collective response to address identified social problems. Clearly the professional association and the profession’s regulatory body are an integral part of this ‘technology’, providing the expertise and sites for its operation and support.

**Institutional logics**

A focal point for analysis is the respective vested interests that the state and the profession each bring to the introduction of statutory registration, that is, the introduction of a new kid on the block. The framework based on Bourdieusian concepts and variables initially identified the key attributes of the sites deemed to have a vested interest in ‘the block’ (refer Figure 3.2.2). Another framework using the system types developed from the theory of institutional logics is posited here to
compare the institutional ideal types described for those institutions relevant to the study (see Appendix 7: Figure 3.2.4 Institutional System Types). (This is an adaptation of the framework developed by Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012), which was, in turn, formulated following their review of earlier models.) Finally, the concept of hybridity is offered to explain the organisational make-up of the SWRB – the organisational construct which becomes the manifestation of the new kid. The meta-theory of institutional logics offers a framework that accounts for the specific and different characteristics pertaining to organisations that are part of everyday life. It offers a way of comparing the make-up of one organisation with others using a set of variables to do so. These provide a picture of:

the socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, including assumptions, values, and beliefs, by which individuals and organisations provide meaning to their daily activity, organise time and space, and reproduce their lives and experiences. (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012, p. 2)

Through an intersecting process, it also invites the consideration of the make-up of any new (hybrid) organisation to show how that organisation exhibits some of the features contrived from existing organisation forms. The organisational forms adjudged relevant for the purposes of the study include the State, the Profession, the Community, and the Corporation. For the purposes of the thesis, the institutional logics perspective provides a frame of reference as a snapshot of, not only the unique identifying features for an organisational type, but also what influences, drives and motivates particular courses of action and organisational behaviour (2012). Definitions of the categories included in the framework adapted for the purposes of the thesis (see Figure 3.2.4) show how institutional types can be viewed as:

building blocks [that] specify the organising principle that shape individual and organisational preferences and interests and the repertoire of behaviours by which interests and preferences are attained within the sphere of a specific order. (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012, p. 54)
This echoes Friedland & Alford’s (1999) conception of institutions as ‘both supraorganisational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space, and symbolic systems through which they categorise that activity and infuse it with meaning’ (p. 232). Their earlier scholarship in respect of advancing the centrality of individual and organisational behaviour in relation to its social context was key to the advancement of the institutional logics perspective. Their earlier assertion related to the need to account for three levels of analysis ‘individuals competing and negotiating, organisations in conflict and coordination, and institutions in contradiction and independence’ (pp. 240-241) thereby highlighting both the significance of the behaviour of individuals and the opportunities for change and ‘institutional entrepreneurship’ that may arise from the contradictions that are inherent in institutions. On the other hand, constraints opposing change may also arise through ‘the paradox of embedded agency’ through institutional processes and personal relationships that dampen any prospect for change’ (Friedland & Alford, 1999; Garud, Hardy & Maguire, 2007). The categories applied to each of the organisational types to provide a basis for their comparison include the root metaphor of each to capture the fundamental assumption that underlies the organisation, its point of being. Underlying this are the origins and sources of legitimacy, authority and identity that credential the organisation and attest to its entitlement to exist and operate. The categories of norms, attention and strategy account for the basis of membership, hierarchy and purpose associated with the organisational type. The manner in which the organisation’s members use their individual and collective influence or presence upon others in the group is framed as informal control. Finally, the way in which the organisation is organised to exist and have the means to operate as it does is set by its economic system. This framework lends itself to an appreciation of the constraints and opportunities that exist within the institutions that are of particular relevance to this study - the state and the profession. It also provides insight into the respective capacities of the state and the profession for innovation and transformation (Friedland & Alford, 1999; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). This will allow the different constraints, opportunities and capacities open to the state and the profession to be examined in respect of the introduction of statutory registration, and the creation of a new entity, the SWRB. The appreciation in the institutional logics perspective for the place of history it contexts and events, and ‘that institutions are historically contingent’ (Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 12) is
particularly appropriate for this thesis recounting the institutional history of the introduction of statutory registration.

**Hybrid organisational forms**

As described in Chapter Two the SWRB which is responsible for the administration of the SWR Act is a Crown Entity. In being credentialed as a statutory body, the SWRB is directly accountable to the state, through the responsible Minister. At the outset, the SWRB’s prime function was to design and implement the new regulations and policies under which statutory registration would operate. It has particular characteristics in that, as a board of governance, the majority of board members are drawn from the profession it regulates, and it is expected to be self-funded. A study of the underlying theorisation around hybrid organisations was undertaken to consider the particular attributes that are manifested in and endow an organisation such as the SWRB - a Crown Entity, accountable, yet not a government body and comprised of members of the profession. Hybrid organisations evolve from a mix of the institutional types such as those identified in the institutional logics perspective introduced in the preceding section (see Figure 3.2.4). Given the possible contradictions that are manifest in its form, and the ‘multiple identities’ (Skelcher & Smith, 2015, p. 343) of its members, its conceptualisation as a hybrid organisation warrants consideration. ‘Hybridised organisations adapt to possess characteristics and logics of multiple sectors (public, private or community) (Aimers & Walker, 2016, p. 1). Accordingly, the literature that informed the institutional logics perspective was followed up with a specific search in relation to hybrid institutions. It was found that the inference of a hybrid institution relates most usually to community/NGO state bodies, public-private organisational arrangements, state-market enterprises (also known as quasi non-government organisations (QUANGOS)) and other partnership arrangements (Christensen & Laegreid, 2011). Studies of forms of organisational hybridity involving NGO/third sector organisations and the State offer insight into the theoretical and practical issues around boundaries, ownership, decision-making and accountability of such organisations and their implications (Aimers & Walker, 2016; Skelcher & Smith, 2015; Billis, 2010). The consequences may include uncertainty, incompatibility, conflict (Brandsen, van de Donk & Putters, 2005), risk (Brandsen & Karre, 2011) and challenges for the governing bodies (Cornforth & Spear, 2010). The SWRB is neither an NGO or third sector organisation. However, as described above, as an agency of the Crown, it is a body in its own right working with the state and
third sectors (including the Association) from where its members and, to some extent, the application of its governing principles are arguably drawn. The intention will be to consider the theoretical and practical issues identified for hybrid organisations to see if any may apply to the SWRB, as a basis for more fully understanding its role, relationships and place. In working towards a theory of hybrid organisations as it may apply to the third sector, Billis (2010) initially designed a model to explain the elements and principles of the public, private and third sectors. This model has been modified as a basis for considering the attributes of the SWRB through the lens of organisational hybridity (see Figure 3.2.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE ELEMENTS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR PRINCIPLES as applied to the State</th>
<th>THIRD SECTOR PRINCIPLES as applied to the Association</th>
<th>CROWN ENTITY PRINCIPLES as applied to the SWRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ownership</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governance</td>
<td>Public elections</td>
<td>Private elections</td>
<td>Appointed Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operational Priorities</td>
<td>Public service and collective choice</td>
<td>Commitment about distinctive mission, i.e. professionalism</td>
<td>Government policy, Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distinctive human resources</td>
<td>Paid public servants in legally backed Bureau</td>
<td>Members and volunteers in Association</td>
<td>Board members Registrar Paid employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distinctive other resources</td>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>Dues, donations and legacies</td>
<td>Fees, levies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.2.5: Ideal Type Sectors and Accountability (as adapted from Billis, 2010, p. 53)*

Billis (2010) also models the application of these sector elements and principles. The model depicts how three sectors intersect and identifies potential zones for organizational hybridity (Billis, 2010, p. 56). This model has also been adapted to illustrate the sectors with which the SWRB has a relationship (see Figure 3.2.6). In turn, this provides a further basis to consider the relevance of organisational hybridity in respect of the functioning of the SWRB.
Note: The circles serve to represent the sectors selected for the purpose of illustration only. Their size does not in any way reflect their potential impact or influence on the SWRB.

Figure 3.2.6: The SWRB as a Zone for Hybridity (as adapted from Billis, 2010, p. 53)

Concluding comment

To this point the thesis has

- described the historical context and set the scene for the introduction of statutory registration for social workers in ANZ, which is the crux of the thesis,
- searched the literature for relevant writings on the topic, and
- identified and offered some theoretical frameworks to provide a means for interpreting and presenting the data collected through interviews.

The purpose is to address the research questions asked:

- To what extent have the aspirations for the statutory registration of social work been realised?
and, having identified the aspirations and with statutory registration in place, subsequently asking:

- In what ways has the introduction of statutory registration changed the face of social work professionalism in ANZ?

As evident in Chapter Two there was no shortage of written material for describing and setting the scene and context. The intention was to give voice to the dialogue and debate of members about statutory registration that had been ongoing since the Association was established and to highlight the professional custodianship the Association had established. At the same time, with the professionalisation strategy of CYFS and the policy objective of the New Zealand Labour Party, that was manifested when it became government, it also became evident there were other agendas at play in respect of the professionalisation of social workers. This led to understanding the impact of neo-liberalism and new managerialism and the consequences of this for a fledgling profession, facing questions about practice standards, lack of qualification and an uncertain professional identity. At the nub of this was the question of professionalism and professionalisation which led to exploring the role and significance of the professional association. One consequence was appreciating that the topic was relatively unique as a piece of research, being a longitudinal study of the impact on and consequences for a professional association of statutory registration being introduced. It was nonetheless reassuring to find through the literature search the writings and commentaries of social theorists and the insight they provide into the macro dynamics and processes at play. Forming a theoretical framework has involved looking to three quite distinctive approaches to support the different aspects of the thesis and conceptualise the data in a meaningful way. The overall framework is to provide the analytical tools for exploring and illustrating the three facets of the research.

- Setting the scene - the kids on the block

The context can now be informed by a framework derived from Bourdieusian concepts (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Garrett 2007; Roxborough, 2016) and applied to the stakeholders and ‘stateholders’ that have a vested interest in the statutory registration of social workers.

These concepts serve to reveal the roles and influences that are brought to bear
on a situation where there are distinctly different motives for promoting ostensibly the same objective - professionalisation. They also provide a basis for articulating and understanding the dynamics of the situation with stakeholders having different institutional footholds – the professional, the managerial/bureaucratic and the political. Bourdieu’s concepts allow the scene to be set, illustrating the different agendas that lie behind the aspirations for statutory registration – the different perspectives on what constitutes the social work profession, the authority and representation claimed, and how these compete in a common and public space.

• **Identifying the sources of authority - the rules of the game**
Statutory registration is about authority and accountability. Foucauldian theories of governmentality and biopower provide the means for ascribing the power and conduct inherent in the various positions and roles under examination – social workers, the Association as a professional body, managers and administrators, the state, government institutions and politicians. The attraction of this theory is its particular relevance to the role of social workers, as subjects, as well as instruments of governmentality and biopower (Foucault, 1972 as cited in Chambon, 1999; Julliard, 1972 as cited in Chambon, 1999; Parton, 1999). At the same time the examination of statutory registration, in particular during the course of its introduction is, in itself, a vehicle for studying governmentality and biopower.

• **Creating the structure - the new kid on the block**
Institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012) and organisational hybridity (Aimers & Walker, 2016; Billis, 2010; Skelcher & Smith, 2015) offer the means to conceptualise different institutional elements of the particular system types that have a stake in the formation of the SWRB. The extent to which any of these elements carry over into the functioning of the SWRB can be considered through the concept of organisational hybridity. The theory provides another useful tool for analysis which complements the others being applied. It also offers the potential for examining the make-up of the SWRB in the light of the aspirations expressed by the respondents.

Three distinct lines of theory have been drawn upon in this thesis. As described each makes a distinctive contribution to the study. Together they also provide a
complementarity that is expected to assist bringing together its various facets. In addition the frameworks will provide the analytical tools for considering and holding the data and themes drawn from the interviews, looking for both consistency and contradictions to ensure some balance to the ensuing discussion.
Chapter Four - Research methodology and methods

Introduction

This chapter first presents the methodology that underlies the methods and steps taken to generate the data and information relevant to the research. The methodology accounts for principles derived from research theory that serve to explain and justify how the research was undertaken, its organisation and activity. The research methods are then described including the steps taken for ethical approval, the creation of the sampling frame, the interview format and the management and analyses of data. Figure 4.1 (see below) outlines the steps of the research as they were derived from the research plan and the chosen methodology. An explanation of how the research became a longitudinal study is given, as the circumstances illustrate how an opportunity for longitudinal research may arise. Given the principle that ‘Social researchers should be reflective about the implications of their methods, values, biases, and decisions for the knowledge they generate‘ (Bryman, 2012, p. 393) particular attention is also paid to my professional relationship with those who were respondents in the research process and my place as an ‘insider‘ social researcher. This chapter outlines both analytical and interpretative approaches to the research, through the qualitative analyses of two sets of interviews and the analysis and interpretation of documents relevant to the topic.

--------------------------------------

The Background - The original plan
- Opportunity knocks - the opportunity to undertake a longitudinal study

Methodology - Principles considered and applied
Qualitative research as the chosen strategy
Longitudinal design and methodological considerations
- Memory
- Rebuilding a sample cohort
The means of data collection
- The value of a semi-structured interview
Data analysis
- The qualitative analysis of data
Content analysis
Reflexology
Ethical considerations
The research methods – the steps
Gaining approval
Creation of the sampling frame
  - The 1996 sample
  - The 2014 sample
Data collection
  - The 1996 interviews
  - The 2014 interviews
Qualitative analysis and management of data

Figure 4.1: Research Methodology and Method

Part One – The Research Methodology

Background

The original research plan
The basis for the research was initially set in the period 1988-1996. During that time, I held key roles in the design and implementation of the Association’s competency assessment process, which became the cornerstone of the Association’s professional self-regulatory system. Through this, I also developed an awareness of the Association’s and Child, Youth and Family Services’s (CYFS) separate agendas in advocating the introduction of statutory registration for social workers. On becoming a social work educator at the University of Otago, I presented and published a paper that considered the prospect of statutory registration and the role the Association might play in such a regime (Randal, 1996). A research project was subsequently commenced to canvass the views of a selected sample of Association members on the possible future place and role of the Association should statutory registration be introduced. The intention was to conduct a qualitative analysis of the data generated with a view to stimulating the discussion on the possible implications of statutory registration and any aspirations the Association might have for a role in that process. Clearly, the research topic, the questions posed and the methods to be employed were derived from a personal and professional interest in the topic and guided by my thesis supervisor at the time. Ethical approval and the support of the University of Otago to undertake the research were forthcoming and the study commenced in 1996. A sample of 16 respondents was selected and engaged, and, with their consent, interviews conducted, audiotaped and transcribed. However, due to a change in my employment in 1997, the research process stalled, and was eventually shelved. The unanalysed data
was nonetheless retained and stored in its original form.

**Opportunity knocks - to undertake a longitudinal study**

Seventeen years later, in 2014, the opportunity arose to use the original data as the basis for a longitudinal study. The decision to do so followed the encouragement of former academic and professional colleagues who felt the data stored was of historical value, particularly if it could be set against what had since transpired. This had included the enactment of the Social Workers Registration Act (the SWR Act) in 2003, the establishment of the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) and the implementation of statutory registration with its objective to support the professionalism of social workers (Social Workers Registration Act, 2003, Part 1, 3 (d)). In line with this objective, the SWRB could be regarded as complementing the Association’s mission as the professional body for social workers. A unique, albeit unplanned, opportunity had thereby arisen to return to data drawn from an historical sample, and to the same set of respondents, to comment on what had transpired in the intervening years. To my mind, the background to this research illustrates what has been referred to as ‘the messiness of social research’. … “Research is full of false starts, blind alleys, mistakes and enforced changes to research plans’ (Bryman, 2012, p. 15). In this instance, the possibility of the research incorporating the elements of a longitudinal study arose not by design but by circumstance and opportunity. The possibility of conducting follow-up interviews with the original respondents became an enticing prospect.

**The Research Design**

**Qualitative research as the chosen strategy**

In his appraisal of the distinctive attributes of qualitative research, Bryman (2012) identifies its functions in relation to theorisation. Qualitative research, through the vehicle of interviewing, offers an inductive view through the data generated, an interpretivist understanding as conveyed by the respondents and a constructionist position that accentuates the interaction of individuals in respect of the formation of social properties (2012, p. 380). As a strategy, therefore, it is well suited to the purpose of research that seeks to elicit from a sample of respondents their insights and views, as individuals, in respect of social properties such as a professional association and the prospect of statutory registration being introduced for their profession. The following sections describe the underlying methodology of the design process for qualitative research including its design and means of data collection. The matters of
reflexology and ethics as critical factors in qualitative research are also examined.

**Longitudinal design**

A longitudinal design, as a research method, involves the collection of data from the same sample on at least two different occasions. Given the circumstances explained above, it now meant that the transcripts of the interviews with the original respondents, once analysed, could provide the baseline data for a study that returns to the same cohort of respondents. This would then serve as a basis for the same respondents to reflect upon the introduction of statutory registration in the light of the aspirations they had previously held. As the researcher this provided the opportunity to consider their responses in the context of wider socio-political agendas. ‘Cohort studies are concerned with illuminating social change and with improving the understanding of causal influences over time’ (Bryman, 2012, p. 63). Such an approach was entirely consistent with the purpose of the research, which was to consider the introduction of statutory registration as an independent variable, and to examine its consequences and impact for the profession as the dependent variable, as perceived by the respondents ten years after its introduction (Denscombe, 2014). Two particular methodological considerations arose in respect of this design.

**Memory**

The proposal to reengage the original respondents led to considering the implications of the respondents forming a ‘new understanding of memory’ (Barusch, 2011, p. 751) if they were provided with a copy of their original interview transcript to read to jog their recollection of what they said in that interview. As it transpired, it was decided not to proceed in that way so that the responses and conversation in the second round of interviews could focus on the present and not what they may have said in 1996. This spared any debate around the accuracy of any recollection. This approach also acknowledged the view that ‘not only can memory be constructed by outside influences but there is good evidence that our recollections change in the course of remembering’ (2011, p. 751). Accordingly, the need to tackle the issues associated with the reconstitution and reinvention of memory was avoided (2011). This decision was subsequently discussed with respondents preparatory to reengaging them for the second round of interviews in 2014.

**Rebuilding the sample cohort and completing the sampling frame**

The intention was to ensure that the analysis provided a reasoned record of the Association’s position as presented through the views of a small cross-section of
members. Such a sample can be viewed as an exploratory sample, as distinct from a more fully representative form, although some effort was made to account for the relative proportions and characteristics of the Association’s member population (Denscombe, 2014). The particular attributes sought provided the basis for the sampling frame which, in 1996, was formed around the selection of three distinct cohorts of members of the Association as respondents: a group of foundation members; another group that included significant past and current officeholders; and a small group of new members. The other key attribute taken into account was that the total sample approximated the proportion of Tangata Whenua members of the Association. But, as noted by Jupp (2006) ‘The major problem with prospective longitudinal studies is attrition, that is to say the exit from the study of sample members brought about by such factors as mobility, death etc.’ (2006, p. 2). By 2014, of the original sixteen respondents interviewed in 1996, two were deceased and another five, by virtue of age and/or incapacity, were no longer fully active in the profession. This meant none of the first generation cohort of founding members was re-interviewed in 2014. This loss was partly ameliorated through the recruitment of new members for the 2014 sample in order to preserve the ethnic and other cohort elements of the original sample and, as best able, reduce the possibility of data bias due to the sample loss (2006). Although a longitudinal study had not been initially planned, the data generated from the cohort of foundation members in 1996 was invaluable in establishing the Association’s credentials, and, as it happened, they exemplified the commitment and loyalty that may be found in such bodies. A profile for each respondent is outlined in the sampling frame according to a set of variables relevant to the study. (see Part Two: Creation of the sampling frame)

The means of data collection

The value of a semi-structured interview

Interviewing is integral to qualitative research and the form of the semi-structured interview was well suited to the intent of the research to engage the respondents in a way that places them, and their voice, at the centre of study, with their point of view valued, and considered relevant and important (Bryman, 2012; Denscombe, 2014). In this instance, the semi-structured interview meant my leading the interview with a series of fairly general questions prepared beforehand. These formed the basis of the discussion, with further questions introduced to clarify the responses as deemed appropriate for the situation and the respondent’s knowledge and experiences. Using
the format of a semi-structured interview meant the research agenda would be kept uppermost whilst also providing the opportunity to capture relevant material to enhance the account of history and context (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Although the prepared questions set the parameters for the interviews they were relatively unstructured and more in the style of a frank conversation with the respondents but no less valid (Bryman, 2012). A semi-structured interview had been used for the 1996 interviews and was applied again for the 2014 interviews. Given my prior relationships and roles undertaken with the respondents, a respectful and open approach was fostered in the interviews. This was out of the recognition that we shared a common professional identity, albeit from different perspectives and backgrounds. The circumstances were collegial and engendered an interviewing style that was essentially collaborative and empathetic (Fontana & Frey, 2008). The wish was to foster a full and frank interview to enable the respondents to air their views about statutory registration and its consequences for the Association. Having a single interviewer ensured that the context for questioning remained relatively constant. All interviews were conducted privately at a location agreed with and best suited for the respondent, most usually at their place of work or at their home. However, three of the 2014 interviews were conducted over the phone or via an online connection.

The qualitative analysis of data

Conducting a qualitative analysis of data involves collecting, interpreting and summarising the information provided to account for the collective views of those interviewed. With the plan to collect two sets of data from interviews 18 years apart, the analysis provided both a longitudinal and historical perspective on the topic. The computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) NVivo was used to aid the qualitative analysis of the two sets of data derived from the interviews. The analyses were facilitated through the design framework and process provided by the software to identify and code the predominant themes of each transcript. The qualitative analyses were essential to grounding the examination and understanding of the topic as faithful reflections of the respondents’ views. A longitudinal approach meant that the data from the sample collected at the first round of interviews in 1996 provided a baseline of data, as themes, that could subsequently be reviewed against data collected in the second round of interviews in 2014. The analysis of the 1996 interviews sought to establish the themes that emerged regarding the prospect of statutory registration and aspirations for the Association. Albeit unintended at the
time, the baseline data provided a foundation for the subsequent examination of the situation in 2014 with a regime of statutory registration with new accountabilities having been in place ten years for the professional social worker and the profession. The questions asked of the second round of data were to identify the themes that related to the consequences and impact of statutory registration. Accordingly the schema established for the interviews conducted in 1996 set the basis for the questions that were formed and asked in the 2014 interviews and served to effectively bookend the study.

**Reflexivity**

**Being an insider researcher**

As previously noted, I was also part of this history having, at different times, been employed in a variety of insider roles on the block.

For each of the ways that being an insider researcher enhances the depth and breadth of understanding a population that may not be accessible to a nonnative scientist, questions about objectivity, reflexivity and authenticity of a research project are raised because perhaps one knows too much or is close to the project and may be too similar to those being studied (Kanuha, 2000 as cited in Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 57).

The different roles I held as an ‘insider’ included employment as a social worker, advisor and consultant within state and non-government social service organisations, as a fieldwork teacher and lecturer in tertiary social work education, as the national executive officer of the Association and finally regional manager of a national counselling agency. I resigned as a member of the Association in 2006 and had never registered under the SWR Act. My employment as one of the kids on the block spanned a significant segment of the period under study. Clearly, I was well and variously socialised into the professional culture and, for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the research, some reflected self-inquiry is offered: What personal lens did I bring to the research? What impact might this have had on my role in the research processes? What safeguards were applied to preserve the integrity of the research?

**Sharing the professional culture**

At the outset, I had access to and familiarity with the Association’s member base, from which the sample of respondents was selected. Some of the historical realities of
Association membership were, therefore, shared experiences and the roles I had held intersected with some of the respondents in various ways, being on the same working party/committee or working within the same field or agency. This meant sharing the same professional language (and its shorthand) and experiencing the same professional culture, processes and significant events. The invitation to members of the sample to participate was made within this context. An open and supportive relationship resulted with the respondents maintaining their interest in the study in spite of the length of time between interviews and time taken to complete.

**Upholding the research ethic and maintaining the space**

The circumstances meant that I needed to ensure that I did not lose sight of the respondents as research subjects, and that I was clear with them regarding consent and confidentiality and checking that the process and my intentions were explicit. In addition, it was recognised that in the instance of any conflict of interest, this could be tabled and acknowledged. Clearly, and particularly as a qualitative researcher, I was an insider, a member of the population being studied (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009).

> The qualitative researcher’s perspective is perhaps a paradoxical one: it is to be acutely tuned-in to the experiences and meaning systems of others – to indwell—and at the same time to be aware of how one’s own biases and preoccupations may be influencing what one is trying to understand (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 55).

Being immersed as a practitioner in the field of study meant a familiarity with and understanding of the respondents and their representation of the population under study. This allowed for open and frank interviews where my focus and intention was that their voices be central, not mine. Prior to the second round of interviews, I had ceased employment within the sector and resigned membership of the Association. This helped to create a degree of space and distance from being totally an ‘insider’ and perhaps engendered greater objectivity and authenticity to help allay any criticism as being too close and similar or knowing too much (2009). Through supervision and self-discipline, I also strove to ensure that the perspectives drawn from the interviews and readings have remained uncontaminated by my personal views. I have been at all times committed to accurate and fair representation of the respondents’ views by keeping reflexivity to the fore.
Some advantages of immersion

On the other hand, there are definite and positive aspects to having ‘insider’ status, particularly with qualitative research where the researcher needs to attend to the individual voices carried within the transcripts (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). It is my belief that the personal and professional relationships with the respondents in fact added elements to the research, in particular, insights and an accumulated wisdom, that helped maintain clarity of purpose as well as commitment to honour the contributions, support and encouragement of the respondents.

Declaring my position

The published paper I had written prior to the first round of interviews provided the respondents with a clear account of my views on the topic. (see Appendix 8: ‘Competent practice and regulation- debating the issues around registration and professionalisation of social work in New Zealand’). Respondents were invited to respond to and comment on the paper at the start of the interview and their feedback was included in their transcripts. It is felt that the paper, as well as being a catalyst for the ensuing discussion, gave the respondents an open declaration of any preconceptions and the beliefs, values, assumptions and position I held regarding the topic. In 1999, I had also written a guest editorial for the Association’s journal specifically on my personal reservations and scepticism regarding the prospect and value of statutory registration as a means for enhancing the professionalisation and professionalism of social workers (Randal, 1999). This was written when I was both an employee of the Association and member of the Association’s Registration Project Team preparing the Association’s case for statutory registration. I concluded the editorial claiming ‘the risk, as I see it is that statutory registration will become something of a sideshow for the Association and a diversion from its central purpose’ (Randal, 1999, p. 2). The research, then, has in some ways become a vehicle for testing this claim, by taking up an unpromeditated opportunity to test the supposition I made in 1999, by asking those members I had interviewed in 1996 what consequences they had seen for the Association as a result of statutory registration. Clearly, as an employee and non-practising member of the Association in the period immediately before, during and after the implementation of statutory registration, I had been centrally involved. After changing employment to a new vocation and role with new professional priorities, I subsequently viewed the Association’s later transition through the post-statutory environment rather more dispassionately and from a
distance, yet with some residual curiosity as how it had turned out. I had certainly remained sceptical that statutory registration had turned out as the Association had envisaged or wished and this, in turn, led to my conjecture as to the motive of government for pursuing it. With retirement, and the rediscovery of the earlier data in secure storage, an opportunity arose to cultivate the hunches and ideas that were to become the basis of the theoretical framework (see Part Two, p. 51).

**Ethical considerations**

The further ethical considerations taken into account during the research included: preserving the anonymity of respondents; confidentiality; the security of data; privacy; and the management of any conflict of interest. These were all accounted for in the information sheets and consents provided the respondents and reviewed before each interview.

- All respondents in both rounds of the interviews were assured anonymity in respect of any write-up of the material and that specific quotes would not be attributed to them in a way that would identify them. Respondents were coded as Respondent 1996A, Respondent 2014A …… and so forth and identified according to descriptors ascribed to them (see Appendix 12: Figure 4.2 the Sampling Frame). In respect of the interviews with the Minister and the Project Manager both additionally consented that any published references attributed to them would be referenced as ‘the Minister’ and ‘the Project Manager’ respectively.

- Data, including the audio recordings, was held securely and, once the research was completed, were to be returned to the respondents, or destroyed as agreed.

- All respondents were asked if there were any issues surrounding privacy or possible conflicts of interest that need to be addressed or managed at the time of their interview. If any conflict of interest had been identified, a joint decision would have been made as to whether this could have been resolved or whether the respondent should be removed from the sample.

**Concluding Comment**

The methodology provides an explicit account of the theoretical approaches applied and justification for the strategies adopted in the research. The methodologies are believed to be congruent with and appropriate for the circumstances under
examination. The regular review of the parameters and scope of the research to keep it manageable given its potentially much greater breadth and depth meant that the methodology needed refinement to make it fit for purpose. The comprehensive research methodology was designed to provide assurance regarding the integrity of the research methods that follow.

**Part Two - The Research Method – the Steps**

The description of the research method includes: the steps taken for ethical approval; creation of the sampling frame; the interviews; recording and managing data; data and content analyses.

**Gaining approval**

In August 2013, a proposal was put to the Departmental Research Committee to undertake the study that would reinstate and build upon the original data collected in 1996 *(see Appendix 9: Thesis proposal).* A condition of the Research Committee’s approval was that a Social Welfare Research and Evaluation paper be completed to ensure that the study be informed by current best research practices. Having last completed a Social Work Research paper in 1972, the requirement to update my social research knowledge and skills was both reasonable and welcomed. Completion of the paper provided new insights into current research practice and theory and played a significant part in refining the research proposal and preparing it for ethical approval. The subsequent completion of the paper in the First Semester 2014 paved the way for the research activity to commence in the Second Semester 2014. University ethical approval was subsequently obtained and included consultation with Ngāi Tahu in accordance with the University’s research protocols *(see Appendix 10 & Appendix 11).*

**Creation of the sampling frame (See Appendix 12: Figure 4.2 the Sampling Frame).**

**The 1996 Sample**

For the interviews conducted in 1996, the sample was selected from:

i. Acknowledged past and present leaders of the Association, as Foundation and/or Life members and/or Past National Officeholders.

ii. Members working in occupational settings in which social work was practised or taught: CYFS; Health; NGOs; private practice; tertiary education.
iii. New members who had just completed or were in the process of completing their competency assessment for full membership of the Association.

iv. The Tangata Whenua caucus of the Association.

The sample provided three distinct cohorts based on the generation of membership: a first generation cohort of founding members from 1964 (five respondents); a second generation cohort of those who joined the Association between 1970 and 1989 (seven respondents); and a third generation cohort of those who joined the Association between 1990 and 1996 (four respondents). Thus, as a non-probability sample, the sample has elements of being viewed as a convenience sample and/or as a quota sample (Bryman, 2012; Denscombe, 2014) drawn from the first generation of founding members (thirty+ years of membership), a second generation who had between ten and twenty years of membership and the third generation with less than 5 years of membership. The sampling frame therefore comprised cohorts representing different generations of membership and the Tangata Whenua caucus. The respondents were selected in consultation with my thesis supervisor at that time and each was approached directly and invited to participate.

The 2014 Sample

For the second round of interviews, nine of the original sixteen respondents were in a position to be reengaged and consented to being reinterviewed. An information sheet was sent to them and the consent form completed at the time the interview was conducted (see Appendix 13: Information Sheet for Participants; Consent form for Participants; Appendix 14: Covering Letter to Participants). To ensure the continuing integrity of the sample in the light of the loss of seven of the original respondents, (as noted above) two additional respondents were selected to ensure that the voice of the Tangata Whenua caucus be retained. In addition, it was decided to approach the former government Minister of the Crown (The Minister) who had sponsored the legislation and the manager of the Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP) Project Team (a Government employee) responsible for the Statutory Registration Project. (The Project Manager) Both were approached directly with access to the Government employee approved following a formal application to the Ministry of Social Development (MSD).
Data collection

The 1996 Interviews

In 1996, the purpose of the interviews was to learn from the sixteen respondents what role, if any, the Association, as the professional body, might have if statutory registration for social workers was introduced and the Association’s readiness to undertake such a role. Preparatory to the interview, a copy of a recently published paper on the topic was sent to each respondent to provide some focus and impetus for the semi-structured interview (See Appendix 8: ‘Competent practice and regulation- debating the issues around registration and professionalisation of social work in New Zealand’). The paper raised some of the issues that surrounded the possibility of statutory registration being introduced, particularly in the light of that having become a strategic goal of the Children and Young Persons Service (CYPS). The paper also included the results of a recent evaluation of the overall integrity of the Association’s competency assessment process. The semi-structured interview that followed was shaped around a set of questions (See Appendix 15: Interview Questions: 1996). Each interview was audiotaped.

The 2014 Interviews

In 2014, a further semi-structured interview was conducted with nine of the original respondents plus two of the newly recruited respondents (to offset the attrition that had occurred with the original sample). The purpose was to learn what they saw as the consequences of statutory registration having been implemented. This interview was also shaped around a set of questions (See Appendix 16: Interview Questions: 2014). Each interview was audiotaped. As noted above, in addition to re-interviewing the original sample, two key government figures (The Minister and the Project Manager) were also interviewed at this time regarding the ministerial and government processes leading to the introduction of statutory registration. The interviews were set up through the same processes of invitation, information and consent. The purpose of the two interviews was to gain some insight into the circumstances that led to the government of the day deciding to introduce legislation for the statutory registration of social workers and to learn the role of MoSP in briefing government on the form of legislation. Different questions were used to guide the semi-structured interviews. (See Appendix 17: Questions for the Minister & Appendix 18: Questions for the Project Manager). Each interview was audiotaped.
Qualitative analysis and management of data

1996
The paper provided preparatory to the 1996 interviews was analysed, using the NVivo software programme, to identify and code the key themes contained within the paper. This analysis of content served to identify the initial themes used to guide the analysis of the interviews. The interviews conducted in 1996 were recorded, transcribed and returned to the respondents to review and confirm as a fair record. When the research was reinstated, the data from 1996 was digitally converted from its original format to enable its qualitative analysis using the software application NVivo. At that time, the attributes of the respondents were classified and assigned. Interview themes, initially drawn from the analysis of the paper (see above) were identified, as were response patterns, and coded accordingly. An iterative process was followed that led to the identification of new emergent themes found in the data, which led to the constant revision of dominant themes and the coding structure. With the data coded, it became possible to identify views in common, views in contrast, and to make queries of the data. Using selected relevant variables as the basis, the data was collated to form the results for conversion and export in document form. These provided a wealth of material from which the findings and results were collated.

2014
The qualitative analysis and management of data derived from the 2014 interviews followed the same process used for the 1996 interviews.

Concluding Comment
With the analyses completed it now remains to collate the results as a basis for discussing the research questions in the light of the literature and theoretical frameworks offered.
Chapter Five - The Results of the Analyses

Introduction

Part One first presents the results of a content analysis that was completed of the paper used as a point of reference for the interviews conducted in 1996 (Appendix 8). The results of the qualitative analysis of the interviews conducted in 1996 prior to the introduction of statutory registration follow. Part Two provides the results of the interviews conducted in 2014 after to the introduction of statutory registration as a follow-up to the interviews conducted in 1996. Part Three provides the results of the interviews conducted in 2014 with the former Minister of Social Services and Employment (The Minister) and the Project Manager, of the Registration Project Team. (The Project Manager)

Part One

The 1996 Interviews

A paper that I had authored and published was provided to all respondents to read two weeks prior to their interview. This paper had raised ‘some of the issues that surround the possibility of occupational regulation/registration of social work in New Zealand and the attendant debates about professionalisation’ (Appendix 8, p. 1) and had been written to promote debate within the Association. It served as a background for the interview and, together with the questions posed in the interview, set my agenda for the interview. Preparatory to conducting the qualitative analysis of the interviews, a content analysis was made of the paper. The coding template formed from this analysis was used as a framework for the subsequent analysis of the interviews (see Figure 5.1 below).

Themes coded from the paper

The content analysis of the paper led to the following themes being coded (highlighted in bold).

The professionalisation of social work through the lens of its professional purpose and practice, in particular accounting for the dual concern of social work with both the
person and their social environment. The paper discussed how the professionalisation of social work has been discredited and that this has been at the nub of the debate about registration in the Association to date.

It is my view that members of the Association should reflect again on the possibility that registration, whatever form it may take, could lead to the disabling split between professional purpose and practice (Appendix 8, p. 5).

The history of debates within the Association about membership criteria, qualification and biculturalism highlighted how lively debates had been a hallmark of the Association’s evolution.

The issue over the criteria for membership came to a further head following the Turangawaewae conference in 1986 and the subsequent resolution a little later to establish an inclusive process of certification, embodying as best it could, principles of biculturalism (Appendix 8, p. 2).

The paper also described the evaluation of the competency assessment process that had been instituted by the Association as evidence of its ability and capacity to manage the process of professional self-regulation and ‘a key plank in any moves for social work in New Zealand to become registered and professionalised’ (Appendix 8, p. 1).

The value and benefits of membership of the Association. These were accounted for showing that:

social workers are attracted to membership, not only for the usual reasons associated with being affiliated through mutual association but also due to the benefits of membership, including indemnity insurance, certification and the sense of professional security the Association and its code of ethics offer for those who work privately or in relative isolation from their peers (Appendix 8, p. 3).
The **prospect of statutory registration** being introduced, with its purpose being ‘the basic integrity of an occupational group and assurances around how it deals with the problems and the unpredictability of practice’ (Appendix 8, p. 6).

This was considered within the current climate of ‘new managerialism’, the driver of the need to account for outputs and outcomes and prescriptive practice.

 Management has an interest in making standards and outputs explicit which, in turn, has led to the prescription of work task competencies and a contractual environment which ties everyone to a centrally determined set of outcomes (Appendix 8, p. 5).

The paper described **the context for the current debate that included CYPS’s professionalisation strategy** and strategic goal for an independent registering body. ‘It is perhaps surprising and ironic that the Association and one of the key social service providers {CYPS} sense that the political climate is right for promoting the registration of social workers. (Appendix 8, p. 2)

The paper concluded that although **the Association’s credibility and self-regulatory system** has it positioned as a key player should statutory registration be introduced, **further debate** was urged.

 This paper will hopefully revive the debate about the nature of social work in New Zealand, in particular, the ways in which social workers are perceived and the ways in which social workers want to be seen (Appendix 8, p. 6).

**and that** ‘Members of NZASW need to closely examine what registration means in the light of NZASW's founding principles’ (Appendix 8, p. 5).

With the themes identified, a coding template was created and used to guide the qualitative analysis of the interviews that followed. (see Figure 5.1 below)
The paper

- Read it?

Themes

- The professionalisation of social work
- The history of debate within the Association
- The value and benefits of membership of the Association
- Evaluation of the competency assessment process
- The prospect of statutory registration
- The context of the current debate
- The need for further debate

Figure 5.1: The Coding Template for the 1996 Interviews

The qualitative analysis of the 1996 interviews – the results

Responses to the paper

In the first instance, the respondents were asked whether they had had an opportunity to read the paper and whether they had any specific response to it as a whole or to anything within it. All confirmed they had taken an opportunity to read the paper, with two qualifying their response in respect of the academic style of the paper.

*I read the first two pages. The literature is a bit heavy for me.*

J 1996

*I felt the language used was very ... I thought "Oh goodness I feel really dumb about this", because I'm a practical hands-on sort of person and it seems very theoretical with a lot of ... of course it would be, it's an academic type paper.*

G 1996

Others viewed the paper favourably in terms of it having stimulated their thoughts, raised questions at an interesting time and broadened their perspective. Their responses were especially affirming in that the paper had engaged them at an intellectual level and stimulated their thinking and views on the themes and issues raised.

*I think that it's a fascinating area. I mean it couldn’t be better timing for the*
whole registration thing starting to get more public.

P 1996

It was a really interesting paper. It challenged my thinking actually. I guess while I was studying we looked at professionalism and what that meant for our clients and having worked for a few years now, particularly in the health system, I’ve looked at how professionalism could protect or be protective, I suppose. The dilemmas struck me as being very real whichever way.

R 1996

Responses to the semi-structured interview questions

Using the themes identified in the coding template as a framework, an analysis was made of the interviews. An iterative process was applied as the qualitative analysis of the interviews was completed to allow for any sub-themes to be identified. As might be expected, the responses reflected the diversity of the respondents’ respective social work backgrounds, and their experience and interests. For example, those who had been foundation members of the Association offered a great deal of insight into the Association’s early history, whilst all respondents commented on more recent developments, offering their reflections on and hopes for the profession. As described in Chapter Two (Part One – An Association Formed, p.17), the genesis of a professional association for social workers first became evident in the collectivisation of those working in welfare and social care roles, preceding the establishment of the welfare state. The possibility that they might become recognised as a professional group did not emerge until the welfare state was in place. The respondents, especially the cohort of foundation members of the Association, gave quite vivid first-hand accounts of the genesis of the Association, the reasons for it coming into being, the early debates and its history.

The purpose behind those groups was first of all to have a forum where you could identify with colleagues who were working outside the agency you were in, and you could also talk about things in your own agency in a way that you couldn’t talk about within your own agency. There was an emerging sense of identity about that time. It had only an early emerging recognition that social workers might be professionals.

D 1996

A forerunner to the debates that were to become a feature of the Association in ensuing years was recalled at the inaugural conference of the Association in 1964.
When I came into this it was the very beginning of the Association, ... I helped write the first Constitution ... and went to the meeting in Auckland which was a very passionate meeting. ... the big controversy was about professionalism. In 1964 a lot of people hadn’t had a chance to be trained. There was a small group in for that and the rest of us were saying "this is too elitist" and not appropriate to New Zealand in 1964.

B 1996

Others recounted the early initiatives of the Association including lobbying government for widened training opportunities, particularly for those working in the voluntary sector, and making formal submissions in relation to the Government’s proposals about the reform of the welfare system.

There was a need seen for an Association to be able to be a strong lobby group and you couldn’t do that unless you can sustain a reasonably large membership.

I 1996

Debates around membership criteria were remembered as creating sharp divisions with the Association and, over time, the loss of members.

So I sat through Conference after Conference and saw every time the thing was raised about membership criteria/training opportunities, it was lost every time. And the Association weakened itself over that because it lost a lot of members.

E 1996

They lost the people who went into private practice who tended then to be therapeutically inclined who went to the Association of Counsellors and the other group being the community workers went to their own association. So the NZASW was left with the middle ground but not much energy until 1986 when it had very few members and had to make a new push.

O 1996

At the heart of these debates, the competing views over the relevance of professionalism and professionalisation for social workers were aired.

I think it was the radicalisation of social work in the ‘70s and with the very strong emphasis on Marxist theory. That’s when the idea of registration or professionalisation became to be looked upon as pretty well a dirty word.

That spelt elitism and all those sort of things and of course in New Zealand it was then overtaken by the whole anti-racist view too ... So you get to the late ‘70s and ‘80s with these two strong strands within the people being social workers.

E 1996
Some of this was recounted as steeped in a suspicion of the motives of the professional worker, particularly when considered in the light of the inequalities between social workers and their clients. On the other hand, professional status, and the training and education that goes with it, was also posited as an essential antidote to such inequalities.

Professionalism or professional quality of peoples work should serve as an antidote to that [constructed inequalities] and should serve to ensure what are the most vulnerable in the community get decent quality services.

Q 1996

Then there was the indecision.

We’ve never decided ... are we a profession or are we not?

M 1996

Amidst this argument were the efforts to resolve where professionalisation fit in relation to the bicultural identity for the Association as it sought to confirm an anti-racist stance.

Māori workers, on the whole, are community workers. Well they have to be. They can have a strong personal component working with individuals but they’ve got to have a base in community work because one must be hapu based for working in Iwi social services.

B 1996

In spite of the continuing debates, the Association forged the set of professional tools that marked out its territory as a professional body. Identified as central to this were its code of ethics, the priority given to training and education, the regular publishing of newsletters and journals, its international affiliation with the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) and ultimately the introduction of competency based assessments which were to become the basis for membership.

My criteria was always "now would I send a member of my family along to that social worker". What am I saying there? That means a) they’ve got to be a good sort of person, b) they’ve got to be competent and the other thing is that they’ve got to have a REALLY good ethical grip of it.

B 1996

The establishment of competency assessment provided agencies with a point of
external validation for practice standards. It also provided the Association with sufficient confidence to assert its views on the desirability of statutory registration.

You have your ethics and your standards, your competency and your complaints procedure and you have your review procedures as well and re-certification, and you have everything that registration provides. What is it going to do that is different? Then you have to say is that the difference is that the compulsory requirement will mean there is consistency amongst practitioners and therefore consistency for the public.
L 1996

Advocacy for statutory registration drew a range of comments including the view that it would give social workers more sway politically.

I see that maybe it is appropriate in 1996. I think it’s very different. One of the reasons that I see it as being appropriate is that we are in the same fix as nurses and teachers and if we haven’t got a powerful group we can’t get into the political mix like the PPTA has done.
B 1996

The timing to push for statutory registration also seemed right, given a gathering groundswell of qualified, competent social workers to complete the picture.

Nowadays it is possible for a far higher proportion of social workers, if they are of a mind, to get proper credentials.
I 1996

Statutory registration was also expressed as necessary for the protection of clients and the desirability of social workers becoming credentialed in light of the public scrutiny faced by them.

It’s the bit about the universality of the protection of the interests of the clients isn’t it? That’s the argument for registration.
L 1996

People are more aware of credentials, accreditation and approval ... the influence of the whole sort of standard setting movement. And social workers have felt really uncomfortable in that environment because they are not a registered profession and secondly they don’t have compulsory membership with any standard-setting body.
M 1996
A statutory registration regime was viewed as according protection to the profession as well as consumers and clients, with the enforcement of practice standards meaning a safer and more clearly defined role for the profession.

\[
\text{Even to be able to ask people if they’re registered social workers would be helpful.} \\
G \text{ 1996}
\]

\[
\text{The identification of your profession being the accountability to other professions and other social workers within the profession} \\
R \text{ 1996}
\]

But still doubts remained.

\[
\text{It’s a double-edged sword for me. Yes I do, and I believe clients deserve the best.} \\
A \text{ 1996}
\]

\[
\text{While I’m real keen for registration, I’m apprehensive or slightly anxious that it will marginalise Māori again.} \\
A \text{ 1996}
\]

\[
\text{I guess my instinct would be that it’s a form of registration which lends itself most readily to the preservation of professional elitism, separation and distancing and all of that, which is the least accessible, both to change and to consumer community type interests.} \\
Q \text{ 1996}
\]

For others, there were vehement arguments against the possibility of statutory registration because of the role of state and its power and because of what regulation/registration may imply or be a vehicle for.

\[
\text{I’m not for a statutory registration. Why? Power. The minute the State authorises a group to be, it gives it the power and it backs the power by statutory authority of an Act of Parliament. I do not believe that one should ever define in law who a social worker is and that it should deny anybody the right to use the term should they choose to do so.} \\
D \text{ 1996}
\]

\[
\text{I have difficulty with the term "regulated" because I think things can be regulated on a scarcity basis. That has always been a fear that some occupations have in the past made sure that they keep a tight clamp on numbers practising, and that of course keeps up the prevailing standards of the}
\]
practitioners. And I think that with social workers, ideologically, we will always be against that.

E 1996

Put even more absolutely was the view that statutory registration would be the antithesis to what social work stood for. This recalled the earlier assertions that it would be self-serving of the interests of the profession rather than the clients it served, particularly with the stamp of the state upon it and the added legitimacy, recognition and status that goes with that.

I don’t want it to have the stamp of the State upon it because at the minute that it does that it increases its potential for exercising that additional power in the interests of itself.

D 1996

The costs for maintaining the processes and mechanisms of statutory registration, including the establishment and running costs of a registration board, were raised as another factor against statutory registration. It was also anticipated that this would have follow-on cost implications for agencies needing to employ social workers. There was also skepticism whether statutory registration would make any difference for Māori.

These kinds of things have never served Māori historically and that the executive group working parties that puts this kind of stuff together inevitably at the end of the day Māori have to look at it from a distance. If we go for legislation, what will it give us that it doesn’t give us now?

A 1996

Respondents were asked, in the event of some form of registration becoming a reality, what form should this take, where might its mandate lie, how might a registration board be composed, and what should be the criteria for becoming registered? Some clear reservations were expressed about registration coming under a statute.

But I have no particular liking or belief that the State should register doctors, nurses, or anybody. I’m anti-state in those matters.

D 1996

A statute is a comparatively rigid type of framework which is closely associated
with more traditional forms of registration like medicine, nursing, psychology, architects and so on … which lends itself most readily to the preservation of professional elitism, separation and distancing and all of that, which is the least accessible, both to change and to consumer community type interests.

Q 1996

These reflected concerns that the profession itself might not hold any control and the risk that:

effectively the sanctioning is being done by Parliament ... and [being] driven probably by ideological and political kinds of expectations that are perhaps rather hostile or at least not very helpful as far as social work is concerned.

Q 1996

The alternative, such as having registration built up from and embedded in the Association, drew much more positive responses, either as an extension of the existing self-regulatory system already in place within its Constitution, or the creation of a regulatory arm of the Association, mandated and delegated to the Association by the Crown. Certainly, the majority view was that registration ought to be tied to having membership in the Association. Such a regulatory body, under the aegis of the Association, could include Tangata Whenua representation, if not partnership, as well as representation of other ethnic and community groups.

I think the ideal is for there to be a recognised regulatory arm of a strong, comprehensive professional association so that ... it’s kind of like a sitting side by side and the regulation might, for example, licence or provide legislative responsibility for the Board of Competency to manage the register of approved social workers and to get the mechanisms all approved. Accountability ... it has to be dual ... one to the profession and the other to the Minister.

L 1996

I think it would be wonderful if it was vested in the Association to take that role, because I think then it could be truly independent and we wouldn’t have political nominees.

M 1996

The downside to this was seen as the potential that this could empower the profession at the expense of the public it served and stretch the Association’s infrastructure and budget.
I’d like the Association to have a major hand! But I don’t think that the Association could carry that and together with the political nuances that would occur if they were associated with it.

O 1996

The worry is that if they don’t contribute anything to the rest of the Association it makes for a very boring organisation. I personally think for all those reasons now, I would probably pick another independent body.

M 1996

Reservations carried over to how to develop a consensus to constitute and compose a board in terms of stakeholder and, ideally, consumer representation, balance and size. Such views revisited the desire not to be captive to traditional models of professional registration.

I think the social work world is very different to other professional worlds.

M 1996

However, the role of the state remained the point of difference and contention.

To make it truly professional, I do see that the State should have a role in it and I don’t think it should just be an in-house thing done by social workers for social workers and it’s all a bit cute and incestuous and I don’t think that that’s very helpful.

G 1996

There was greater consensus regarding the criteria that should be set for registration. These included competence assessments against practice standards at regular intervals, an academic qualification, that practice is supervised, an adherence to a code of ethics and evidence of continuing professional development. However, not all considered a qualification should be required.

If the person is competent and are practising competently and have knowledge about power imbalances and structural factors and bi-culturalism.... all the things that are central and important to social work, then no it shouldn’t necessarily be tied to the fact that people have just got an educational qualification.

R 1996

Alternative pathways for registration were also suggested, drawing on different combinations of qualification, competency and continuing professional training that
built on what the Association and training providers already offered and that was akin to the post-qualifying schemes of the medical colleges. However, in the event of a form of statutory registration being established, it was considered that a continuing political advocacy role by the Association would remain important to uphold the Association’s foundation principles of social justice.

*I see the Association as being the forum by which we can explore all sorts of new things and it would be a pity if it became tied into a very sort of conservative role and I see that radical thought should come through the Association.*

_E 1996_

_To get a powerful Association you’ve got to have registration, so be it._

_B 1996_

Opinions were sought on the recent initiative of CYPS to set up its own competency programme and press government for statutory registration as the key elements of its overall professionalisation strategy. This seemed to parallel the Association’s own course, albeit from a different agenda and as another *kid on the block*. Quite firm views were aired in respect of this.

*CYPS and its policy to have an independent registering body established. CYPS needs a big battle fought._

_B 1996_

_They [CYPS] aren’t “social work” and they need to be told that very firmly that they’re not. If we, social work, the profession gets captured by one agency we’re done for, in terms of any independence, any sort of social justice. If we get overtaken by basically an instrumentalist bureaucratic model then we’re finished._

_M 1996_

**Concluding comment**

The data gathered was analysed to identify the themes of the responses to questions put to the respondents regarding how the Association carved its niche as a *kid on the block*. **Appendix 19: Figure 5.2 (The 1996 Interviews – summary of data analysis)** summarises the interview responses coded against the broad themes of the coding template developed from the content analysis of the paper. Through the iterative process that was applied as the qualitative analysis of the interviews was
completed, second and third tiers of sub-themes were identified. Furthermore, the summary accounts for the number of respondents (as sources) who responded to each theme including the total number of references coded to each respondent. This provides a comparative weighting of the themes in terms of the level of engagement with each. **Appendix 20: Figure 5.3 (The Association as the kid on the block Plotting the data: Association Members 1996)** outlines the themes plotted from the data that not only tell the story of the Association as recounted by the respondents but also capture their views on the prospect and possible forms of statutory registration and aspirations for the Association. The themes embedded in the responses will be used to inform the discussion that follows in Chapter 6.
Part Two
The 2014 Interviews

Part Two provides the results of the interviews conducted in 2014 as a follow-up to the interviews in 1996. The respondents included nine of those originally interviewed in 1996 and two additional members of the Association recruited to offset the attrition from the original sample. A coding template was created drawing from the themes of the questions prepared for each interview. (see Figure 5.4 below) The coding template was further developed through an iterative process as the qualitative analysis was made. This led to the identification of additional and emergent sub-themes that became an integral part of the results.

Themes

• The SWR Act 2003 and consequences
• Impact on the Association
• Aspirations for the Association
  - not realised
  - realised
• Empowerment of the Association
• Marginalisation of the Association
• The professionalisation of social work and professionalism
  - advancing, ascending?
• Anything else?

Figure 5.4: The Coding Template for the 2014 Interviews

The qualitative analysis of the 2014 interviews – the results

Responses to the semi-structured interview questions

With the Social Workers Registration Act having been enacted in 2003 (The SWR Act), a Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) was appointed by the Minister of Social Services and Employment (the Minister) to create the framework for assessing the competence and fitness to practise social work as a basis for the public accountability of registered social workers. Some respondents saw the realignment of
the professional accountability of social workers to the SWRB, as displacing the oversight of the Association as the professional body.

*Control, direction and responsibility moves from those who do the practice to the government appointed legislative body ... and that is appointed by the Minister, responsible to the Minister.*

Q 2014

And the SWRB was viewed as working to an agenda not necessarily shared by social workers.

*The value base of social work might not be directly aligned to the value base of policy makers ... put it that way ... because they’re totally focused on efficiency, economic rationalism ... that that’s the all encompassing ... and risk management of course ... whereas social work’s value base is about social justice and human rights and I think there’s a real tension there.*

F 2014

Furthermore, a Ministerially-appointed Board ran the risk of being subject to political influence or otherwise losing the confidence of the Minister.

*It always leaves it open to the potential that an anti-social work Minister could in fact stack the panel, the Board, with people who have particular views.*

M 2014

The analogy of statutory registration as a new kid on the block was considered as befitting of what had transpired.

*I think you’re right when you say there’s “a new kid on the block”. But this kid’s got huge backing, you know ... it’s not just something ... like you know how we’ve had to develop our sense of responsibility inside the profession. I think that that’s ours always but I don’t think we’ve got the same critical teeth.*

H 2014

The governance of statutory registration was vested in the SWRB, six members of which were to be registered social workers. This reflected the Minister’s wish to have social workers at the forefront of the SWRB. In the light of this, it was inevitable that the inaugural SWRB included current members of the Association. As it transpired, all of the six appointed registered social workers had held significant roles in the
Association. From observations made by some of those interviewed in respect of this, these Ministerial appointees to the SWRB were seen to be carrying a conflict of interest into their role on the SWRB. Also, their appointment was viewed as a generous endowment given to the SWRB by the Association.

There were people on the Board who were also in a position on the Executive (of the Association) and they shouldn’t have been in both. I think it’s a clear conflict of interest but I don’t think it was recognised at the time.

I think that’s true that the Association ‘gifted’ that to the Registration Board. I think that’s a good way of looking at it.

P 2014

Respondents recalled their initial reactions to the enactment of the legislation, the pressures and expectations experienced at the time and some of the consequences. For those respondents who had been members of the Association and appointed to the SWRB, their recollections included some unforeseen consequences. They recalled the tightness of timeframes set by the legislation for establishing the infrastructure and criteria for registration and learning the implications of working for a Crown Entity.

People from the Ministry coming in saying the first rule of any Crown Entity is don’t embarrass the Minister. So the first message was kind of a negative one ... behave ... and for many of us who had been activist it was kind of a shock to realise that suddenly we were part of the apparatus of the State.

M 2014

Change was the operative word particularly in terms of the scale of change that statutory registration meant for the profession, some unanticipated consequences and the implications of the entry on the scene of a new entity that would hold distinct and critical powers over the profession.

Now you’ve got this place where there’s this kind of confusion amongst social workers about “Where am I? Who do I belong with? What am I affiliated to?” instead of “That’s their role and that’s their role and they both impact on me”. Some people have lost sight of that and it’s almost like there are two organisations in competition with each other. They’re not necessarily behaving that way but they’re being seen like that.

R 2014

There were disappointments too, in that the legislation fell short of providing what
some saw as more absolute protection for the public. Statutory registration was not made mandatory and neither was there the absolute protection of the title ‘social worker’ that licensing would have provided.

Changes in the professional social worker’s milieu were observed.

*The construction of a particular environment that is focused quite narrowly on the characteristics of the formalities of professional registration.*

*Social work, not just the Association, has drifted quite significantly ... and there has been a very inward looking focus and some of that has been about "who are we, what do we do in this kind of context?".*

Q 2014

The **impact** of the introduction of statutory registration on the Association included the view that it should relinquish to the SWRB its preoccupation with the business of competency assessment and:

*Go back to “its knitting” which is about advocacy, industrial representation and social policy and public platform.*

L 2014

The Association was also criticised for not having pondered longer on its reasons for statutory registration and its inability to understand the respective and distinctive roles of a professional body and a registration board. This carried through to the following perception of the SWRB:

*Wittingly, or unwittingly, [the SWRB] undermines the activities and really the financial base of the Association so that it’s a threat to the existence of the Association and it’s severely challenging our credibility.*

C 2014

The requirements and deadlines set by the SWRB, backed by their staffing resources, were seen to put the SWRB at an advantage over the Association, which was then left looking:

*Less than professional and I think it makes us look reactive.*

C 2014

Others saw the dynamic between the two organisations as a battleground.
And it became a battle between the two, which is a real shame.
P 2014

It’s just an enormous competition.
K 2014

Such observations led to further reflection on the downstream effects of statutory registration, both positive and negative. In a positive vein, there was the view that statutory registration was considered as instrumental in achieving the objective of the social work profession becoming more professionalised. But this did not carry through to the Association necessarily being seen as any stronger or empowered as a professional body.

I think it’s [the Association] marginalised itself. I think it’s taken an insular perspective and has obsessed itself with its infrastructure and its survival, I suppose.

It’s [the Association] lost its public voice and lost its public credibility.
L 2014

Nor was this state of affairs necessarily just attributed to the advent of the SWRB. Some quite trenchant criticism of the governance of the Association was expressed regarding its significant makeover of its governance structure in the years following the introduction of statutory registration.

The key people in the Association had not kind of grappled with “what does an Association look like in a compulsory registration environment?”
Q 2014

The attendance to the infrastructure and the way in which the Association is organised and staffed and governed as well, has inhibited the development.
L 2014

There was a disengagement from the membership and people really had no way in to say or do anything.
P 2014

This raised the question of what becomes of the Association’s role if it no longer has the mandate, albeit as a self-regulator, to assess and confirm practice standards.
Further, the Act did not specify or name the Association for any prescribed role and neither was any recognition given for holding Association membership.

*I’m not clear that the SWRB have accorded the Association the mana that it deserved.*

*I think the Social Workers Registration Board could have gone some way towards making it very highly desirable that you have your membership.*

R 2014

*Where’s the legitimacy of the Association vis a vis the Board?*

Q 2014

Confusion regarding the differences between, and relative merits of, registration and membership was also reported.

*If they register they don’t need to be part of the Association ... which I think is really wrong.*

P 2014

*The thinking was going “oh well actually I don’t need to think about ANZASW ... I can just be accountable to the SWRB”. And that worried me. That really concerned me that people were even beginning to think that way.*

R 2014

Working **relationships** between the Board and the Association were at times obviously fraught, particularly at the outset. This was the experience of the members of the Association appointed to the SWRB and as observed by others. The relationship was reported to be at times adversarial and antagonistic and contrary to early expectations that it would be collegial.

*I kind of think how naive we were. It’s almost like we felt we would be just sitting around the table and chatting as colleagues the way we always had and fight and argue and get upset and run away and come back and try again.*

*I think the Association reacted very, very defensively to the Board’s decisions and there was a reluctance to actually acknowledge that people on the Board were colleagues doing the very best they could.*

M 2014

*I think that there was great opportunity for the Registration Board and the Association to work together and promote social work in NZ. From my*
experience of those earlier years it didn’t happen and I think that was really very sad.
P 2014

With the SWR Act and the Association both committed to enhancing the professionalism of social workers, one might assume that for social workers carrying the testimony of both statutory registration and Association membership this would occur. There was a sense this has happened, some would say a lot, in terms of respect from other professionals.

I think it’s seen to come of age in that the extent of the validation that comes through ... people looking at the certificate on the wall ... [it] provides an immediate confidence and so I think there’s a much greater confidence
L 2014

On the other hand there was contrary opinion of the perceptions held by others of social workers as professionals.

There’s still that ... probably because of the range of tasks social workers do ... they’re still seen a bit as dog’s bodies. They’ll clean up after everyone else whereas psychologists and psychiatrists they can say “well this is my field and I’m an expert in this field”.
N 2014

People don’t see social workers as being professionals and I think that’s pretty much across the board.
G 2014

There was some consensus about the respective role of each element (statutory registration and Association membership) in constructing the notion of professionalism and how that occurs. It was also made clear that the assertion of professional identity should be through the Association, although one’s credibility as a social worker was undoubtedly enhanced by registration.

The bottom line is the Association’s values and principles are about protecting the profession. And the Registration Board isn’t ... it’s about protecting the public.
L 2014

The Association provides is a really strong identity for social work outside of government. We shouldn’t rely on the Board for our identity as a profession.
M 2014
There were doubters too, despite the credentials of the Association as a voluntary organisation that was membership driven and free of government influence.

_The organisation that’s got the authority to call the shots to me is ANZASW informed by the IFSW. But I have a feeling actually that it’s no good calling if no one’s listening. And I think that the organisation that people are listening to is likely to be the SWRB because that takes the money. That’s how I see it._

_K 2014_

_My sense at the moment is that probably the Board is driving the profession, establishing a process for you to establish that you are competent and therefore, de facto, establishing what constitutes minimal standards to practice and in establishing and then monitoring what happens in education programmes._

_Q 2014_

Evidence of a **bicultural commitment** is expected to underpin social work practice in ANZ. This is evidenced in the policies and objectives of statutory and non-government social services and has been a cornerstone of the Association’s ethical code and practice standards since the 1990s.

_Prior to registration ... even in that space around registration ... ANZASW was in a pretty powerful position ... a unified, bicultural, mainstream position._

_H 2014_

That this commitment would be carried through into the SWR Act 2003 and its implementation was, therefore, a matter of interest and comment.

_There was this huge debate about where bicultural commitment and requirement fitted in to the Act. And I think ultimately that came out OK._

_L 2014_

_The way that it requires ability to work with Māori and with other cultures is better than the Association’s one, I think._

_H 2014_

_The Registration Board ... it’s been struggling, you know, with trying to work out what they could do in that space. They needed a credible Māori body to take this work on._

_H 2014_
A new set of statutory professional tools were required and created under the SWR Act 2003. These included a Code of Conduct, practice standards as the basis for competency assessment under the Act, requisite educational qualifications and requirements for continuing professional development. These were independent of and separate to the requirements of Association membership – not that the Association’s professional tools were not used to inform those developed by the SWRB.

In my reading of the Association’s Code of Ethics and the Board’s ethical expectations, the Board’s is a much narrower frame in the sense that the Association’s picks up the broader responsibility which the Board doesn't have. It’s a reflection of the nature of a Crown Entity. It’s not going to be able to engage in activity which is seen to be not only critical of its Minister but more fundamentally critical of those broad social and economic structures.

Q 2014

Views on the development of the competency assessment for statutory registration reflected the different experiences and perspectives on how this unfolded.

They (the Board) simply put up their own process but without any acknowledgement of ours and they’ve never, I don’t think, acknowledged the founding stone of their processes and so on and which I deeply regret.

C 2014

Insofar as developing competencies to work with Māori, the Association, through its Tangata Whenua caucus, had established the Niho Taniwha process specifically for Māori members. This was not carried into the SWRB’s model for competency assessment and remained a point of contention.

The niho taniwha process should have been there in the first place really and not just for Tangata Whenua. That’s why I think we had some really good taonga and we had some good history inside ANZASW.

H 2014

On the other hand, from the perspective of one respondent who had been a Board member:

The Board was obliged to come up with a system of registration that took into account people’s competence. All the things the Association probably wanted,
which was an embedding of competencies in the legislation ... for example embedding the competency to work with Māori and the competency to work with other cultural groups. That had been the Association’s territory.

M 2014

But with the Association maintaining a competency assessment process modified to meet the requirements for statutory registration, members of the Association experienced the changes less positively.

Unless practitioners and users develop a framework of competence and its meaning then we will find competence decided by political and managerial forces and narrowly defined in a micro sense.

Q 2014

It’s not quite working for me. I just feel that competency ... we’re letting it go ... the whole concept of competency go. We’re coming down to the lowest common denominator and it’s really hard to find an avenue to do something about that.

R 2014

The SWRB sets the benchmark for the educational qualification required for statutory registration and the evidence required of continuing professional development. The Association has maintained a role in respect of the latter.

One of the things that the Association has developed is a series of tools around CPD and that was a pretty obvious route to go down in the current environment.

Q 2014

Membership of the Association is not, in itself, recognised as evidence of professional development, although there was the view that this should be the case. In respect of setting the level of qualification and the accreditation of education and training courses, the previous role held by the Association has been superseded by the SWRB.

The Association traditionally, historically had a really key role in the development of social work education in all sorts of ways. Now it is the Board that determines what is done, it sanctions the course and so the Association has no role in shaping the nature of practice as reflected in what happens for new practitioners and new graduates ... none at all.

Q 2014

In conclusion, the respondents were invited to add any further comment regarding the implications of the introduction of statutory registration. These ranged over how
statutory registration was experienced in specific work settings, such as in CYFS and Health, and where statutory registration leaves the social justice agenda of social work and the future for the profession.

The confusion with Child Youth and Family staff between the Association and the SWRB. I think there’s still some who are confused about it.
K 2014

I had observed the dynamics of how professions had their hierarchies. I just really felt strongly that registration was something that really put social work on the map, on the same footing as the other allied health professionals.
F 2014

One of the central pieces of a post registration Association was that it would be seen to be the body that would speak not just on behalf of social workers but on behalf of the social and economic environment in which they worked. That’s the piece that I think has got lost.
Q 2014

In respect of the Association’s future, there is a desire for the Association to become much more of a public voice in respect of social and political issues –

Getting out of competence and disciplinary process and focusing around the wider political social issues and getting much more into public comment. We need to be advocating about well-being and safety and public policy, etc. To be much more strident about housing, refugees … child protection is another.
L 2014

– and in respect of professional support for members.

I think at the moment the Association’s doing good stuff … the support for CPD, the development of the webinars and I think there’s a lot of potential for the Association to use social media a lot more.

Bring back the conferences … the Journal is really important

Find a way back in the back having an influence on social work education.
M 2014

However, posed against this was a rather more sobering view.

ANZASW is in survival mode virtually.
H 2014
Concluding comment

The data gathered was analysed to identify the themes of the responses to questions put to the respondents regarding the consequences of the introduction of statutory registration and the impact on the Association. Appendix 21: Figure 5.5 (The 2014 Interviews – summary of data analysis) provides a summary of the interview responses to the codes set using an iterative process as the qualitative analysis of the interviews was completed. Furthermore, the summary accounts for the number of respondents (as sources) who responded to each theme including the total number of references coded to each respondent. This provides a sense of the weighting of responses and the level of engagement with each theme. Appendix 22: Figure 5.6 (Statutory Registration - the new kid on the block. Plotting the data: Association Members 2014) outlines the themes plotted from the data that account for the respondents’ responses to the introduction of statutory registration and also their views on its implications. The themes embedded in the responses will be used to inform the discussion that follows in Chapter 6, Part Three.
Part Three

The 2014 Interviews with the Minister and the Project Manager

Part Three provides the results of the interviews conducted in 2014 with the Minister of Social Services and Employment (the Minister) and the Project Manager of the Social Workers Registration Project (the Project Manager), two key figures involved in the introduction of the legislation that provided for the statutory registration of social workers. The Minister had sponsored and led the legislation through the parliamentary process. The Project Manager oversaw the writing of a discussion document used to consult with the social services community and the profession preparatory to the Government’s decision to proceed with statutory registration. Both the Minister and the Project Manager were closely involved as the legislation was shaped, written and enacted and were invited to contribute their respective reflections on the process and outcome. A coding template was formed around the themes of the questions prepared for each interview. Although the prepared questions for each interview differed, a common coding template was nonetheless developed and applied (see Figure 5.7 below)

Themes

- Reasons for the Act
- The political context
- The design
- The administrative process
- The Association
- Stakeholders
- Te Tiriti (The Treaty of Waitangi)
- Education and training
- Outcomes

Figure 5.7: The Coding Template for the 2014 interviews - the Minister & the Project Manager
The qualitative analysis of the 2014 interviews with the Minister and Project Manager – the results

Responses to the semi-structured interview questions

Using the themes identified in the coding template as a framework, an analysis was made of the interviews. An iterative process was applied as the qualitative analysis of the interviews was completed to allow for any sub-themes to be identified. As noted, the two respondents had significant roles in the introduction of statutory registration. The interviews were tailored to the different perspectives they each held.

In reflecting on the context when the legislation was first considered, the Minister described that the timing was not at all conducive because the proposal, as a regulatory measure, ran counter to prevailing views.

*It was a real shift in direction. “What on earth are we doing?” ... trying to recreate professions when everyone’s been destroying them for the last while.*

*Many people, particularly outside the profession, but certainly in the non-government sector were kind of you know “what on earth is this for?”*

The Project Manager confirmed this view.

*The Labour government at that time was fairly anti-regulation ... they wanted to reduce the amount of regulation.*

The Project Manager recalled how the proposal for statutory registration had been included in the 1999 Labour Party manifesto, where it had pledged to establish a system of professional registration for social workers.

*Minister Maharey was personally pretty committed to that and so pushed it along.*

As the proposal unfolded under the Minister’s direction, the Project Manager was aware there were people within the government sector who believed there should be less regulation. At the same time, a new regulatory environment for occupations had been heralded by the Ministry of Commerce detailing what needed to be taken into account for regulation to be considered. Then there was the backdrop – the advocacy...
of the social work profession and the option of the inclusion of social workers under the impending legislation that covered the regulation of the health professions, the Health Professions Competency Assurance Bill. The Project Manager recalled:

*Some parts of the profession ... were loud in its advocacy for registration for the professionalisation of social work.*

*Officials were not that keen on having a separate piece of legislation for social workers.*

**The underlying reasons** given by the Minister for the Act were threefold. These included, in his view, the demoralised and dispirited state of the social work profession due to large caseloads while also coming under attack for their practice. In addition, the Minister was concerned with the growth in numbers of untrained and therefore, as he saw it, unprofessional social workers. Alongside this, he saw the need to foster the reprofessionalisation of social workers with statutory registration as a vehicle for this by providing a lift in status for the profession and he recounted:

*Social workers in the public sector had a pretty rough ride from the ‘80s onwards in the sense that they were constantly attacked, badly organised and felt very bad about the profession that they were in.*

A catalyst that served to bring this to head for the Minister was Judge Mick Brown’s report.

*Judge Mick Brown’s report did a very good job and highlighted a lot of the things, I guess, we are talking about here. So yes it gave us a pretty solid base to be saying, along with other things, arising from his report to say that there’s something wrong here and we should be moving towards a more registered professional environment.*

Viewing registration as an essential element to being regarded a professional, the Minister considered it as part of the professional’s ethic to take individual responsibility for the costs for both registration and membership of one’s professional body. Putting these costs onto one’s employer, for example, undermined this ethic in his view. The Minister’s perception that the latter was happening had a bearing on his determination that, collectively, social workers did not yet constitute a sufficiently professionalised body to take on the added responsibility for statutory registration.
I think it really undermines the whole professional ethic if you’re saying “well I’ll register but my organisation will just pay for it en block”.

Clearly, forming a **professional identity** was a key marker for being recognised as a profession and it was the Minister’s view this was not yet the case for social workers.

They don’t actually have all the bits and pieces and place to be a profession. ... that’s certainly true of social workers. They’re still migrating towards that. And may not ever get there because they do include a large workforce of people ... that think of themselves as involved in this but aren’t really ... they’re not professionally involved.

In drawing this conclusion, the Minister compared the place of social workers with that of other professionals such as lawyers, doctors, engineers and psychologists, noting that social workers were not able to draw the same professional boundary around themselves.

They may end up somewhere in the middle ground where they’ve got a professional body but it’s not quite like the law society and so on.

In respect of **Te Tiriti** (The Treaty of Waitangi) not being written into the Act, the Minister explained the Government line at that time.

Principles of the Treaty were entrenched in broad blocks of legislation and constantly repeating them through other bits of legislation was unnecessary. That was probably what would have informed that debate ... “do you have to have this in here when it’s in general legislation anyway?”

The Minister’s view that social workers had not yet earned full professional status coloured his view regarding where the accreditation of **qualifications and training** should lie. It was not with the Association.

If you’re going to have a profession you need to have some sense of what are they learning to become an effective social worker and that’s the dialogue that goes on between the registration process and the people who are providing education.

In respect of the level of qualification the Project Manager commented:
The Minister was always keen on a University level qualification and that was something that we just had to take into account.

It set quite a high standard, I had thought at the time. I had been aware of when I was a social worker ... I worked with people who were older, there were some Māori people that I worked with who were just amazing social workers and they were fantastic and they had no qualifications and I don’t think they would have met the bar the Board set.

Whether registration would be mandatory or not when implemented was decided on the wider scope of social work practice, the workforce issues it would create and costs. It was a question left for a subsequent review. As the Project Manager recalled:

It became clear that would be too much like a sledgehammer for the profession I think because it’s so broad in scope and practice.

Then the question became should it be mandatory only for Child Youth and Family statutory social workers. In the end that wasn’t taken up or forward either because of the costs involved and workforce issues.

Within Child Youth and Family, the Project Manager noted pockets of resistance in respect of the notion of statutory registration. Again, this reflected the costs of training and qualifying the comparatively high numbers of unqualified social workers.

There were people, groups within the Department of Child Youth and Family who were not at all happy about registration and there was a sense of them “dragging the chain a little bit”, being resistant to it and trying to put barriers in the way.

By comparison, social workers employed in the health sector worked in a sector where a professional identity was commonplace.

The health sector were pretty much on board with it because they were working alongside nurses and doctors and people like that they felt professionalisation was really important for them. It was easier and more accepted and would give them more credibility with their peers and colleagues and the people they were working with.

The Project Manager advised that the involvement of the Association in the drafting
of the legislation was at the direction of the Minister. This was considered unusual but reflected the work the Association had done in respect of competency. However, the Minister was clear that it would not follow that the Association would be given any responsibility for registration. He recalled:

_There was never any pressure of any great sort from them to be in the legislation._

_They were important but not all-inclusive so there was never really any real pressure to say “but we represent everybody so we should be there”. There was a discussion about it but at no time did they say, “we want to be mapped into this legislation”. I think they were comfortable to remain as a professional association._

Nonetheless there was acknowledgement by the Project Manager of the impact of a statutory environment on the Association and social work.

_There was certainly the potential for that (the activism aspects of social work … social justice and social change) to get crushed by this professionalisation._

_I think the Association was struggling a little bit then with its role … it didn’t know what was going to happen._

The **work programme conducted by Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP)** was outlined by the Project Manager. This included: conducting a literature review and evaluation of other jurisdictions; reviewing the case for occupational regulation against the criteria set by the Ministry of Commerce; preparing a discussion paper; receiving submissions; and servicing the Minister and Cabinet preparatory to the Bill being drafted by Parliamentary Counsel and tabled in Parliament.

_I think it was a good process … interesting in terms of the Minister driving it and something he was really keen on. His motives were fairly clear. It was a really collaborative process I thought. I think that we always, and the Minister always had this 10 - 20 year plan. It was something he wanted to have happen._

As to **outcomes** articulated by the Minister:

_I think that they are still confronted with many of the same problems. Registration doesn’t cure the problems of the social work profession. Hopefully it contributes to a group of people feeling more professional and control standards of accountability and many of the issues which, of course, cause them grief._
A casual observer would say the social work profession seems to be a little bit better placed than it was, say, in the 1980s and 90s.

Concluding comment

The data gathered was analysed to identify the themes of the responses to questions put to the respondents regarding their reflections on the form and process of statutory registration introduced, its consequences and the impact on the Association. Appendix 23: Figure 5.8 (The Minister & the Project Manager – summary of data analysis) summarises the interview responses coded against the broad themes of the coding template developed from the content analysis of the paper. Through the iterative process that was applied as the qualitative analysis of the interviews was completed, second and third tiers of sub-themes were identified. Furthermore, the summary accounts for the number of respondents (as sources) who responded to each theme including the total number of references coded to each respondent. This provides a comparative weighting of the themes in terms of the level of engagement with each and reflects the fact, as noted, that the agenda set for the interview with each of the two respondents was tailored to their particular role. Appendix 24: Figure 5.9 (Statutory registration – the new kid on the block Plotting the data: Minister & the Project Manager 2014) outlines the themes plotted from the data that account for the respondents’ responses to how the Act came about, from its genesis to fruition and reflections on the outcome. The themes embedded in the responses will be used to inform the discussion that follows in Chapter 6.
Chapter Six - Discussion

Introduction

The aim of the research is to address the questions that are the crux of the thesis: To what extent have the aspirations for the statutory registration of social work been realised? In what ways has the introduction of statutory registration changed the face of social work professionalism in Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ)? The questions are addressed through the analyses of the aspirations held by a sample of members of the Association in respect of the prospect for statutory registration and their reflections following its introduction. The questions are also examined from a theoretical perspective in order to offer a broader interpretation of what has transpired. This provides a basis for discussing how statutory registration came to be introduced and the implications when a new statutory authority establishes and places new obligations and responsibilities on the profession. The discussion references the theoretical framework established and the theoretical stances outlined within it (See Figure 3.2.1, p. 51). These are now considered in respect of the results of the analyses of interviews conducted in 1996 and 2014. The interviews generated three sets of data that were subsequently coded to provide a summary of the predominant themes extracted (see Appendix 25: Figure 6.1 Summary of the Predominant Themes drawn from the Interviews) In this chapter, the themes are used as the basis for applying a theoretical understanding to the data (Bryman, 2012). A framework based on the different stages of the research process is used to identify and align the connections between data and theory (see Appendix 26: Figure 6.2 Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework). Part One draws on the themes identified in the analyses of interviews conducted with the respondents in 1996. In addition, the reflections of the Minister of Social Services and Employment (the Minister) and the Project Manager of the Registration of Social Workers Project (the Project Manager), who were interviewed in 2014 about the process, are brought into the discussion too. Together, these serve to inform the discussion about the different agendas ‘placed on the table’ in the 1990s prior to statutory registration being introduced. As described in Chapter Two, the Association, with its self-regulatory process already in place, had by then become an advocate for statutory registration. Also joining the mix with a stake in the same outcome were the Children and Young Persons Service (CYPS), as a service of a government department with its workforce professionalisation imperative, and the
New Zealand Labour Party (NZLP), with its new policy objective to introduce statutory registration for social workers. Using a Bourdieusian framework, the different attributes of the key stakeholders are described and their respective agendas explained through the application of an institutional logics perspective. Neo-liberalism and new managerialist policies are put forward as underpinning the government’s actions and serve to illustrate how social work can be considered as a public profession and thereby shown to fit within the Foucauldian web of governmentality. 

**Part Two** discusses the purpose of occupational regulation, to protect the public from practice incompetence, and the professional and statutory sources of authority that may be applied to provide such protection. The professional self-regulation provided by the Association provides a form of protection, albeit not through statute. Statutory registration provided under the aegis of government legislation is another. Central to determining whether statutory registration should be introduced was the assessment of the risk posed by social work to its client base. The close relationship that professionals may forge with clients and the margin of autonomy and discretion that may go with it is also discussed. This discussion provides a basis for examining the different forms and processes of occupational regulation that apply to professions in ANZ and to the social work profession in other national jurisdictions. This, in turn, provides a basis for noting significant differences between them and considering how the Social Workers Registration Act, 2003 (the SWR Act) compares to legislation for social workers elsewhere and other professions in ANZ. In particular to consider the role the professional body may have in statutory registration and the credit professional membership is given in meeting the requirements for statutory registration. The intention is to provide some insight into the government’s agenda for the statutory registration of social workers, particularly its regard for the Association having the capacity and integrity to play a part. **Part Three** discusses the impact and consequences of a new kid on the block as articulated in the findings. This discussion is central to addressing the questions posed by the thesis in the light of the theoretical approaches adopted. Three different levels of analysis of the findings provide a basis for considering the consequences and impact on the Association and its members at a macro or socio-political level, at a meso or institutional level and at a micro or personal level.
Part One

Setting the scene – the kids on the block

By 2000, the Association, as the voluntary professional body, the Child, Youth and Family Service (CYFS) as a government Department, and ultimately the state, as the vehicle for the Minister’s sponsorship of legislation, had all emerged with separate and vested interests in statutory registration being introduced. The Association, with its self-regulatory system in place, had become a strong advocate for statutory registration. The separate agendas ‘placed on the table’ will now be discussed, drawing on the findings presented in Chapter Five, which are considered in light of the theoretical framework and within the context of the policies of neo-liberalism and new managerialism and the process of professionalisation. These provide distinct professional, institutional and political perspectives to be considered in the discussion. The following summary (Figure 6.1.1) provides a guide to the ensuing discussion, drawing on the analysis of the interviews with members of the Association in 1996 coupled with the respective reflections of the context at that time by the Minister and the Project Manager. These analyses will be used to illustrate the selected theoretical stances and social, political and legal processes that arose in the course of statutory registration being considered and introduced.

Sources of vested interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The profession</th>
<th>Genesis of the Association</th>
<th>The Association Members 1996</th>
<th>Bourdieu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foucault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ‘stateholders’</th>
<th>Political context</th>
<th>The Minister</th>
<th>Neo liberalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>Professional identity</td>
<td>The Project Manager</td>
<td>New managerialism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Government CYFS | |

Figure 6.1.1: Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework

Setting the scene - the kids on the block

---

4 The Department of Child, Youth and Family Service (CYFS) was established in 1999 from the former Children and Young Persons Services (CYPS). In 2006 CYFS merged with and became a business unit of the Ministry of Social Development (MSD). In 2017 CYFS was replaced by a new Ministry for Vulnerable Children Oranga Tamariki (MVCOT).
To begin, a framework (see Appendix 27: Figure 6.1.2 The kids on the block revisited (after Bourdieu)) has been applied to lay out the particular attributes for each of the Bourdieusian concepts – field, capital, doxa and habitus – as they apply to those sources that are deemed to have a vested interest in the social work profession. This framework was introduced in Chapter Three (see Figure 3.2.2, Appendix 5). Figure 6.1.2 expands on Figure 3.2.2 and includes the SWRB being the new kid and with a new interest in the block. The figure identifies the predominant descriptors: Field [1]; Capital [2]; Doxa [3] and distinguishing features of each site [A] in relation to the block, that is, the social work profession, as the Habitus [4]. A second framework, (see Figure 6.1.3 below) builds on the system types developed from an institutional logics perspective (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012), introduced in Chapter Three (see Figure 3.2.4. see Appendix 7). This had provided a comparative model identifying the distinct institutional differences between the Association as a profession and the state. Figure 6.1.3 (see below) serves to contextualise and explain what lies behind the agendas that each system type held for statutory registration and introduces the SWRB as an example of institutional hybridity (Skelcher & Smith, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>State Government</th>
<th>Profession The Association</th>
<th>Community NGOs</th>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Hybrid SWRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>CYFS</td>
<td>The Association</td>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root metaphor</td>
<td>Redistributive mechanism</td>
<td>Relational network</td>
<td>Common boundary</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>CrownEntity QUANGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Unity of will</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Market Expertise Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Bureaucratic domination</td>
<td>Professional association</td>
<td>Commitment to community values ideology</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Body corporate Board Bureaucratic domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Social &amp; economic class</td>
<td>Association with quality craft</td>
<td>Emotional connection</td>
<td>Bureaucratic roles</td>
<td>Bureaucratic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Group membership</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Appointment (Board) Employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Figures (6.1.2 and 6.1.3) will be used as points of reference for the discussion. The focus first turns to the Association as the professional body and a driver of professionalisation, drawing on relevant theoretical insights and the perspectives offered by the respondents.

**The Association as a professional body**

**The professional association**

Matarazzo (1977) writes of the typical history of professions and how a loose guild of practitioners haphazardly enter a profession, become organised, form an identity and code of ethics, set membership entry requirements and, through the development of formal educational qualifications and standards, move toward certification and licensure, ultimately through governmental machinery (1977, pp. 856-857). The beginning of that journey is reminiscent of the Association’s first thirty years to 1994. As shown in Chapter Two (An Association Formed, p. 17), the Association followed a similar chronology of events to eventually introduce competency assessment and the certification of members’ practice, establish a formal complaints system and have a role in the accreditation of tertiary courses offering social work qualifications. All that was then required was the machinery of government, through statutory registration, to provide the means for formally attesting practice competence and thereby assuring the public in respect of social work practice. The professional association therefore embodies multiple functions in respect of achieving a professional status. One consequence is that the professional association becomes a qualifying association that...
qualifies its members for practice in a particular occupation (Millerson, 1964). The Association fell short of achieving this attribute and social work, as an occupation in ANZ, only partially meets the attributes of a profession such as those identified by Greenwood (1957). Arguably, the Association demonstrates an ethical code and upholds a professional culture but its authority is not totally derived from community sanction, qualification or professional authority. In Foucauldian terms, one could liken its place to providing a collective pastoralism form of government over the profession, although ultimately dependent upon achieving political authority through the rather more rational art of government (Foucault, 1981, as cited in Deacon, 2002).

As a professional body, therefore, the Association provided, at least in the interim, disciplinary mechanisms as an instrument of governance over social work as, in Foucauldian parlance, one of the disciplines (Foucault, 1986, as cited in Deacon, 2002). The Association’s history, as has been recounted, witnessed an ongoing debate about professionalisation and registration, which were viewed, on the one hand, as the antithesis to the mission of social work, on the other, the saviour of its identity and reputation. Bitensky (1973) characterised social work as being chameleon-like, reflecting the contradictory trends in its history as it tried to build its professional image while also promoting its role as the conscience and activist for social justice. ‘Sometimes social work has seemed to be the conscience of society. During other periods it seems to have been an apologist for the status quo, devoting its efforts to adjusting clients to the existing social institutions’ (1973, p.119). While an ANZ commentator made a more acerbic observation ‘The social work profession’s unwillingness to accept risks and responsibilities and its desperate desire to become professionally respectable’ (Older, 1975, p. 31). The cohort of foundation respondents interviewed in 1996 recalled these early contentions in the Association and both these perspectives on the profession’s character are confirmed by what the respondents had to say. The first was the relentless striving towards professional identity and recognition and the second, the equivalent effort and commitment arguing against the concept of professionalisation, in particular what professionalisation stands for and how this undermines a core mission of social work – social justice. The formation of the professional association became the catalyst and place for these views to be asserted and resolved. From the very outset, the leadership of the Association was significant in cultivating this discussion, particularly in emphasising the specific
national context and character of ANZ in relation to social work practice and its identification as a profession.

The egalitarian component in the New Zealand national character, allied to our well-known capacity to improvise, is doing us a disservice. When will we rise up and say: 'These things are wrong with our profession; we will put them right - and nothing will stop us doing it'. (Wadsworth, 1969, p. 53)

In 1969, the Association published an article regarding the role and place of the professional association, in particular, what is involved when members of an occupational group form a body to assert a professional status (Collis, 1967). Collis’s focus on the professional association as part of the process of professionalisation, and not a static entity, as an end in itself, helps to locate the association body in relation to its responsibilities and obligations to practising social workers as its main constituents, to clients and to the state (Collis, 1969). As such, the professional association serves to enhance the professional responsibilities of a social worker as well as providing the means for a collective professional view to be brokered and mediated. In respect of its relationship with the state, the Association quickly asserted its presence through advocacy and the government’s recognition of it as a legitimate and informed professional body. This foundation, and claim of professional representation, was to be a significant factor in the Association’s voice being heard when the prospect of statutory registration became closer to reality.

A Bourdieusian view of the Association
In discussing their aspirations for statutory registration, the respondents were inclined to reflect on the history of the Association’s debates on the topic. Debates had ensued regarding the professionalisation of social work and the criteria for membership of the Association became the vehicle for arguing that issue. The respondents’ aspirations were therefore very much seated in their memory of these times. Of course, these recollections and the attendant voicing of aspirations occurred several years before there was any real prospect for statutory registration, given that the latter would ultimately be at the behest of the government. In addition, the aspirations clearly illustrate the Association’s accumulation of a set of relations (field), tokens of power (capital) and common belief (doxa) in respect of forming that sense of place (habitus) that is the social work profession. (see Appendix 27: Figure 6.1.2 The kids on the
block revisited (after Bourdieu). The profession’s field evolved through the collectivisation of those who identified as working in welfare and social care roles and, as this became formalised with forums and national conferences:

*There was an emerging sense of identity about that time. It had only an early emerging recognition that social workers might be professionals.*

*D 1996*

This resulted in the inaugural conference of the Association, where steps were taken to establish and claim its first tokens of power as a professional association – a membership base and code of ethics. The latter would also serve as the Association’s first expression of common belief as its cornerstone statement and mark of identity. As the respondents recounted, the Association also moved quickly to gain political recognition as the voice for the profession, advocating strongly for enhanced training opportunities and making submissions in respect of welfare reform. The Association also gained international affiliations to widen its set of relations and anchor its creation of a habitus for the social work profession in ANZ. The real test to claiming field, capital, doxa and habitus, was for the Association to reflect a true partnership with Māori given that the central dimension of the national character of ANZ is Te Tiriti (The Treaty of Waitangi). Securing a bicultural identity for the Association, and what this meant in respect of systems of public accountability and the identification of practice standards, faced a strong challenge as articulated by Rangihau (1983, 1987). Nonetheless in 1989, even in the face of such criticism, a twin partnership of the Tangata Whenua and Manuhiri caucuses was formed under the single umbrella of the Association (Fraser & Briggs, 2016) and this served the Association well in the years that followed.

*Prior to registration ... even in that space around registration ... the ANZASW was in a pretty powerful position ... a unified, bicultural, mainstream position.*

*H 2014*

One can reasonably conclude at this time that the Association was now in a position to make a strong claim, in Bourdieusian terms, to be able to assert its power, common belief and relational strength in respect of the habitus that was the social work profession in ANZ.
The Association as an institutional system involved in change

In a similar vein, as a professional body, the Association became the embodiment for each of the categories of the institutional system type ‘profession’, including its identity, expertise, authority and legitimacy (see Figure 6.1.3, p. 116 -117). In respect of innovation and institutional change, professional associations are also deemed important in providing a venue for social interactions around matters for which members feel entitled to claim some authority, at the same time providing the process to reconcile competing interests or reach consensus (Greenwood, Suddaby & Hinings, 2002). As illustrated by the findings in Chapter Five, such interactions may occur internally within the usual membership forums as committees, working parties and conferences. They also occur externally through representation to other organisations and groups, this serving to also promote and project the association’s identity, role and exclusivity. A professional association may also provide a monitoring function during times of institutional change. (Greenwood, Suddaby & Hinings, 2002). The course followed by the Association and recounted by the respondents illustrates its accumulation and claim of expertise, authority and legitimacy and the expression of these through its developing identity, representation and advocacy.

The professional association as the vehicle for professionalisation

The establishment of a professional association is deemed an inherent part of the process of professionalisation. This section sets a theoretical context for the professionalisation agenda embarked upon with the formation of the Association in 1964. It seems appropriate to examine professionalisation in the light of the classical theories that were contemporaneous with the time the Association was formed. Ritzer (1975) brought together the ‘widely scattered’ threads of Weber’s (1968) thinking on the subject of a profession. The examination of contemporary writings on professions shows that, despite Ritzer’s contrary view as expressed in 1975, Weber’s analysis continues to remain relevant in the continuing debate today. This is despite professions today being more aligned to the sociology of occupations whereas Weber spoke of professions in relation to bureaucracies and rationalisation. Perhaps Ritzer’s effort and his objective for his paper have served to keep Weber alive in this respect. As Weber (1968) is quoted, ‘a profession is an important part of Western rationality’ (Ritzer, 1975, p. 628), and the ‘disciplining and methodological organisation of conduct’, (1975, p. 268) as he describes it, is echoed today in a multitude of professionalisation structures and regulatory processes, such as professional
associations and registration boards. Such structures and processes are also seen as providing a context for the shakedown and redistribution of power. This theorisation seems particularly pertinent when examining occupational regulation that is directly keyed into the machinery of government within a western democracy. Statutory registration may be a vehicle for professionalisation given the public endorsement it accords, but it may also be viewed also, in Weber’s (1968) terms, as the ‘disciplining and methodological organisation of conduct’ (Ritzer, 1975, p. 628) for social workers. This raises the question of whether it is the government’s aspirations for statutory registration or the Association’s aspirations that prevail. The respondents’ honouring of the Association’s role in bringing the profession to a position to lobby for statutory registration was a clear outcome of the first round of interviews, notwithstanding differences on how this might happen. This legitimation of the Association confirms its recognition by social workers as a professional authority on behalf of social workers. The Association had clearly formed its own aspirations for statutory registration and how this might be shaped to assure the continuing professionalisation of social workers. The other agendas for statutory registration emerged from the professionalisation strategy of the Children and Young Persons Service (CYPS) and what became the concomitant policy of the 1999 Labour government. These ultimately resulted in the state vesting its authority in statutory registration and thereby introducing a different and contrasting set of aspirations.

**Professionalisation**

**Social work as a public profession**

Given that state institutions are the predominant practice setting for social work in ANZ, the consideration of social work as a ‘public service profession’ or ‘public profession’ is warranted. The particular implications of working to the additional layer of public control implied in being a ‘public service professional’ are pertinent as this is the context into which the CYPS introduced its professionalisation strategy, which provided the impetus for seeking statutory registration. The history of the development of social work in ANZ as related in Chapter Two describes how the first social policy legislation led to the establishment of charitable and voluntary organisations and the emergence of public services such as hospitals, asylums, orphanages, refuges and industrial schools. Early legislation also set the terms for the administration of government relief funding and its oversight by relieving officers.
Arising from this, of course, were the roles that gradually and variously came together to form the nexus of social work in ANZ, with the public service influence becoming consolidated with the establishment of specific public social service Ministries, Departments and Divisions such as Social Security, Probation, Health and Child Welfare. Given that the public service ethic binds employees to fulfil their lawful obligations to government, it becomes clear that this may run against the professional code of ethics to which the social worker may also subscribe. Working to their professional ethics, social workers in the public service seek to maximise the services and resources available for their clients while, simultaneously, advocating for their clients and seeking to ameliorate the effects that state intervention may have on them. ‘They constantly seek to invent new ways of practicing their profession in collaboration with their clients and other social and political actors and agents’ (Gray et al., 2015, p. 387). Inasmuch as credentialing, through statutory registration, may be seen to enhance the social worker’s authority in respect of working with clients and their professional standing alongside other professions, it may also serve to assert the accountability of the public service professional to their organisation and managers. ‘Therefore legal and bureaucratic guidelines or organisational superiors define the formal professional-client relationship’ (Anleu, 1992, p. 40).

The professionalisation strategy of CYPS

In response to the Mason Report (Mason, 1992), which had reviewed the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989, CYPS introduced a professionalisation strategy (CYPS, 1996). The Mason Report had noted that the level of professionally trained social workers in the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) was at a dangerously low level and recommended that the deficit be addressed immediately so that all departmental social workers had professional social work qualifications and complete a competency assessment within three years. The expectation was that the quality and effectiveness of CYPS’s social workers would be enhanced and the occupational group would thereby become professionalised. Given the managerialist agenda of the time, it is perhaps unsurprising that an independent evaluation of the professionalisation strategy was conducted in 1995 to analyse the return on investment of the strategy (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995)\(^5\). In addition to this analysis the report also

\(^5\) The cost of this two-pronged professionalisation strategy was $19 million (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995, p. 36) and the evaluation arguably shows a low return on investment.
commented on the professional status of social workers in ANZ and how this differed to the status enjoyed by other groups. This was attributed to there being:

* no independent, statutory body which is universally recognised as bestowing professional status;
* no formal academic, practical or other criteria which must be satisfied by aspiring practitioners;
* no statutory limitations on the right to practice as, or describe oneself as, a social worker. (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995, p. 1).

The report goes on to acknowledge the joint competency assessment process developed by CYPS and the Association allowing staff to have their competency assessment credited for both Association membership and the CYPS competency programme (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995, p. 26). It concludes by urging stronger ties between CYPS and the Association including ex officio CYPS representation on the Association’s management committee and the joint exploration of the possibility of establishing an independent registration/accreditation body for social workers (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995, p. 52). As a consequence, the professionalisation strategy was revised and updated along the lines recommended including extensive research into the implications of registration of the social work profession to be undertaken by the Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP) (CYPS, 1996).

**Professionalisation within the public sector**

The strategy fits one of the scenarios for professionalisation within the public sector described by Noordegraaf (2007). A professionalisation strategy such as described is seen to structure and regulate occupational practices as a means of managerial control through quality control, measurement and monitoring. Given that the CYPS’s strategy arose as a consequence of a previous critical review, it was undoubtedly stimulated by ‘neo-liberal management control’ or ‘cost- and client-based managerialism’ (2007, p. 762) seeking value-for money. Noordegraaf’s observation that ‘new professionals are not created automatically and they do not automatically perform better’ (2007, p. 762) raises the question of the wisdom of adopting such a strategy, devoid of any involvement of the professional body in its determination. The strategy can also be perceived as illustrating a form of occupational professionalisation (2007, p. 763) aimed at having social workers within CYPS meet the adjudged organisational and
bureaucratic evidence-based and outcome-oriented realities and requirements (2007, p. 763). In this situation, of course, the control, definition and accountability are to the government department, not a professional body such as the Association. All this reflects the little autonomy that professionals working in the public arena hold (Howe, 1980). Howe also reiterates the particular nature of social work as a profession seated within the public domain and a professional life with a dual accountability to the client and the public service of which they are part. Just as Anleu (1992) also observed, a consequence is reduced independence as a professional, less autonomy and subject to public control within a bureaucratic setting that entails supervisory and management oversight. Others describe this greater propensity for state control over the role and tasks of social workers and the implication this may hold for their obligations as professionals as part of a deprofessionalisation thesis (Clark, 2005). This sees professionals experiencing reduced autonomy and discretion having to sacrifice their view of the client’s best interests. Work tends to be undertaken by functionaries as a consequence of a welfare policy that includes shifts to control public expenditure and to shift responsibility to non-government organisations and from formal services to the individual/family (2005). The professionalisation strategy is also clearly related to the public sector reform occurring at that time which was prompted by New Right arguments about inefficiency and lack of accountability and changes to the managerial control of professional work (Uttley, 1994). This led to professional work being redefined and fragmented into measurable performance-based or output-focused units to achieve broader social policy outcomes (Duncan & Worrall, 2000, as cited in Brown, 2000). The context for CYPS’s professionalisation strategy was quite removed from that which one might consider as a setting for professionalism to be exercised in its ‘pure’ or ‘classic’ form (Noordegraaf, 2007). Only a minority of CYPS’s social workers were members of the Association and able to claim the protection that a professional association might offer, let alone be subject to the Association’s processes, standards, supervision and code of ethics that encapsulate the content and control elements normally associated with the ‘pure’ or ‘classic’ model of professionalism. One might surmise, therefore, that CYPS’s social workers held few of the autonomies around decisions, assessments and action exercised through professional self-controls (Noordegraaf, 2016). So, as much as the organisational contexts for the public professions had also changed with the managerial frameworks and scrutiny associated with neo liberalism, these were being
placed over a workforce that had very little professional wherewithal to counter or resist.

They [CYPS] aren’t “social work” and they need to be told that very firmly that they’re not. If we, social work, the profession gets captured by one agency we’re done for, in terms of any independence, any sort of social justice. If we get overtaken by basically an instrumentalist bureaucratic model then we’re finished.

M 1996

The professionalisation strategy, in seeking a qualified and competent workforce, can also be viewed as a twofold attempt, through qualification, to foster the specialised knowledge base of social workers in CYPS as well as hold them to account through competency assessment. What remained for the social workers in respect of professionalism, however, is that they lacked any of the institutionalised sources of professional power attributed to a fully-fledged professional status (Randall & Kindiak, 2008), let alone any means of justifying and defending any special influence or privilege they were perceived to hold (Kirkpatrick, Ackroyd & Walker, 2005). Thus they were not in a strong position to resist any of the professional decline associated with deprofessionalisation. In respect of the professionalisation project, it is Randall & Kindiak’s view that until social work achieves formally state-delegated self-regulation through statutory registration, it falls somewhat short of the ‘ultimate evidence of an occupation achieving professional status’ (2008, p. 347). Nonetheless, the professionalisation strategy was key in supporting the professionalisation project for social workers (Kirkpatrick, Ackroyd & Walker, 2005). CYPS’s professionalisation strategy differed markedly from the Association’s drive for the same end. One explanation can be found when comparing their institutional characteristics i.e. the categories: legitimacy; authority; identity; norms; attention; strategy; informal control and economic system, bearing in mind their respective specific institutional system type with CYPS being a state organisation and the Association a profession (see Figure 6.1.3, p. 116 -117).
Political sponsorship

The New Zealand Labour Party

In forming a new government in 1999, the New Zealand Labour Party (NZLP) announced a new policy objective to introduce statutory registration for social workers. This initiative became the third and most crucial component for statutory registration to become a reality. The discussion in this section explores the context in which the new Government Minister commissioned his Ministry to investigate a possible form of statutory registration for social workers. The Foucauldian perspective of governmentality is offered to describe the socio-political dynamics involved. The discussion is informed by the findings presented in Chapter Five, in particular the Minister’s rationale for statutory registration, and provides insight into his motivations and views on professionalisation.

Neo liberalism

The backdrop to this period of politics in ANZ is unquestionably neo-liberalism witnessing the displacement of the welfare state ethos by performance government and the application of monetarist, neo-liberal social and economic policies (Dean, 2010; Duncan & Worrall, 2000). Furthermore, neo-liberal government features public management that involves ‘diverse governmental, biopolitical, and disciplinary regimes of regulation’ (Gray et al., 2015, p. 381). It is within this socio-political context that the NZLP included in its 1999 manifesto its proposal to ‘establish a system of professional registration for social workers that will cover the public and private sector’ (NZLP, 1999, p. 509). The Minister’s observation was that the proposal ran somewhat counter to what he saw as the NZLP’s direction at the time.

*It was a real shift in direction. “What on earth are we doing?” ... trying to recreate professions when everyone’s been destroying them for the last while.*

The Project Manager shared this view.

*The Labour government at that time was fairly anti-regulation ... they wanted to reduce the amount of regulation.*
The NZLP’s proposal was one of a number put forward within the manifesto relating to a need to revamp the provision of services for the protection of children, support for families in crisis and to assert the role of state agencies.

The Brown Report

The NZLP’s proposal was somewhat prescient of the recommendations of a Ministerial Review of Child, Youth and Family Service (CYFS) (Brown, 2000) that was reported to the new government in its first year of office. In reporting on the state of CYFS, the report, in part, attributed CYFS’s shortcomings to the impact of neo-liberal reforms, deregulation and a competitive quasi-market system designed to increase efficiency and reduce state expenditure (Duncan & Worrall, 2000 as cited in Brown, 2000). Brown’s appraisal of social work in CYFS noted the discrepancy between the values of the profession and the managerialist values that drove the bureaucratic controls and performance expectations set by managers, meaning a loss of professional autonomy (Duncan & Worrall, 2000, as cited in Brown, 2000). The report concluded with the recommendation that the introduction of social work registration be given urgency, noting ‘That the work being done on the registration of social workers with ANZASW is endorsed and fully supported by Child Youth and Family management’ (Brown, 2000, p. 53). As the Minister recalled:

Judge Mick Brown’s report did a very good job and highlighted a lot of the things, I guess, we are talking about here. So yes it gave us a pretty solid base to be saying, along with other things, arising from his report to say that there’s something wrong here and we should be moving towards a more registered professional environment.

The Minister’s rationale

The Minister had also formed the personal view of a demoralised and dispirited social work profession.

Social workers in the public sector had a pretty rough ride from the ‘80s onwards in the sense that they were constantly attacked, badly organised and felt very bad about the profession that they were in.

His concern with the growth in numbers of untrained and, as he saw it, unprofessional social workers and led to what seemed his almost personal mission to foster the reprofessionalisation of social workers using statutory registration as a vehicle to provide a lift in status for the profession. The Project Manager recounted
Minister Maharey was personally pretty committed to that and so pushed it along.

The agendas

The polarisation of views

The Bourdieusian concepts of field, capital, doxa and habitus, as applied to politics, government ministries and departments as sites of vested interest in respect of the social work profession (see Appendix 27: Figure 6.1.2), help to identify and accentuate the particular attributes ‘the stateholders’ bring to the undertaking. When considered alongside those attributes assigned to the Association, it is clear that their frames of reference, mission, and resources differ markedly. The comparison is useful for the purpose at hand – to understand the processes and elements at play as the move toward statutory registration begins to unfold. It also serves to highlight the sharp distinctions that can be made between the two agendas that also become factors of polarisation.

*I’m not for a statutory registration. Why? Power. The minute the state authorises a group to be it gives it the power and it backs the power by statutory authority of an Act of Parliament. I do not believe that one should ever define in law who a social worker is and that it should deny anybody the right to use the term should they choose to do so.*

*D 1996*

The inference was that the involvement of the state and its associated power and the added legitimacy, recognition and status that goes with that is the antithesis to what social work stands for and would be self-serving of the interests of the profession rather than the clients it serves.

*I guess my instinct would be that it’s a form of registration which lends itself most readily to the preservation of professional elitism, separation and distancing and all of that, which is the least accessible, both to change and to consumer community type interests.*

*Q 1996*
The web of governmentality

The account of how the political sponsorship of statutory registration evolved also uncovers the different layers and activities of governmentality at both the micro and macro levels (Gordon, 1991; Nadesan, 2010). The social worker can be viewed as both the object and subject, with the government, in response to a rigorous critique of its key social work service delivery arm, CYFS, seeking to redress this with the introduction of an administrative disciplinary system to govern social work practice. At the same time, such a system would provide the means for the individual social worker to self-regulate their conduct and practice through their alignment of these with the standards and expectations set as the basis for registration. The process of political sponsorship, in itself, is drawn into the cycle of governmentality, with the Minister as sponsor, as is CYFS (the subject of a Ministerial Review), the Review itself and the government agencies deployed to assess and ultimately implement statutory registration. A web of governmentality materialises with the prospect of a new regulatory agency and activity being legislated that, in turn, will itself become subject to government surveillance as a crown entity all ‘in order to normalize, stabilize, and optimize activities, identities and power relations’ (Dean, 2010, pp. 173-174).

Lingering doubts

It now remained to see whether the lingering doubts expressed by some of the respondents in 1996 would materialise once statutory registration was in place; in particular whether, in the spirit of Te Tiriti (The Treaty of Waitangi) partnership, it would address the needs of Māori.

While I’m real keen for registration, I’m apprehensive or slightly anxious that it will marginalise Māori again. These kinds of things have never served Māori historically. If we go for legislation, what will it give us that it doesn’t give us now?
A 1996

The unknowns at this stage, such as the form of registration, make-up of the statutory board and criteria for registration, were details also on their minds, as were the costs involved.
Concluding comment

The discussion in this section has covered the different motivations that led to the situation where statutory registration is now all but an accomplished fact. The respective attributes of each agenda, that of the professional body and that of the state, have been identified as a basis for further cross-examination. Which agenda will prevail in the final analysis? Has the Association ended up serving a political service? Has the Association compromised its mission and purpose? What has been the significance of the Minister’s personal tutelage in statutory registration being introduced?
Part Two
Identifying the sources of authority and creating the structure

Statutory registration is one of the forms of occupational regulation available to government and authorised through state legislation. Its purpose is the protection of the public from practice incompetence with the government as the source of authority for the rules applied to provide this protection. Part Two first addresses the features of statutory registration and its implications for the professions given the level of autonomy and discretion professionals may apply in their practice and the risks entailed. The assessment of the risk to clients arising from social work incompetence was a key determinant in whether statutory registration for social workers would be introduced in Aotearoa New Zealand (ANZ). The differences in the form and process of statutory registration that apply to the professions in ANZ are outlined as are the forms of occupational regulation that apply for social workers in Australia, the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA) and Canada. These provide a basis of comparison for the statutory registration introduced for social workers in ANZ as the new kid on the block. The following figure (Figure 6.2.1) aligns the themes drawn from the findings with the theoretical stances adopted to facilitate the following discussion on occupational regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of vested interest</th>
<th>Data themes</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Theoretical stances, social, political &amp; legal processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The profession             | Professional tools  
For/against registration  
Criteria for               | The Association Members 1996 | Professionalisation |
| The ‘stateholders’         | Underlying reasons  
Professional identity  
The Treaty of Waitangi  
Stakeholders  
CYPS/CYFS               | The Minister  
The Project Manager | Occupational regulation |

Figure 6.2.1: Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework
Identifying the sources of authority - the rules of the game
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Occupational regulation

Public protection through self-regulation

Since 1989, the Association had provided a self-regulatory and self-governing model of registration with its members listed on a membership register and classified according to one of the categories of membership – provisional, full, student, life, or non-practising. Entitlement for membership was by meeting the Association’s entry criteria and completing an assessment of competence for full membership. The protection accorded to the public lay in knowing that, as a member of the Association, the social worker subscribed to its code of ethics, held a police vetting clearance, had been adjudged competent and might hold a relevant qualification. Recourse to the Association’s complaints and disciplinary process was available in the event of a member being alleged to have erred ethically or not met the prescribed practice standards (Interim Board of Competency, 1989). Members were encouraged to make their membership known to clients and others.

You have your ethics and your standards, your competency and your complaints procedure and you have your review procedures as well and re-certification, and you have everything that registration provides. What is it going to do that is different?

L 1996

Clearly the Association had a vested interest and, indeed, experience in offering some means of public protection from incompetent social work practice.

Statutory registration as a form of occupational regulation

Statutory registration, that is, the regulation of a profession through government legislation, can occur in different ways. The most common form provides a statutory framework and process managed by a government appointed or self-regulatory board that includes representation from members of the profession and laypersons. The professional applies to the board for registration and, on meeting the criteria, becomes registered. Such legislation serves to protect the title ‘registered’ and only those who become registered are entitled to, and are indeed subsequently required to, identify as ‘registered’. Such legislation is ‘often referred to as a ‘title protection act’ that ‘govern[s] the use of the professional title’ (Thyer & Biggerstaff, 1989, p. 4).

Even to be able to ask people if they’re registered social workers would be helpful.

G 1996
Statutory registration is usually supplemented by a requirement for the professional’s practice competence to be certified. This is set against a code of conduct, identified practice standards, requisite minimum educational qualifications and demonstrated practice competence. The statutory board maintains the register of the professionals who apply for and meet the requirements set. The board also manages the process for admission and removal from the register. In addition, the statutory board accredits education providers to issue the qualifications requisite for registration and oversees a formal complaints procedure and disciplinary mechanism to provide for the referral and adjudication of complaints in respect of the professional’s practice and use of the title (Bibus & Boutte-Queen, 2011; Rubin, 1980).

**The occupational regulation of professionals**

In an examination of the regulatory control of professions, as distinct from other occupations, it is argued that professions bring an additional set of occupational characteristics to the relationships with consumers or clients, an expectation of trust (Trebilcock, 1983). This is due to the margin of autonomy and discretion that may be involved in the judgement and decision-making credited to their position (Evetts, 2002). For example, not all professions share the hallmarks of ‘deference’ and ‘privilege’ and ‘exclusivity’ associated with the classical medical and legal professions resulting in their self-regulatory control being endorsed through legislation. By comparison, the regulatory control of most other professions involves greater government intervention on behalf of its public. In other words, the way in which professions are regulated and the principles applied depend on their status and how they may be perceived, their genesis and history of development (Rubin, 1980).

Using the assessment of the risk factor associated with a profession is one way of illustrating how the risk factor may be managed through one form of occupational regulation or another depending on the autonomy and level of trust attributed to the profession in managing that risk itself (see Appendix 28: Tariff of Risk). Professional regulation has been described as involving ‘the relationships between national and state sovereignty, between government action and individual liberty, between regulation and the marketplace, and between public enforcement and private remedy’ (Rubin 1980, p. 29). Such a reality was just as those with reservations about statutory registration feared.
A statute is a comparatively rigid type of framework which is closely associated with more traditional forms of registration like medicine, nursing, psychology, architects and so on ... which lends itself most readily to the preservation of professional elitism, separation and distancing and all of that, which is the least accessible, both to change and to consumer community type interests.

Q 1996

The ‘rules of the game’ for occupational regulation and statutory registration were therefore already well established and practised by the time momentum gathered for statutory registration to be considered for social workers in ANZ. The following figure (Figure 6.2.2) aligns the themes drawn from the findings with the theoretical stances adopted to facilitate the following discussion on the form of statutory registration adopted for social workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of vested interest</th>
<th>Data themes</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Theoretical stances, social, political &amp; legal processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The profession</td>
<td>Forms of registration</td>
<td>The Association Members 1996 Members 2014</td>
<td>Institutional logic Bourdieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for Professional tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td>MoSP enactment</td>
<td>The Minister The Project Manager</td>
<td>Governmentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biopower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2.2: Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework
Creating the structure - the new kid on the block

The Government’s project for the registration of social workers

The project team

With the fifth Labour Government installed in 1999, the Minister asked the Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP) ‘to undertake a project to determine the best system for the registration of social workers in NZ’ (MoSP, 2000, Foreword). This step served to bring the separate agendas of the Association, the Child, Youth and Family Service (CYFS) and the Government into a single process to determine the shape of statutory registration for social workers. The aspirations of the professional body for statutory registration could now join the mix of the managerial imperatives of CYFS, the public concerns articulated in the recently released Brown Report (Brown, 2000), and the
political agenda of the Government. With Ministerial direction and support assured, the way was set for a project team to be established to advise on the form of occupational regulation deemed appropriate for the social work profession. This included the preparation of a discussion paper as the basis for consultation with the profession and the social services sector before reporting back to the Minister and parliament (see Appendix 29: Seven Key Questions).

The assessment of risk

A framework introduced by the Government in 1999 required that the Ministry of Commerce be consulted on all proposals relating to occupational regulation (Ministry of Commerce, 1999). It set the ground rules to be followed in assessing the necessity for occupational regulation. These were based on identifying the risks posed by an occupation, the best measures for managing those risks and whether the public needed protection from such risks, with occupational regulation being the ultimate sanction available. The framework described the different regimes of regulation available as forms of government intervention should the risks deem that as necessary and how these would likely apply. The subsequent risk assessment of social work conducted by the project team showed the risk as sufficiently high and therefore recommended the Government proceed and establish a system of registration. ‘Social work has the potential to be a moderate to high-risk occupation’ (MoSP, 2000, p. 4).

The Social Workers Registration Act 2003

The progression into law of the legislation for the statutory registration of social workers in ANZ followed the Project Team’s consultation with the sector (Croydon Consultants, 2001; MoSP, 2001) and their reporting of findings to the Minister (Minister of Social Services and Employment, 2001a, 2001b). The records of the parliamentary Select Committee of Social Services and the parliamentary debates account for the enactment of legislation in (New Zealand Parliament Hansard, 2003, 2000a, 2001b, 2000c). The enactment of statutory registration for social workers provided the means for the Government to address the Brown (2000) critique of CYFS and at the same time introduce another strand of performance government (Dean, 1999, p. 173). It also served to construct another agency, a statutory board, to potentially partner with and facilitate the professionalisation of social work and exercise a new authoritative relationship over professionals involving a new level of surveillance by the regulatory authority in order to govern risk (Dean, 1999, pp. 173-174). The essential tenet is statutory registration be ‘appropriate to protect citizens
from incompetence’ (Rubin, 1980, p. 31). The Social Workers Registration Act 2003 (the SWR Act 2003) was enacted with this basic tenet as its objective. As statutory registration was not made mandatory, however, the protection accorded would only apply in respect of those social workers who became registered and carried the title ‘registered social worker’. The design of the SWR Act 2003, as summarised in the synopsis provided in Chapter Two (p. 35), was very much in keeping with the principles of a ‘title protection act’ described above (Bibus & Boutte-Queen, 2011; Rubin, 1980; Thyer & Biggerstaff 1989). To briefly recap, the implementation of the SWR Act 2003 lay with a statutory board of 10 members appointed by the Minister. The legislation provided for the voluntary registration of social workers who met competence requirements set by the Social Workers Registration Board (the SWRB) and had a social work qualification that had been accredited by the SWRB. The legislation thereby served to protect the title ‘registered social worker’ (Beddoe & Duke, 2009).

How does it rate?

The wish-list

The interest of the respondents had been whether the Association would hold any responsibility or role in the management and process of statutory registration.

*I think the ideal is for there to be a recognised regulatory arm of a strong, comprehensive professional association.*

*L 1996*

*I think it would be wonderful if it was vested in the Association to take that role, because I think then it could be truly independent and we wouldn’t have political nominees.*

*M 1996*

---

6 On the 9th August 2017, the Social Workers Registration Legislation Bill was introduced to the New Zealand Parliament to increase the professionalism and coverage of the existing legislation by making statutory registration mandatory for all social workers.

7 By April 2014, there were 4621 registered social workers of which 28% (N= 1321) were employed by CYFS (SWRB Annual Report 2013-2014) and 54% were members of the Association (ANZASW Annual Report 2013-2014). At the same time, there were 3423 members of the Association of whom approximately 73% (N=2500) were also registered social workers The member employment profile for the Association in July 2015 showed 26% (N=864) were at that time employed by CYFS. (ANZASW Annual Report 2013-2014).
These aspirations had reflected the concern that if the profession did not hold any control the attendant risk was that:

\[
effectively \text{ the sanctioning is being done by parliament ... and being driven probably by ideological and political kinds of expectations that are perhaps rather hostile or at least not very helpful as far as social work is concerned.} \]

\[Q \text{ 1996}\]

On the other hand:

\[
\text{To make it truly professional I do see that the state should have a role in it and I don’t think it should just be an in-house thing done by social workers for social workers and it’s all a bit cute and incestuous and I don’t think that that’s very helpful.} \]

\[G \text{ 1996}\]

Other respondents were concerned that, if the Association had been assigned a statutory responsibility, it would stretch the Association’s infrastructure and budget.

\[
The worry is that if they don’t contribute anything to the rest of the Association it makes for a very boring organisation. I personally think for all those reasons now, I would probably pick another independent body. \]

\[M \text{ 1996}\]

As it transpired, the SWR Act 2003 did not specify any role for the Association in statutory registration, nor for that matter was Association membership recognised as a credit for statutory registration.

‘Public callings’, ‘skilled callings’ and the ‘helping professions’.

There are differences in the form of occupational regulation that may apply to one profession or another. For example, a distinction can be made between ‘public’ callings such as professions considered indispensible (e.g. medical practitioners) and ‘skilled’ callings, those professions of a particular specialist nature (e.g. accountants) (Rubin, 1980, p. 34). Another classification is that of the ‘helping’ professions (e.g. nursing). The following figure, ‘Public callings’, ‘skilled callings’ and the ‘helping professions’ (see Figure 6.2.3) provides a basis for considering social work as one of the ‘skilled’ and ‘helping’ professions and how the form of regulation compares with those of other professions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Public calling'</th>
<th>Empowering legislation</th>
<th>Registration authority (RA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical practitioners (1867)*</td>
<td>HPCA Act 2003***** Medical Practitioners Act 1995</td>
<td>Medical Council of NZ** (as a RA under the HPCA Act 2003)****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers (1869)*</td>
<td>Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006</td>
<td>NZ Law Society**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Skilled calling'</td>
<td>NZ Institute of Chartered Accountants Act 1996</td>
<td>Institute of Chartered Accountants**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants (1908)*</td>
<td>Education Amendment Act 2015</td>
<td>Education Council **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (1914)*</td>
<td>Chartered Professional Engineers Act 2002</td>
<td>Chartered Professional Engineers Council **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers (1924)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The helping professions'</td>
<td>Nursing Council of NZ*** (as a RA under the HPCA Act 2003)****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (1901)*</td>
<td>HPCA Act 2003 Nurses Act 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapists (2008)*HPCA Act 2003</td>
<td>Psychotherapists Board** (as an RA under the HPCA Act 2003)****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapists (1949)* HPCA Act 2003</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Board** (as a RA under the HPCA Act 1949)****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapists (1949)* HPCA Act 2003</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy Board** (as a RA under the HPCA Act 1949)****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers (2003)* SWR Act 2003</td>
<td>Social Workers Registration Board***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors</td>
<td>Self Regulated (non statutory)</td>
<td>NZ Association of Counsellors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legislated as a body corporate**

A body corporate is an organisation that has been incorporated as a company, a cooperative company, an incorporated society or a charitable trust. (NZ Companies Office, 2017)

***Legislated as a crown agent***

Crown agents are statutory Crown entities that must give effect to Government policy directions as distinct from having regard to Government policy directions or being generally independent of Government policy. Crown agents are those Crown entities most closely subject to ministerial control. (State Services Commission, 2014)

****The RA is independent of government and, being constituted as a body corporate, is accountable to the public. A RA operates as a statutory board and works in conjunction with the Health and Disability Commissioner when a health practitioner’s practice is deemed to pose a risk of harm to the public (HPCA Act Section 118)

*****The HPCA Act 2003: The Health Practitioners Competency Assurance Act 2003

Note: The professions of Medicine, Law, Engineering, Accountancy are granted self-regulation under legislative provision.

Figure 6.2.3: ‘Public callings’, ‘skilled callings’ and the ‘helping professions’

A significant difference, as indicated, is that as one of the ‘helping’ professions, social workers are regulated under stand-alone legislation. Other ‘helping’ professions (with the exception of counselling, which is not subject to statutory registration) are regulated under the Health Practitioners Competency Assurance Act, 2003 (HPCA Act), with the regulation for each discipline managed by their respective professional board as a designated Registration Authority (RA) under the HPCA Act (2003). Scopes of practice for each profession are defined by the RAs as the RAs see fit (HPCA Act, 2003). The other distinction is that the SWRB is established as a Crown Agent and is therefore more closely subject to Ministerial control than the other professions (State Services Commission, 2014). In two respects, therefore, the statutory registration for social workers differs markedly, in terms of its separate and specific legislative control by the state.

**An international comparison**

Given our Anglo-North American heritage for social work practice, it warrants comparing the form of statutory registration instituted in ANZ with the forms of occupational regulation for social workers in Australia, the UK, the USA and Canada. Each reflects quite markedly different governmental legislative conventions and
exemplifies different ways of credentialing social work (Talboys & Buchan, 2000; Thyer & Biggerstaff, 1989). The statutory accountability of social workers in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales is subject to separate although similar forms of jurisdiction, each of which establishes a registration board for social workers and a register of those who practise social work and use the title ‘social worker’, which is protected by law.

Rather than specify precisely what social work is in a legalistic way the British approach is to say that a social worker is someone who has been through a recognised process of education and learning to practice (Bibus & Boutte-Queen, 2011, p. 52).

To become licensed rests on the social worker completing a course that meets the national occupational standards for social work and working within any role identified as social work. The implications of becoming licensed are rounded out with standards of conduct and procedures to surrounding compliance (Bibus & Boutte-Queen, 2011). According to Bibus & Boutte-Queen (2011), the ‘most rigorous form of regulation of social work practitioners is licensure’ (p. 1). In the USA, the majority of the states regulate social work through licensure whilst the remainder apply registration or certification. To this end, in the USA, it is incumbent upon each state to provide a definition for social work. Some differentiate between clinical practice and more generic practice across a range of services and settings and also the requirements for different levels of practice (Bibus & Boutte-Queen, 2011; Garcia, 1990; Marks & Knox, 2015). An overarching organisation, the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB), is governed by the boards that regulate social work in the USA and works in collaboration with the professional associations. For the guidance of state legislatures, the ASWB has written The Model Social Work Practice Act (ASWB https://www.aswb.org/; Biggerstaff, 2000), the contents of which provide guidance on standards, procedures and processes for licensing social workers through legislation as a basis for greater standardisation and consistency. The definitions of social work practice that are at the core of a licensing regime are drawn from the activities in which social workers engage and are aligned to each of the three levels of academic qualification – Bachelor, Masters and Clinical (ASWB https://www.aswb.org/). Australian social workers are not subject to any form of statutory occupational
regulation and look to a self-regulatory system through becoming eligible for membership of the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) by being placed on the membership list/register on the basis of having attained a social work qualification from a social work programme accredited by AASW. AASW membership is promoted to the social work industry through the vehicle of a ‘legally protected collective trademark’ for member social workers to show they hold legitimate credentials (AASW, https://www.aasw.asn.au/; Lonne & Duke, 2009; Talboys & Buchan, 2000). ‘The Accredited Social Worker Trade Mark’ identifies professionally qualified social workers who are accountable to the AASW Code of Ethics and who have committed to, and completed a minimum amount of ongoing, annual, continuing professional development. This trademark is a gold standard in professional recognition for social work (AASW https://www.aasw.asn.au/). The Trademark is the vehicle for providing consumer protection. The following figure summarises the different forms of occupational regulation for social workers in ANZ, the UK, USA, Canada and Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Governing body</th>
<th>Take-up</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation (Trademarked)</td>
<td>The professional association, AASW</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Australia (Requires membership criteria – qualification, standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory registration</td>
<td>State appointed Board or Council</td>
<td>Voluntary or Mandatory</td>
<td>UK (Requires scope of practice or definition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State appointed Board</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>ANZ (No definition or scope of practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>State appointed Board or Council</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>USA &amp; Canada (Requires definition of task as set according to level of academic qualification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6.2.4: Occupational regulation for social workers in ANZ, the UK, USA, Canada & Australia*

**Concluding comment**

**Part Two** has provided an account of the enactment of the SWR Act 2003, described its form and the explicit statutory authority it has in respect of registered social
workers. Comparisons were made with the forms of statutory registration for other professions in ANZ and with the social work professions in the UK, USA and Australia. These comparisons showed up some significant differences that set the regime of statutory registration established for social workers in ANZ distinctly aside from equivalent regulations in place for other helping professions and certainly the established professions in ANZ. Similarly, when compared with the occupational regulation for social work in other western jurisdictions, these have been shown to go further to define a scope of practice for social work and, in most instances, are mandatory. With the ‘wish lists’ and aspirations for the Association held by the respondents in mind, and with the comparisons just made, it now remains to consider and discuss the consequences and impact of statutory registration as seen and articulated by the respondents ten years on.

Part Three
Reflecting on the outcomes
With statutory registration having been in place for ten years, the respondents were invited to reflect on what they held to be the consequences of its implementation; in particular, what they saw as the impact of statutory registration on the Association as the professional body, and, more broadly, its effect on the professionalisation of social workers. Aside from this, the respondents also reflected on the role and place of the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) in the new professional environment, of which it was now part. This discussion is central to addressing the questions posed by the thesis in the light of the theoretical approaches adopted. Three different levels of analysis of the findings have allowed the consequences and impact of the introduction of statutory registration to be considered at a macro or socio-political level, at a meso or institutional level and at a micro or personal level. The selected theoretical approaches are applied to enhance the discussion. The following figure (Figure 6.3.1) aligns the themes drawn from the findings with the theoretical stances adopted to facilitate the ensuing discussion.
Figure 6.3.1: Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework
Reflecting on the outcomes - how the rules of the new game apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites of vested interest</th>
<th>Data themes</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Theoretical stances, social, political &amp; legal processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The profession</td>
<td>Consequences for the Association &amp; the profession</td>
<td>The Association Members 2014</td>
<td>Institutional logic, Hybridity, Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bourdieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The future</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governmentality, Biopower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>The Minister The Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact

At the macro level

Chapter One provided an account of the Association’s development towards becoming the professional custodian of the social work profession in ANZ, having instituted a self-regulatory regime to provide assurances to the public in respect of the social work practice of its members. By 2000, the Child, Youth and Family Service (CYFS), with its professionalisation strategy, and the New Zealand Labour Party (NZLP), with a new policy objective, ultimately led to a new realm of statutory custodianship for social work being introduced with the enactment of the Social Workers Registration Act, 2003 (the SWR Act). This new form of custodianship was viewed by some within the sample as realigning professional accountability to an agenda not necessarily shared by social workers. There was also the attendant risk of political influence and the introduction of a value base inconsistent with that held by the profession.

*It always leaves it open to the potential that an anti-social work Minister could in fact stack the panel, the Board, with people who have particular views.*

M 2014
They’re (policymakers) totally focused on efficiency, economic rationalism...that that’s the all encompassing ...and risk management of course ... whereas social work’s value base is about social justice and human rights and I think there’s a real tension there.
F 2014

Such views echo the Foucauldian concept of governmentality and the role of the state in acting out the concept. Through statutory registration, as one of the technologies available to it, the state is now inextricably involved in setting and monitoring the principles and standards of social work and effectively removing significant elements of those from the profession itself (Thibaud, 1999, as cited in Chambon, 1999; Parton, 1999, as cited in Chambon, 1999)

I think you’re right when you say there’s “a new kid on the block”. But this kid’s got huge backing, you know ... it’s not just something ... like you know how we’ve had to develop our sense of responsibility inside the profession. I think that that’s ours always but I don’t think we’ve got the same critical teeth.
H 2014

At the meso/institutional level
The registration of social workers had become a ‘core mission’ for both CYFS as a state bureaucracy and the Association as a professional association. Statutory registration had also become a policy plank of the NZLP in its 1999 election Manifesto and subsequently as government (NZLP, 1999). What form or structural concept would the statutory registration for social workers take? Institutional hybridity provides a means for considering the organisational form of the SWRB as the new kid on the block as a Crown Entity given the institutional influences that had a bearing on its make-up. These specifically included the state bureaucracies involved in its design and form including the Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP) and CYFS, being ‘archetypical, politically headed bureaucracies as the primary arena for policy development and programme delivery’ (Skelcher & Smith, 2015, p. 433). Through consultation non government organisations, as employers of social workers providing government contracted and voluntary services, were indirectly involved in the design just as the Association was as the professional body. The SWRB, as the organisation responsible for implementing the Act establishing the infrastructure and criteria for registration, became the institutionalised manifestation of statutory registration. It was designated the organisational form of a Crown Entity,
a body established by law in which the Government has a controlling interest, through
having the power to appoint and replace a majority of the governing members. It is
however legally separate from the Crown. Furthermore, the SWRB was designated a
Crown Agent, an organisation that is required to give effect to government policy
directions as distinct from only having regard to Government policy directions or
being generally independent of Government policy. Crown agents are those Crown
entities most closely subject to ministerial control (State Services Commission, 2014).
The institutional logics approach (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012) provides a
theoretical backdrop for examining more closely the make-up of hybrid organisations
and, therefore, can provide a keener appreciation of, for example, how the new kid on
the block – the SWRB – is constituted. As described in Part One (see Figure 6.1.3,
p.116-117) applying a set of relevant institutional sectors: market, state, community,
profession and corporation, (2012, p. 56) one is able to provide an explanation, for
example, of the legitimacy, authority and identity that underpins the SWRB as a
Crown Entity and, on the other hand, the Association as a professional body. As a
Crown Entity, the SWRB delivers government/public policy but also has independent
status and power that enables it to consult, set policies, processes and standards and
establish a judicial system to investigate and rule on complaints, as well as penalise.
Furthermore, as a self-funding, not for profit agency, it needs to both market and sell
itself within a predominantly low-income streamed sector. In other words, the SWRB
embodies both non-profit and government elements with the need to exist within the
community sector and having a significant influence across the health, welfare and
educational sectors. This provides a basis for understanding how and why the
relationship between the SWRB and the Association may be impacted by competition
and negotiation at an individual level, in conflict and coordination at an organisational
level and in contradiction and interdependency at an institutional level (Friedland and
Alford, 1991). Hybrids are carriers of multiple institutional logics, (Skelcher and
Smith, 2015, p. 439) as there may be a multiplicity of logics bearing on organisations
and individuals, even if one may be dominant (Skelcher and Smith, 2015, p. 437). If
so, the question arises how is this multiplicity played out? An approach to this in
relation to the SWRB and the Association is to postulate where tensions might accrue,
particularly given that both organisations exist in support of ‘the profession’ and, as
separately constituted institutions, bring to bear their respective logics and hybridity to
‘the profession’. Insofar as enhancing the professionalism of social workers and
thereby contributing to their professionalisation, what elements can be seen to be in competition, conflict or contradiction? Where is there evidence of negotiation, coordination and interdependency? (Friedland and Alford, 1991). The perceptions of the respondents varied.

*The organisation that’s got the authority to call the shots to me is ANZASW informed by the IFSW. But I have a feeling actually that it’s no good calling if no one’s listening.*  
K 2014

*My sense at the moment is that probably the Board is driving the profession.*  
Q 2014

*The bottom line is the Association’s values and principles are about protecting the profession. And the Registration Board isn’t … it’s about protecting the public.*  
L 2014

*The Association provides us a really strong identity for social work outside of government. We shouldn’t rely on the Board for our identity as a profession.*  
M 2014

Certainly, the Minister was clear in his views regarding the status of social work as a profession and whether the Association should be assigned any statutory functions. From the outset, and perhaps which now explains the underlying reasons for the Association not being written into the legislation, the Minister was of the view that social workers were not a professionally involved workforce and the Association was not ready, if it ever might be, to assume any responsibility in a statutory registration regime.

*They don’t actually have all the bits and pieces and place to be a profession … that’s certainly true of social workers. They’re still migrating towards that. And may not ever get there because they do include a large workforce of people … that think of themselves as involved in this but aren’t really … they’re not professionally involved.*  
S 2014

In drawing this conclusion, the Minister compared the place of social workers with other professionals such as lawyers, doctors, engineers and psychologists, noting that social workers are not able to draw the same professional boundary around themselves.
They may end up somewhere in the middle ground where they've got a professional body but it’s not quite like the law society and so on.

An inference that may be taken from this is that the Minister’s agenda was very much aligned to that of CYFS. Statutory registration was introduced to address the performance shortfalls and an insufficiently qualified social work workforce identified in CYFS (Brown, 2000; CYFS, 2000). It was not necessarily about giving any stamp of endorsement to the Association or its members let alone social work practitioners as a profession. In summary, it was hoped to at least help them along this path but for the Minister it was apparent statutory registration was no guarantee of acceptance as a profession.

At the micro/personal level - playing out biopower

With the appointments to the first SWRB including six high profile members of the Association, this was seen both as a generous endowment by the Association and also as having the potential to carry a conflict of interest into their role on the Board.

I think that’s true that the Association ‘gifted’ that to the Registration Board.

I think that’s a good way of looking at it.
P 2014

There were people on the Board who were also in a position on the Executive [of the Association] and they shouldn’t have been in both. I think it’s a clear conflict of interest but I don’t think it was recognised at the time.
P 2014

In the parlance of institutional logics, the SWRB therefore comprised a membership of ‘multiple identities’ (Skelcher & Smith, 2015, p. 434) given six members held concurrent positions with both the Association and the SWRB. This also resulted in a parallel affect on their place as key officeholders within the Association. A further consequence, albeit unexplored, was what this may have meant for their colleagues within the Association and the SWRB. The institutional logics approach and hybridity explains some of the dynamics at play when a new, arguably, hybrid organisation, the SWRB is formed, playing to ‘new rules’, yet being played out by key actors in a new
hybrid organisational form which is of a very different mix and mission from whence they were recruited/appointed by the Minister (i.e. from the Association). For SWRB members, the ‘new rules’ were made patently clear and asserted the accountability to government.

*People from the Ministry coming in saying the first rule of any Crown Entity is don’t embarrass the Minister. So the first message was kind of a negative one ... behave ... and for many of us who had been activist it was kind of a shock to realise that suddenly we were part of the apparatus of the state.*

M 2014

It is therefore not surprising that there were also tensions observed and experienced that impacted at the personal/micro level.

*It’s almost like there are two organisations in competition with each other.*

R 2014

The fraught early working relationship between the SWRB and the Association, which at times became adversarial and antagonistic, was recounted by some of the respondents. This was contrary to expectations that it would be collegial.

*I kind of think how naive we were. It’s almost like we felt we would be just sitting around the table and chatting as colleagues the way we always had and fight and argue and get upset and run away and come back and try again.*

*I think the Association reacted very, very defensively to the Board’s decisions and there was a reluctance to actually acknowledge that people on the Board were colleagues doing the very best they could.*

M 2014

This represented the very real personal investment that individuals made in the roles ascribed to them by the circumstances in which they found themselves and were obliged to uphold. Such investment was at some cost not only to relationships but also to an opportunity for both organisations to forge a way ahead in the interest of their common objectives to protect the public and enhance the professionalism of social workers. The circumstances were illustrative of their exercising biopower through the personal and positional power they carried into their respective agendas and interests as they sought to influence and shape the processes for professional registration.
I think that there was great opportunity for the Registration Board and the Association to work together and promote social work in New Zealand. From my experience of those earlier years it didn’t happen and I think that was really very sad.

P 2014

The consequences

From a Bourdieusian perspective

The Bourdieusian elements from the framework introduced in Chapter Three (see Figure 3.2.2, Appendix 5) are now reapplied to include the SWRB as the new kid on the block (see Figure 6.3.2. below). This illustrates the particular characteristics and offerings of the SWRB across all elements – field, capital, doxa and habitus – and serves to highlight its significant impact on the scene as a new player on the block.

Not only does the establishment of the SWRB set up new sets of relations and relationships that call for the Association’s attention and new communication channels, there are also new agendas and assertions informed by statutory requirements, accountabilities that give new dimensions to the block and the creation of a new sense of place that incorporates the identity of a registered social worker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the kids on the block</td>
<td>Social space a set of relations</td>
<td>Tokens of power as constituted through</td>
<td>Competing sense of common belief through</td>
<td>Sense of place The Social Work Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRB the new kids as regulators</td>
<td>Crown Entity Board members Registrar Administrators</td>
<td>The Act The Register Practice standards Course approval Disciplinary Board</td>
<td>Registration Reports &amp; reporting Statutory accountability</td>
<td>Registered Qualified Competent Accountable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| THE ASSOCIATION The kids as key stakeholders | Govt. & NGO social workers Private practitioners Community workers Tangata Whenua | History Membership International affiliation Code of Ethics Competency standards Publishing Professionalism Biculturalism | Professional expertise Knowledge Research Advocacy Submissions Debate | Ethical Competent Accountable Professional |

Figure 6.3.2: The kids on the block – the SWRB and the Association (after Bourdieu (Emirbayer, 2005))
‘Where to?’ for the Association

For some the advent of the SWRB was perceived as a threat to the very existence of the Association, which was seen to marginalise itself as it sought to maintain its role in what had become a new environment for the profession.

Wittingly, or unwittingly, the Social Workers Registration Board undermines the activities and really the financial base of the Association.
C 2014

The threat was seen in part as attributable to the Association’s own actions in adopting a new governance structure to reduce costs and use new media forms for communication in place of kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face meetings) resulting in its disengagement from membership, in particular Māori. Some quite trenchant criticism was made of the significant makeover of the Association’s governance undertaken in the years following the introduction of statutory registration.

I think it's [the Association] marginalised itself. I think it’s taken an insular perspective and has obsessed itself with its infrastructure and its survival, I suppose.
L 2014

The Association, as the professional body, was not formally recognised or written into the legislation as some of the 1996 respondents had envisaged might happen. The Association’s role as the sole provider of competency assessments was pared back and it lost its previous role in course accreditation processes. In addition, membership in the Association was not in itself identified as a criterion for registration, although the Association’s code of ethics and standards of practice were used by the SWRB to inform the standards of competence it set for registration. Some respondents viewed these as negative outcomes for the Association, affecting its credibility, legitimacy and public voice.

I'm not clear that the Social Workers Registration Board have accorded the Association the mana that it deserved.
R 2014

It's [the Association’s] lost its public voice and lost its public credibility.
L 2014
The Social Workers Registration Board could have gone some way towards making it very highly desirable that you have your membership.

R 2014

The requirements and deadlines set by the SWRB, backed by their staffing resources, was seen to put the SWRB at an advantage over the Association, which was then left looking:

Less than professional and I think it makes us look reactive.

C 2014

In Bourdieusian terms, this can be viewed as an encroachment on the capital and doxa the Association had accumulated and its previous mandate, albeit as a self-regulator. It’s function as a self-regulator to assess and confirm practice standards had, for some, been superseded by the SWRB.

The thinking was going “oh well actually I don’t need to think about ANZASW ... I can just be accountable to the Social Workers Registration Board ”.

R 2014

The situation was described as almost one of confusion for social workers unable to distinguish what was expected of them in the new environment.

Where am I? Who do I belong with? What am I affiliated to?

R 2014

Who are we, what do we do in this kind of context? What does an Association look like in a registration environment?

Q 2014

Another respondent was of the very firm view that the Association should relinquish its preoccupation with the business of competency assessment to the SWRB and:

Go back to “its knitting”, which is about advocacy, industrial representation and social policy and public platform.

L 2014
Concluding comment – addressing the research questions

Part Three discussed the impact and consequences of *a new kid on the block* as articulated by the respondents and in the light of the theoretical approaches adopted. The discussion has been central to addressing the questions posed by the thesis:

- To what extent have the aspirations for the statutory registration of social work been realised?
- In what ways has the introduction of statutory registration changed the face of social work professionalism in ANZ?

In 1996 the respondents had expressed confidence in the Association’s processes of self-regulation and, by and large, anticipated that if statutory registration was introduced the Association would play a role in its operation by delegation from the government or by providing some function in the process. Concerns were whether the Association would be able to manage the inevitable costs involved and the extent to which such a role would impinge on the Association’s core mission and objectives around social justice. The expectation that the Association would hold a prescribed role in the process of statutory registration was based on how other professional bodies were involved in the statutory registration of their professionals. However the outcome was not as anticipated, with the Association not accorded any statutorily prescribed function in statutory registration. The feeling expressed was that the Association had been sidelined, and, at the same time, some of its assets, its professional capital, had been used to inform and resource the processes of the SWRB. The exploration of this outcome from a theoretical perspective has provided insight and explanation for why this occurred and left the respondents in 2014 disillusioned and dismayed. The rules that prevailed were not of the Association’s making and the analysis from the perspective of governmentality, biopower, (Burchell, Gordon & Miller, 1991; Foucault, 1977, 1991a, 1991b, 1999; Foucault & Lemke, 1999; Mills, 2003; Nadeson, 2010), and institutional logics ((Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012) provides a rationale for this. The reflections offered by the Minister and the Project Manager also added to this explanation, providing some insight into the government’s intentions and, significantly, the Minister’s opinion regarding the status of social workers as a profession. Instead, the catalyst that had precipitated the introduction of statutory registration was not so much a result of the Association’s drive and aspirations but the
culmination of pressure upon CYFS, as the principal government social work agency, to professionalise its workforce, coupled with the political intervention of a new Labour government and the personal sponsorship of the Minister. As this unfolded, and as subsequently witnessed, any thought or aspiration that the Association would play some sort of role in the provision of statutory registration soon evaporated. Quite clearly, the Minister did not consider that social work practice ranked highly as a profession nor were social workers true professionals. This became evident in the tight rein placed on the SWRB compared to other professions. As recounted by a former President of the Association to a gathering to celebrate its introduction, statutory registration ‘occurred despite us [i.e. the Association] and the considerable attempts of many devoted people to register the profession of social work’ (Briggs, 2003, p.24).

The theoretical analysis highlights the disparity of power between the state and the Association and the low regard held of the profession by the Minister and government. Overriding the design and implementation of statutory registration was the need, driven by the government, for a workforce of qualified social workers who would, in turn, become accountable – not so much to their profession but to an instrument of the Crown. The social work profession, represented by the Association, was deemed not worthy of the trust granted other professions when it came to statutory registration. One also senses a naivety on the part of all players involved at the time statutory registration was introduced in not recognising the extent to which the Association was being divested of its professional capital and ending up peripheral to the process. There was also a big shift in roles for many of the individuals involved. The initial enthusiasm and celebration that statutory registration had been achieved quickly waned and was replaced, initially at least, by a fraught working relationship between professional colleagues working to agendas from essentially disparate organisational cultures - a Crown Entity and the professional body. This disjunction could have been addressed if it had been recognised and signalled at the outset and, given the circumstances, addressed by some independent process management to guide both parties. Instead, the key individuals and officeholders within the Association and the SWRB had to carve out their own processes of engagement and learn the realities of how a new Crown Entity was required to function and how different this was to a professional and voluntary body. And this occurred just when the Association had consolidated its role and confidence as the self-regulator for its
members, had an active membership, established codes and standards and intact professional affiliation with educators and internationally. It is therefore not surprising that, in seeing some of this accumulated and hard-earned capital pass to the SWRB as personnel, knowledge, processes and experience, there were lingering concerns that the Association was being dispossessed and even usurped.

The relatively tight accountability of the SWRB as a Crown Entity to its responsible Minister reflects the cautious approach taken in respect of the social work profession by government. This distinguishes the social work profession from other skilled and helping professions and is testimony to the Minister’s view on the marginal status of social work as a profession. As a consequence, the social work profession remains subordinate to the state in respect of the accountability for the protection of the public from incompetent practice with no direct involvement of the Association as the professional body in such accountability. The only credit that membership in the Association may provide for such protection is the recognition of its competency assessment certificate for the purposes of statutory registration.
Chapter Seven – Final reflections

Chapter Seven offers some final reflections on the research topic and the outcomes arising from the introduction of statutory registration bearing in mind the different mandate, authority and institutional purpose of the Association and the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) respectively. To what extent do these differences encourage or impede their respective objectives to enhance the professionalism of social workers in ANZ? As shown in the findings, the respondents were very forthcoming in sharing a wide range of aspirations and views in respect of what statutory registration might hold for the Association and mean for the profession. These ambitions were in the same league as the sometimes arduous, and often heartfelt, but always worthy debates that the Association had hosted in the preceding 30 years. There is no question about the Association’s investment in advancing the collective professionalism of social workers. For its own part, it was the prime mover in establishing measures of public protection to address incompetent social work practice through the self-regulatory measures it introduced in 1989. In the light of the aforesaid comments (‘Where to?’ for the Association. p. 151) the social work profession and the professional body in ANZ, in 2014 continued to face challenges around the presentation of its professional identity and role. The SWRB and the Association share a common objective to support the professionalism of social work. Given this and with approximately 73% of Association members also being registered under the SWR Act and 54% of registered social workers being Association members (ANZASW, 2017; SWRB, 2017), there is common ground upon which the professionalism of social workers can be enhanced and the professional identity of social workers strengthened. However, given the respective differences of mandate, role and purpose of the Association and the SWRB, Timmons’s (2011) research throws caution to this, pointing to the underlying tension between the respective agendas of a statutory and professional body. Timmons concluded ‘the meaning of professionalisation itself is changing, from being principally concerned with autonomy to being principally concerned with regulation’ (p. 348). In other words the state seeks to control professionalisation on its own terms (Timmons, 2011). In
respect of the social work profession in ANZ the state has achieved this, in Bourdieusian parlance (Beddoe, 2017; Beddoe, 2013a), by fully utilising all the professional capital that the Association had to offer and not allowed the boundary set by statute between the SWRB and the Association to become blurred. Thus the Association and its members do not have access to the symbolic capital that being recognised as partners in statutory registration would provide. Instead, by persisting with a line of demarcation that excludes the Association from any public recognition as a participant in statutory registration, the boundary remains a site of continuing struggle and skirmish (Beddoe, 2017; Garrett, 2009).

From a recent ANZ study of social workers’ perceptions of their professional identity it was found ‘there is an inherent challenge for the profession to address this distress and unease about their identity’ (Beddoe, Staniforth & Fouché, 2017, p.14). This is clearly concomitant to the broader challenge facing social workers with no diminution in the personal, social and political struggles that the social work profession seeks to ameliorate as its core mission, and no curtailment of the prevailing managerialist control over social work. The social and political terrain for the profession remains difficult. What the thesis has shown up is the effect of statutory registration in perpetuating the neo liberal and managerial agenda to have the individual social worker accountable while, alongside, the Association seeks to represent the profession collectively. Therefore the challenge is for the Association to continue to foster and participate in conversations that seek to restate and reclaim its voice for the profession. Otherwise, what remains of the profession becomes ‘at best a severely truncated and technocratic version of what it once promised to be’ (Rogowski, 2010, p. 4), or worse, becomes left behind as a professional group.

Postscript

Just as the thesis was brought to its completion a Social Workers Registration Legislation Bill was introduced to the New Zealand Parliament (2017). This Bill is aimed to increase the professionalism and coverage of the existing legislation by making statutory registration mandatory (p. 2). In its present form, however, the Bill has already been described by the Public Service Association (PSA), an industrial union representing state social workers, as ‘an assault on the profession’ and ‘an arbitrary and ineffectual protection of title and role’ given that the Bill fails to define
social work in terms of a defined scope of practice (PSA, 2017, p.6). Instead, the Bill seeks to have the determination of social work rest on the position descriptions ascribed by employers for those positions titled ‘social worker’. Ross (2017) contends that this ‘embeds long standing misunderstanding of and disrespect for social work as a unique and skilled profession’ (p. 1). The Association has indicated its intention to ‘work to protect the profession of social work’ and address its concerns that the Bill only seeks to register the title ‘social work’ (ANZASW, 2017). The SWRB shares similar concerns regarding the proposal.

‘The Board believes the proposed mechanism is inconsistent with other professional regulatory legislation – both in New Zealand and internationally – and would put us out of step with other professions. It is usual for a profession to regulate itself. Allowing employers to decide who is practising social work will remove this ability from the profession’ (SWRB, 2017).

The fact that the PSA, the SWRB and the Association view the Bill in much the same light and have separately expressed their concerns forcefully and publicly points to the possibility of an intriguing new phase for the profession. Will the state respond in a way that opens the door for the profession’s views to be accepted and sustained? In the meantime this new development, as embodied in the Bill, serves to accentuate the findings of the thesis, perpetuating the dubious light in which the state holds the social work profession while seeking to intensify its governmentality over the profession. In the face of this the challenge for the Association remains - to assert its advocacy role on behalf of the social work profession in ANZ. It also presents an opportunity for the Association to promote the merits and relevance of professional membership, raise its public profile and shed new light on the value of a strong and collective voice for the social work profession in ANZ. The thesis serves as a reminder of the Association’s sustained record representing the profession in the public arena since 1964. It also offers a fully documented examination and theoretical critique of the dynamics and processes that surrounded the entry of *the new kid on the block* in 2003. And, in the light of the new circumstances that have arisen with the introduction of the Bill, hopefully the thesis can also inform the upcoming discussions about mandatory registration.
There are new relations on the habitus

There are new relations on the habitus,
new capital and doxa too,
bringing state officials and bureaucracy
to address so-called professional mediocrity.

And boy that changes things.

Higher qualifications, competence and registration
offer new tokens of professional power,
while outcomes driven managerialism
shrinks the social worker’s working hour.

And boy that changes things.

The habitus has changed its looks
bringing new measures of public protection
placing greater expectation
on an already embattled profession

And boy that changes things.

What that means for professional aspiration
remains probably anyone’s guess.
Will statutory registration
lead to professionalism at its very best?

And boy that would change things.
So who’s come out on top?
Whose doxa now prevails?
Is it ANZASW
with proud history and past travail?

How that would change things.

No, it’s something rather more hybrid
that Bourdieu and Foucault would enjoy,
applying governmentality and biopower
but not to be toyed with boy.

And that changes things.

So I’ll leave you with my conclusions
for you to digest at will.
And trust they’re something much better
and not a bitter pill.

And hope that changes things!

Howard Randal, 2017
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Appendices
APPENDIX 1  

Figure 2.1: Building *the block*
Seeding the profession - the beginnings of social work in Aotearoa New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional type</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Roles and Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Tangata Whanau</td>
<td>Whanaungatanga/Manaaki</td>
<td>Iwi, Hapu, Whanau,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlers/colonists</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Care/support</td>
<td>Extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>Destruct, needy, homeless</td>
<td>Giving/sheltering</td>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church</td>
<td>Parishioners &amp; allcomers</td>
<td>Supporting/counselling</td>
<td>Ministers of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual guidance</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Ordinances</td>
<td>Destruct, needy</td>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>Magistrates, JPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Institutionalisation</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sick</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>Asylums</td>
<td>Relieving officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orphaned</td>
<td>Orphanages</td>
<td>Attendance officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>Refuges</td>
<td>Probation officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegitimate</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Almoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Child Welfare Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insane</td>
<td>Reformatories</td>
<td>Medical social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maori Welfare Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychiatric social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counsellors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 2**

**Figure 2.2: Building the block**
Forming the profession: 1950s-1970s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional activity</th>
<th>Professional formation</th>
<th>The building blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Regional Child Welfare meetings</td>
<td>Regional associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing</td>
<td>National Study Conference, 1962</td>
<td>An emerging professional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associating</td>
<td>Inaugural Conference, 1964</td>
<td>NZASW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debating</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Aims &amp; aspirations</td>
<td>NZASW Constitution (1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing</td>
<td>Membership criteria</td>
<td>Membership by virtue of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associating</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Education &amp; training</td>
<td>Training for social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining</td>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>‘Social Welfare at the Crossroads’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elitism</td>
<td>Newsletters and Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td>Remits and policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other significant players</th>
<th>and their contributions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Administration &amp; management</td>
<td>Statutory title ‘social worker’ (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites of social work practice</td>
<td>Social Work Training Council (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for networking</td>
<td>NZ Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>Diploma of Social Science (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites of social work practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3  Figure 3.1: Conducting the Literature Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The kids on the block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association as a professional association</td>
<td>Setting the context</td>
<td>NZASW/ANZASW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- profession</td>
<td>- Identity forming</td>
<td>- archives, newsletters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- professionalisation</td>
<td>- Shifting positions</td>
<td>- journals, papers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CYPFS professionalisation strategy</strong></td>
<td>Setting the socio-political context</td>
<td>Library/online searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neo-liberalism</td>
<td>Capturing the history</td>
<td>- journals, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- new managerialism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public professions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal records &amp; discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The evolution of the new kid on the block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i. Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational regulation</td>
<td>Understanding forms &amp; processes</td>
<td>Library/online searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the Labour Party manifesto</td>
<td>Tracking the debates</td>
<td>- journals, texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii. Explanation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSP consultation</td>
<td>Identifying the agendas</td>
<td>MSD Research Access Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SWR Act 2003</td>
<td>Understanding the Act</td>
<td>Submissions, Hansard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflecting on the new kid on the block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequences</strong></td>
<td>Reflecting on aspirations</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong></td>
<td>Understanding the ramifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Interpreting the consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forming conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 Literature Research Tools

- Identifying key words, e.g. ‘social work/social worker’ as the prime identifier in conjunction with ‘occupational regulation’, ‘statutory registration’, and ‘profession, professionalism, professional, and professionalisation’.
- Completing predominately online University library searches and loans including Interloan: University of Canterbury; University of Otago (Central Library (including storage), Robertson Library, Health Sciences Library and the Hocken Library); University of Massey archival collections (the Hancock collection)).
- Perusing papers, reports and journals privately held and collected over time.
- Follow-up after perusal of articles for relevant secondary sources. Digging deeper.
- Subsequent searches as the research focus widened and then narrowed.
- As suggested by supervisor and former work colleagues.
- Browsing of library shelves by subject and Table of Contents/Index. Browsing of relevant journal collections.
- Searching related professions and historical accounts of their becoming registered.
- Noting key authors as they may be cited or emerge during searches.
- Formal application to MSD under the OIA for copies of documents pertaining to the consultation for and the writing of the SWR Bill.
- Online access of parliamentary Hansard records.
- Perusal of the Association’s archives and requests to ANZASW National Office for supplementary material.
- Specific requests of previous ANZASW officeholders.
- Google Scholar
- Capturing/entering sources on endnote and grouping/categorising according to key words and subject/sub topic to enable retrieval, integration, synthesis, subsequent downloading, hard copying and referencing.
**APPENDIX 5**

**Figure 3.2.2: The kids on the block (after Bourdieu, (Emirbayer, 2005))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites of vested interest</td>
<td>Social space - a set of relations</td>
<td>Tokens of power as constituted through</td>
<td>Competing sense of common belief through</td>
<td>Sense of place the block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The kids on the block</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doxa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Habitus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>S Govt. social workers</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Professional expertise</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association</td>
<td>t NGO social workers</td>
<td>International affiliation</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>a Private practitioners</td>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key stakeholders</td>
<td>t Community workers</td>
<td>Competency standards</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u Tangata Whenua</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Biculturalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>r Politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Ministries &amp; Departments</td>
<td>y - government</td>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>y - opposition</td>
<td>Statutory power</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'stateholders'</td>
<td>R Administrators</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e Advisors &amp; outputs</td>
<td>Government outcomes</td>
<td>Political power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g Funding contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training providers</td>
<td>i Academics</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>s Teachers</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educators</td>
<td>t Tutors</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r Students</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 'Public'</td>
<td>t Clients</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>o Voters</td>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recipients</td>
<td>n Social service agencies</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | o e n l i s b a t d c P t c r e o o n u f t n e t s a
**APPENDIX 6**

**Figure 3.2.3:**  

**THE PROFESSION of SOCIAL WORK**

Sources of Authority/Knowledge/Power  

**FOUCAULTIAN THEORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmentality</th>
<th>Sites of Expertise and Government Technologies to Achieve.....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of the population</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘conduct of conduct’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery of government</td>
<td>A N Z A S W (Collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>S W R B (Non mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biopower**  

- Disciplinary Gaze  
- Surveillance  
- Policing  
- Correction  

**Instrument of governmentality**  

**Bio-political technique**  

| Social work | Social workers  
|---|---  
| Professional practice | Social service agencies  
| Registration | - Statutory  
| Accreditation | - NGOs  
| Contracting | Clients  
| | - Individuals  
| | - Families  
| | - Communities  

**ANZASW**  

| M | C |
|---|---  
| E | O |
| M | D |
| B | E |
| E | U |
| R | O |
| S | F |
| H | I |
| I | E |
| P | T |
| H | I |
| I | C |
| C | O |
| S | M |

**ANZASW**  

| E | T |
|---|---  
| A | Q |
| T | G |
| U | A |
| T | S |
| O | T |
| R | F |
| Y | A |
| T | C |
| N | I |
| P | N |

**ANZASW**  

| E | U |
|---|---  
| C | T |
### Categories of Institutional System Types

**Figure 3.2.4: Institutional System Types**

*(after Thornton et al, 2012 (Institutional Logics) and Skelcher et al, 2015 (Theorizing Hybridity))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>System Types</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Root metaphor</strong></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redistributive mechanism</td>
<td>Relational network</td>
<td>Common boundary</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimacy</strong></td>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Unity of will</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief in trust &amp; reciprocity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Bureaucratic domination</td>
<td>Professional association</td>
<td>Commitment to community values &amp; ideology</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Social &amp; economic class</td>
<td>Association with quality craft</td>
<td>Emotional connection Ego-satisfaction &amp; reputation</td>
<td>Bureaucratic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms</strong></td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Group membership</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td>Status in group</td>
<td>Status in profession</td>
<td>Personal investment in group</td>
<td>Status in hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Increase community good</td>
<td>Increase personal reputation</td>
<td>Increase status &amp; honour of members &amp; practices</td>
<td>Diversification &amp; increase size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal control</strong></td>
<td>Backroom politics</td>
<td>Celebrity professionals</td>
<td>Visibility of actions</td>
<td>Organisation culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic system</strong></td>
<td>Welfare capitalism</td>
<td>Market capitalism</td>
<td>Cooperative capitalism</td>
<td>Managerial capitalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8

‘Competent practice and regulation – debating the issues around registration and professionalisation of social work in New Zealand’

Introduction

This paper raises some of the issues that surround the possibility of occupational regulation/registration of social work in New Zealand and the attendant debates about professionalisation. It is drawn from a paper presented at the 1996 NZASW Conference in Wellington which had the theme 'Clinical Practice Issues for Contemporary Social Work in New Zealand.' The topics of occupational regulation and registration seemed quite relevant issues for such a conference to consider and a paper looking at the issues of regulation/registration and professionalisation seemed to fit quite easily into a conference with the theme 'clinical practice' compared to, say, if the conference had had the theme of 'justice' or 'community'. For me clinical practice conjures up the vision of a therapist/client relationship which mostly occurs 'behind closed doors', just as clinical psychologists and psychotherapists might practice. The nature of this relationship and working in this way seems to fit more closely to the popular notion of 'a profession' as it has quite a bit to do with the client investing a fair bit of trust (and money) in the professional's claim to expertise and authority. Therefore some people might say that the clientele of those who conduct clinical practice and work in private with people behind closed doors 'ought to have some form of statutory protection to guarantee the expertise and authority claimed by the professional.

Typically such statutory occupational regulation is likely to include some form of registration which amounts to the compilation of a public list (register) of those who have met a predetermined set of standards in their practice and are deemed suitable and approved to use the title 'registered'.

My guess was that most attending the conference would be on the side of registration for social work. It was my further contention that those who identify themselves as clinical social workers are supportive, if not the driving force behind the push for registration. The challenge, as I see it, is to stimulate the wider membership of the Association to think and further debate the issues that surround the very real prospect of social work in New Zealand eventually becoming a registered occupation and thereby completing the process of professionalisation. In this abridged version of the paper presented at the conference I will very briefly recount some of the history to the Association's previous debate about professionalism and registration and provide an account of the present state and status of the Association's competency assessment programme. The latter, I suggest, is a key plank in any moves for social work in New Zealand to become registered and professionalised. A subsequent paper will discuss the pros and cons of NZCYS and its strategic goal (NZCYS1996) to have an independent registering body for social workers in New Zealand. NZCYS's policy will be considered in the light of an underlying theme to the issues of registration and professionalisation - the theme of power.

To preface this paper I would like to first reflect on the observations of Susan Kemp, whose social work practice was grounded in New Zealand and who is now an Assistant Professor at the University of Washington, Seattle. In her 1994 Doctorate dissertation entitled 'Social Work and Systems of Knowledge' (Kemp, 1994) in which she investigated the concept of social casework theory, 1900-1983 in the USA, Susan made the following initial observations. In contemplating social work's unique and dual concern with both person and environment, she chose to explore the ambiguity of social work practice in the USA, in particular clinical social work. In identifying as a New Zealander, Susan wrote that she was 'accustomed to a form of social work more orientated to the environment' and found the pre-eminence of person-centred direct practice in the United States obvious, troubling and not fully explained by most accounts of the development of the American profession'. In addition she noted that clinical social work is 'the methodology that more than any other has defined the profession' and went on to surmise that if social workers know and therefore do more about psychological than about environmental factors, then in practice social work is something other than it claims to be.' 'The result is a disabling split between professional purposes and practice.' My contention is that Susan's caution also hold for social work in New Zealand. For instance, her assertion that if social workers are to address such issues effectively they(social workers) 'need to understand how they are constituted', least the disabling split between professional purpose and practice, she refers to, occurs. This applies just as rigorously, I suggest, to New Zealand and the current issue of registration. All social workers need to understand and develop a critical awareness of how they are constituted as a body of social workers. This paper is intended to assist this understanding and the ongoing debate which I hope develops the hallmarks of being critically aware and informed. The past debate about professionalism and the registration of social work in New Zealand
First to briefly recap the Association's track record in addressing the issue of professionalism and registration. This is not so much a blow by blow account of the detail of the debate, but rather what stands out for me in terms of the responses of membership to challenges thrown out to it in the past. A fuller account can be found elsewhere. (Beddoe and Randal) In relation to the point prefaced by Susan Kemp, I consider the Association has had relative success in avoiding 'the disabling split between professional purpose and practice'.

The Association was formed in 1964 and quite heated debates over professionalism occurred in the 1970s when the issue was the criteria and eligibility for membership of the Association. Should membership be restricted to only those who hold a social work (academic) qualification? At that point of time membership was determined by members being employed by a recognised social service agency. Then, as I recall, following not a small number of resignations over the issue, the possibility of a more exclusive basis to membership was eventually defeated. Interestingly this was after Ivan Illich's keynote address to the 1978 conference. The theme of his address was 'the disabling professions' and the attendant notion of 'professionals as needs-makers'. This amounted to a rather complete discrediting of professionalism from one who was regarded as something of a modern-day guru. The issue over the criteria for membership came to a further head following the Turangawaewae conference in 1986 and the subsequent resolution a little later to establish an inclusive process of certification, embodying as best it could, principles of biculturalism. Competency certification as the basis for membership effectively allowed the issues raised by talk of registration, professionalism, academic qualification and elitism to be conveniently sidestepped. It seemed the debate around registration and the aspirations for professional status had been put aside if not buried. And so to 1994 when the Association chose to revisit the objective to seek the registration of social workers.

Judging from the anti-professional tenor of the political and social change that has swept over us in recent years as well as the all but complete deregulation of the economy, the means of production and the attendant servicing industries, it is perhaps surprising and ironic that the Association and one of the key social service providers (NZCYPs) sense that the political climate is right for promoting the registration of social workers. It seemed the Association, having set aside its debate about membership criteria and assuming a gatekeeping role over membership, was content with the midway path it had found between the more professionalised and, dare I say it, elitist basis for membership and one which was quite inclusive and reasonably accommodating of Treaty-based principles. Having arrived at this point which led to a bolstering of the Association's membership, and formal mechanisms of consumer accountability, the Association seems to have again reached a point of 'where to now?' It has apparently a renewed motivation to seek registration. Moreover it has shown through its programme of competency assessment and the complaints procedure that it has the ability and capacity to successfully manage a process of self-regulation.

To my mind the Association has a lively record of debating the questions around membership, accountability and registration. As suggested in the preface to this paper it is important that all social workers develop a critical awareness of how they are constituted as a body of social workers. I would now add that this should be a continuing debate' And although as risky as it may sometimes seem, such debate in the past has shown that creative solutions can be found.

The present state and status of the NZASW competency assessment programme.
The competency assessment process is one of the key planks to the Association's self-regulatory mechanisms. For this reason it is just as well to reflect upon the relative integrity of this process in order to see how well placed the Association might be in the registration stakes.

Background
Since 1990 when the competency assessment process was introduced as the basis for membership 794 members have completed the certification/recertification process. Within the same period the Association's membership has risen from fewer than 500 to 1131 members. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that social workers are attracted to membership, not only for the usual reasons associated with being affiliated through mutual association but also due to the benefits of membership, including indemnity insurance, certification and the sense of professional security the Association and its code of ethics offer for those who work privately or in relative isolation from their peers. The latter seems to be a factor, for example, for those where restructuring has seen them dispersed throughout an organisation in
multidisciplinary teams, such as in health settings. In addition, given the numbers of vacancies being advertised calling for social workers with the NZASW certificate as a prerequisite, it seems that agencies and services are also promoting NZASW membership as a desirable attribute. The numbers of block applications for membership from particular agencies for their staff is another example of agency support for the added value that membership of NZASW now provides.

What was the state of its competency assessment process four years down the track since its inception? Over three months in late 1994 an evaluation of this process was conducted with the objective of determining its integrity from the perspective of those who participate in it: candidates, their supporters, referees, assessors and national assessors. Do they adjudge the process to be fair, reliable, flexible, feasible and valid? In their view does the process achieve what it sets out to do? What parts of the process are they happy/unhappy with? In what ways might the process be modified?

In the evaluation 139 participants responded through questionnaires. This was a take-up of 40% of the total number of participants in the 46 assessments conducted during the timeframe of the evaluation. Although the full analysis and write up has yet to be completed, it is nonetheless possible to draw some tentative conclusions from the responses captured through the questionnaires.

The data pertaining to the personal characteristics (ethnicity, gender and region) of those who responded tells us that the predominant number of applicants were pakeha women, that Maori had a higher involvement as referees, panelists and supporters than they did as candidates and that during the period in question more than half the assessments were conducted in the Waikato/Bay of Plenty and Southern regions.

**Fairness, reliability, flexibility, feasibility and validity**

For the process to be fair etc. it seems important that there should be a reasonably consistent application of the assessment guidelines across all assessments regardless of where they are held. The evaluation showed this to be the case. All panels had a full complement of at least one national assessor and two local assessors. In addition, the intention of the assessment process is that it be transparent and open - that candidates should be given feedback directly by those they nominate as referees and that it is recognised that candidates should feel supported throughout the process. In terms of the displacement of referees and supporters 'in attendance' at panels, in 80% of the assessments, at least 1 referee attended, in 66% of the assessments, more than 1 referee attended. Conversely referees did not attend in 20% of the assessments and their testimonials were given by other means. In 63% of the assessments, there was at least 1 person in support of the candidate, in 37% of the assessments there were more than 1 person in support. Conversely support people did not attend in 37% of the assessments.

**The logistics of the assessment process**

The indications are that the philosophy and principles surrounding openness, consistency and support are unfolding in practice. This is despite the logistics involved in arranging meetings and the 'preciousness of time' that was commented upon by some respondents. It also reflects the key role played in some regions of those people who have undertaken the task of organising the assessment meetings, arranging panelists and venues and assisting National Assessors in other ways. Importantly the competency assessment process is an active process which touches upon every member of the Association at least once in every five years. A quick calculation based on the figures drawn from the evaluation shows that the level of membership activity attributed to the competency assessment process, including those who assist national assessors to arrange assessments and others who undertake roles as assessors and, sometimes referees and supporters, is very high. The estimate is that around 300 people would have been involved in the 46 assessments held within the evaluation period, a fair proportion of them members of the Association.

**The assessment process**

There was a relatively high degree of homogeneity in what all participants had to say about the assessment process. Moreover the feedback was overall very positive. For example, the handbook is intended as a guide to the process and the assessment meeting and expectations of the process should be reflected in practice and the experience of candidates, assessors/ referees and supporters alike. This appears to be the case and can be attributed to the content of the handbook and the way in which the handbook is utilised and offered to the referees and supporters for their guidance. Despite less than half the 'local' assessors reporting that they had been given 'training' in relation to their role, assessors reported being reasonably prepared for their role in the assessment process, particularly in terms of the notice they were given, understanding of the standards and confidence with their role. Apart from this being
attributed to the helpfulness of the handbook it also seemed due to their self-confidence and confidence in other panelists and the process. This confidence is translated into threequarters of the assessors reporting that, to them, the overall assessment process is fair and acceptable. Threequarters of the referees who responded had attended the assessment meeting as opposed to providing their reference in writing or by ‘phone. Attendance at the assessment meeting would have given referees greater insight into the assessment meeting and the process as a whole. Most adjudged the overall process to be fair to the candidate and acceptable to themselves. Referees also reported adequate preparation in terms of notice, information and understanding. Support people, too, indicated a high degree of satisfaction with their preparation and understanding of the assessment process and experience within the meeting itself. Most found the process to be fair on the candidate and acceptable to themselves. The value of good preparation was reflected in the overall outcomes of the assessment process, as was the importance of good management of the assessment meeting process, not only by the National Assessor as convenor but also by the candidate. The manner in which the candidate brought their assessment material and personnel together and conducted themselves in the process of presentation and interview was reported by some as a relevant and demonstrable indicator of the standard of their practice.

Other conclusions
What are some of the downside conclusions that can be drawn from this initial analysis of the evaluation? Apart from some specific deficiencies that were pointed up in the handbook such as its 'language' and lack of examples, some questioned the flexible and open culture that the assessment process tends to encourage. The impression was gained from the evaluation that some adjudged the assessment process to be 'soft' and possibly overindulgent of the candidate in terms of the flexibility for candidates to select/veto the panel membership, arrange the venue, and set the timeframe. This 'comfort level' for the candidate was inferred rather than explicitly referred to as was the impression, drawn from the occasional comment, that indicated the 'inside' knowledge and possible advantage gained by candidates who had participated in a prior assessment in another capacity such as referee, supporter or even panelist. There was a hint of overfamiliarity (I am reluctant to say 'incestuousness') in addition to the 'softness' that was detected. Together these impressions tempered the otherwise almost unqualified approval of the process.

Summary
This initial internal audit of the assessment process confirms its basic integrity, a fact which is also affirming of the Association's resourcefulness and management capability. As a relatively comprehensive and thorough process, it is now quite embedded as part of the Association's culture. It remains to be seen whether the Association decides to capitalise on the basic integrity of the process should it find itself in the position of tendering for the role of registration body, as well it might. The experience and unblemished history that the Association has quickly accumulated in the first six years of the competency assessment process points to its obvious robustness and astute management. This suggests that the Association is well-placed to respond to the feedback that this evaluation will provide and, if called upon, to offer a sound model for external stakeholders to consider as a basis for the registration of social workers - should that course be adopted. Otherwise the Association can work to modify and improve the process in its own way.

Conclusion
At this point there is little doubt that the Association should be a key player, if not, have a significant say, in any move toward the registration of social workers given its strong membership base, the substance of its previous debate around the issue of registration and the credibility of the self-regulatory systems it has put in place. However, before embarking further with this, it is my view that members of the Association should reflect again on the possibility that registration, whatever form it may take, could lead to the disabling split between professional purpose and practice to which Susan Kemp refers. We need to pause again to renew our collective understanding of how we should best be constituted as a body of social workers given the specific context within which we practice. Therefore to conclude I will briefly refer to some of the features of the present landscape of social work practice in New Zealand. These features, I suggest, should impinge upon the nature and form of the ongoing debate around registration and professionalism, including NZCYP'S's professionalisation strategy. They also should cause us to return to consider what professionalism and professionalisation implies, particularly in relation to the issue of power. The contention is that members of NZASW need to closely examine what registration means in the light of NZASW's founding principles, against the particular backdrop that is New Zealand, as well as in relation to the concept and application of power within our society.
With our welfare system residualised and state agencies fragmented, there are much reduced yet nonetheless quite regulated forms of service delivery. Service delivery has been captured by new managerialism which means that control and management is less likely to be in the hands of professionals and more likely to be in the hands of managers who are driven by a need to create a market-driven enterprise to counter the retrenchment faced in resources and services. This means management has an interest in making standards and outputs explicit which, in turn, has led to the prescription of work task competencies and a contractual environment which ties everyone to a centrally determined set of outcomes. In this context de-regulation doesn't necessarily mean a freeing up of options and opportunities. In fact it has produced control in other ways - the notion of 'the shadow state' nicely encapsulates what is going on (Wolch, 1990) as does the advent of 'new-managerialism.'

Competence is now enthroned in our vocabulary as the basis for work performance and, along with unit standards, is currently regarded the guiding light for professional knowledge and training in the social services. Presumably competence will also become the guiding light for the registration of social workers. If this were to be the only factor, it would miss the point as registration demands a much broader consideration than that which the registration and competency and unit standards regimes provide. Registration, I contend is more about the basic integrity of an occupational group and assurances around how it deals with the problems and the unpredictability of practice. When you think about it, registration is exactly about that - governing the possibility and consequences of unpredictable practice. Registration is as much about the basis upon which someone may be removed from the register as it is about how you get on the register in the first place.

This paper will hopefully revive the debate about the nature of social work in New Zealand, in particular, the ways in which social workers are perceived and the ways in which social workers want to be seen. A subsequent paper will explore this further with particular reference to the significance of NZCYP's professionalisation strategy and the possible effects of registration on the status of social work as a regulated occupation, as a profession and as a political force. For members of the Association, I suggest, this will also have a significant impact on the future of their Association.
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Background
I was enrolled and worked on an initial thesis proposal in 1995/6/7 (part-time) approved for MCapSc (Otago) entitled: *The professionalisation of social work in Aotearoa NZ*. Pat Shannon was the designated supervisor. The thesis was to have evolved along the following lines:

**An evaluation of the NZASW competency assessment process.**
A paper to the NZASW conference in 1996 included an account of the outcome of this evaluation conducted in 1994. The purpose of this evaluation was to test the integrity of the NZASW competency assessment process as one of the precursors to the Association’s pursuit of registration for social workers in NZ.

**Investigate professionalism and the processes of professionalisation.**
To account for the place of competency assessment as one of the processes for regularising and regulating Association membership (the code of ethics and a complaints procedure are others) and study social work and professionalism, drawing upon literature etc. A stockpile of NZ and international literature was gathered and has been retained.

**To describe the social, institutional and political context of social work practice in NZ.**
To account for the demise of the welfare state, the pursuit of Treaty based practice, the implications of ‘new managerialism’ and a ‘market economy’ for the provision of social services and the impact of a new regime for qualifications (i.e. NZQA)
Papers were presented to international and local conferences and journal articles published and others submitted. (1995 -1997)

**Consultation/commentary**
To interview a small selection (16 participants) of NZASW members with a view to eliciting their insights and views regarding the professionalisation of social work in NZ. A paper entitled ‘*Competent practice and its regulation – debating the issues around the registration and professionalisation of social work in NZ*’ was shared with each
participant to act as a catalyst for the interview and address the following:

*Any specific immediate response to the paper?*
*Do you think social work in NZ should be subject to some form of occupational regulation?*
*If so, what form of regulation .... as presently applied through the auspices of NZASW, statutory regulation through registration or licensure, or something else?*
*Who would administer ... government, independent national body, NZASW, some other arrangement?*
*Should NZASW’s competency assessment process be retained and become part of a formalised system of occupational regulation?*
*How should the issues surrounding this be debated?*
*What else would you want to see for social work in NZ in the future?*

Transcripts of 16 interviews were compiled and are held. Those interviewed included academics, Maori, present and former NZASW officeholders and practitioners ... from Auckland, Palmerston North, Christchurch and Dunedin.
The intention was to analyse the responses using N:U:D:I:S:T, a qualititative research programme.

**Theorisation**  
The intention was to develop an explanation that draws upon theoretical approaches to help synthesize the different elements examined.

**Conclusions**  
To reflect the findings and observations back to the social work community.

(n.b. Hard copies of all of the material produced is held as well as on floppy disks. Arrangements are being made to convert this data)

**Where to from here?**  
Re-engaging with the topic and a selection of the original participants with a view to reviewing what has transpired since the establishment of the SWRB in 2003.
Examining the submissions made by ANZASW in respect of the SWR Act (2003), noting the extent to which the Association’s views prevailed/did not prevail.

Examining the relationship between ANZASW and the SWRB after 10 years of coexistence with particular consideration of the complementary/competing roles of a professional association and a statutory board. Explore the theoretical models that underpin such organisational forms.

Identify the tensions that may arise, conflicts of interest should they have occurred or do we have it right? e.g. leadership of the profession, value of ANZASW membership/CPD/competency assessment for statutory registration, promotion of mandatory registration, management of complaints etc.

n.b. My membership of ANZASW ceased 6 years ago and I have never been a registered social worker.

howard.randal@xtra.co.nz
027 4542022
03 454 2255
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ETHICS APPROVAL, 27 June 2014
Dr P Walker
Department of Sociology, Gender and Social Work

Dear Dr Walker,

I am again writing to you concerning your proposal entitled “There’s a new kid on the block”, Ethics Committee reference number 14/104.

Thank you for providing your revised application in response to the Committee. You have clarified who your participants are and how they will be recruited. Thank you for initiating consultation with Ngai Tahu Research Consultation Committee. Thank you for amending the Information Sheet for Participants and Consent Form. These documents clearly advise that all participants will remain anonymous. We note that the interview is now expected to only be one hour.

On the basis of this response, I am pleased to confirm that the proposal now has full ethical approval to proceed.

Approval is for up to three years from the date of this letter. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, re-approval must be requested. If the nature, consent, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise me in writing.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Gary Witte
Manager, Academic Committees
Tel: 479 8256
Email: gary.witte@otago.ac.nz

C.C. Professor H R Campbell  Head  Department of Sociology, Gender and Social Work
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Ngāi Tahu CONSULTATION, 23 July 2014
Wednesday, 23 July 2014.

Mr Peter Walker,
Department of Sociology - Gender and Social Work,
DUNEDIN.

Tēnā Koe Mr Peter Walker,

There is a new kid on the block. How the introduction of statutory registration has changed the face of social work professionalism in Aotearoa New Zealand

The Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee (the committee) met on Tuesday, 22 July 2014 to discuss your research proposition.

By way of introduction, this response from The Committee is provided as part of the Memorandum of Understanding between Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and the University. In the statement of principles of the memorandum it states "Ngāi Tahu acknowledges that the consultation process outline in this policy provides no power of veto by Ngāi Tahu to research undertaken at the University of Otago". As such, this response is not "approval" or "mandate" for the research, rather it is a mandated response from a Ngāi Tahu appointed committee. This process is part of a number of requirements for researchers to undertake and does not cover other issues relating to ethics, including methodology they are separate requirements with other committees, for example the Human Ethics Committee, etc.

Within the context of the Policy for Research Consultation with Māori, the Committee base consultation on that defined by Justice McGechan:

"Consultation does not mean negotiation or agreement. It means: setting out a proposal not fully decided upon; adequately informing a party about relevant information upon which the proposal is based; listening to what the others have to say with an open mind (in that there is room to be persuaded against the proposal); undertaking that task in a genuine and not cosmetic manner. Reaching a decision that may or may not alter the original proposal."

The Committee considers the research to be of interest and importance.

As this study involves human participants, the Committee strongly encourage that ethnicity data be collected as part of the research project. That is the questions on self-identified ethnicity and descent, these questions are contained in the latest census.

The Committee suggests dissemination of the research findings to Māori health organisations regarding this study.

We wish you every success in your research and the committee also requests a copy of the research findings.
This letter of suggestion, recommendation and advice is current for an 18 month period from Tuesday, 22 July 2014 to 1 January 2016.

Nāhaku noa, nā

Mark Brunton
Kaiwhakahaere Rangahau Māori
Research Manager Māori
Research Division
Te Whare Wānanga o Otago
Ph: +64 3 479 8738
Email: mark.brunton@otago.ac.nz
Web: www.otago.ac.nz
### The Sampling Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Status 1996</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Membership Role</th>
<th>Other Work Setting</th>
<th>Primary Work Setting</th>
<th>Member SWRB?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A**</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mid Foundation</td>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B**</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>Tangata Whenua</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C**</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D**</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E**</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H***</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I**</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J**</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Membership Cohort</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Membership Status 1996</td>
<td>Membership Status 2014</td>
<td>ANZASW Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K*</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Past President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M*</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N*</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O**</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Past President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q*</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Past President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R*</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
* denotes interviewed in 1996 and 2014 (n=9)  
** denotes interviewed in 1996 only (n=6)  
*** denotes interviewed in 2014 only (n=4)
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PARTICIPANT’S INFORMATION SHEET
There’s a new kid on the block
How the introduction of statutory registration has changed the face of social work professionalism in Aotearoa New Zealand

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS or PARENTS / GUARDIANS ETC.

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?
The purpose of the research project is to examine and form an understanding of how the statutory registration of social workers was shaped and what have been the consequences for the social work profession as a result of statutory registration being introduced. The transition of social work in New Zealand from being a voluntarily self-regulated profession to becoming a statutorily regulated profession will be documented using data collected from respondents to form a view on this process.

The Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW) was established in 1964 and for nearly 40 years members of the Association debated the merits of statutory registration and its possible forms and processes. In 2003 the Social Workers Registration Act (SWR Act) was brought into law. This thesis will use a longitudinal design to examine the aspirations that a sample of members of ANZASW held for statutory registration and the extent to which these aspirations have been realised. In 1996, sixteen (16) ANZASW members were surveyed about their aspirations for statutory registration. Eighteen (18) years on, their reflections on the extent to which these aspirations were realised will be recorded and analysed. The formal submissions made by ANZASW to government will also be
analysed for its aspirational content and compared with the content and processes embodied in the Act and policies developed by the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB).

This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for Howard Randal to complete a Master of Social Work.

What Type of Participants are being sought?
Participants are being sought to undertake a recorded structured interview conducted by the student to reflect on what their aspirations had been for the introduction of statutory registration for social workers in New Zealand and the extent to which these aspirations have been realised.

Participants will be provided a copy of the transcript to review and correct. They will also be provided a final copy.

In the qualitative analysis of the data drawn from the transcript participants will not be identified or named.

As members of the profession under study in this research all participants will eventually have access to enable them to read the completed thesis.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to:

Be available to be interviewed by the student at a time and place mutually agreed in the participant’s city/town of residence. Approximately one (1) hour of time may be required for the interview.

There are no risks, discomforts or inconvenience indicated in participating other than the time required.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?

Raw data, in the form of a recorded interview and its subsequent transcription will be collected in audio, hard copy and digital form. The transcript will be subject to a qualitative analysis that will be used to inform the thesis. Personal information (gender, membership status, year of joining ANZASW, race) will be collected to form a profile of the sample.
No-one, other than the student, a transcriber and the supervisor will have access to the information being collected. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned below will be able to gain access to it. Data obtained as a result of the research will be retained for at least 5 years in secure storage. Any personal information held on the participants [such as contact details, audio or video tapes, after they have been transcribed etc.] may be destroyed at the completion of the research even though the data derived from the research will, in most cases, be kept for much longer or possibly indefinitely.

The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity.

The project involves both a structured and an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes questions related to the consequences you see that have arisen from the implementation of the SWR Act and whether your aspirations for ANZASW in respect of statutory registration been realised or not?

The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used. In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:- Howard Randal and Dr Peter Walker

Department of Sociology, Gender and Social Work

howard.randal@xtra.co.nz  peter.walker@otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256 or email gary.witte@otago.ac.nz). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Dear

I have enclosed the Information Sheet and Consent Form approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee for the purpose of data collection for my thesis. Thank you for intimating to me that you would be happy to consider being interviewed again for this. I would appreciate, after your consideration of the documents, if you would sign, date and return the consent form. Of course feel free to ask any questions and seek any further information about the proposal.

You will see that I propose to conduct a follow-up interview with you to the interview I conducted in 1996. At that time you may recall I sent you a copy of the transcript of that interview and you subsequently acknowledged you were happy with its content. I still hold a copy of the transcript and your acknowledgement of that interview. I’m proposing that you don’t directly refresh your memory of the original interview and that the follow-up interview be conducted afresh, as it were. That means that the two interviews be allowed to stand apart and the data I establish be allowed to respectively reflect what you said in 1996 and what you say in 2014. This approach accounts for the view that ‘there is good evidence that our recollections change in the course of remembering’ and ‘that reactivating a memory destabilizes it, leaving it vulnerable to change through a process he (Nader) called “reconsolidation”’ (Barusch, 2011). I trust you will be agreeable with this approach.

I have prepared a set of questions to guide my interview with you. Broadly, I’m interested to learn from you your views on how statutory registration has panned out.

I look forward to hearing back from you and confirmation of the opportunity to meet with you again soon.

Kind regards

Howard Randal
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Interview Questions, 1996

1. Have you had a chance to read my paper? If so, do you have any specific response to it as a whole or to anything particular within it?

2. Do you think social work in NZ should be subject to some form of occupational regulation? If so, for what reasons?

3. What kind of occupational regulation do you think should apply?
   a. that which is provided at present which places the main onus on those who employ social workers or social workers themselves through their voluntary association?
   b. statutory regulation through registration or licensure?
   c. some other form?

4. How would you suggest the form of occupational you propose being administered?
   a. by the government?
   b. by an independent body?
   c. by NZASW?
   d. through some other arrangement?

5. What parts of NZASW’s competency assessment process do you think should be retained in any formalised system of occupational regulation that may be instituted?

6. To what extent do you think the issues which surround registration need to be debated? How should this occur?

7. What do you ideally want to see for social work in the future?
APPENDIX 16

Interview Questions 2014

'There’s a new kid on the block’
How the introduction of statutory registration has changed the face of social work professionalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

1. What consequences do you see have arisen from the implementation of the SWR Act? (+ probes)
2. In what ways has the SWR Act and the SWRB had an impact on ANZASW?
3. In what areas have your aspirations for ANZASW in respect of statutory registration been realised?
4. In what areas have your aspirations for ANZASW in respect of statutory registration not been realised?
5. Has statutory registration and the subsequent role of the SWRB resulted in ANZASW becoming more/less empowered as a professional body?
6. Has statutory registration and the subsequent role of the SWRB resulted in ANZASW becoming more/less marginalised as a professional body?
7. Has the professionalism of social workers been advanced or diminished by the introduction of statutory registration?
8. Is the professionalism of social workers on the ascendancy or declining?
9. Is there anything else you would like to add?
APPENDIX 17

Questions for the Minister

Commitment of Government

1. What was the driving force behind the commitment of the government of the day to introduce legislation for the registration of social workers?

2. Judge Mick Brown's report ... was that a particular trigger?

Form of occupational regulation

3. Was there any specific model for occupational regulation that you recall was in mind when the legislation was prepared? Was there another professional body or occupation that you perhaps recall looking at or did you have an objective model out there, as it were?

Role of ANZASW

4. In terms of how the legislation was written, the professional body, which was ANZASW, was not named or specified in the legislation which left it then for the Board to set and manage approval processes for social work registration.

Consequences for social work

5. Do you still have some sort of cursory glance to social work in terms of thinking about how it's turned out? How the Act's turned out?

Consequences for the profession

6. Where does the profession end up as a consequence of the interplay with the Board

7. There are bits and pieces that the profession still needs to attend to from what you're saying?

Mandatory or voluntary

8. That would be the reason, would it not, behind it being a voluntary process initially at least?
Impediments

9. Social workers probably have to look at their discretionary dollar as to whether they need to be registered or whether they are able to be a member of the professional association as well.

Place of the Treaty

10. The lack of explicit acknowledgement of the Treaty …..do you have any background comment into that?

Social work and other professions and professionalisation

11. You’re clearly, I think, saying that there’s a greater autonomy, I guess, in respect of the traditional professions, shall we say, such as medicine and law which social workers have yet not really gained.

12. What do you think it would look like then if social workers reached that place? What would be the components you would expect to see so that social work then could truly identify itself as a profession? Are there some … what are the key elements?

13. So really a form of licensing rather than what it is at the moment?

Anything else

14. Is there anything else you want to share with me going back to that point when the legislation was formed?

15. So it was against the tide wasn't it?
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Questions for the Project Manager

1. What was the process for the preparation of the Consultation Document?
2. How was the preparatory work (Discussion paper etc) recorded?
3. What were some of the drivers to the registration of social workers?
4. Did any issues arise during the process?
5. How were sectors other than CYPS responding to the proposals?
6. What consultation occurred around the preparation of the Discussion paper?
7. How were the submissions to the Discussion paper managed?
8. Were there any fishhooks?
9. What process led to the law being drafted and tabled?
10. Why no specific recognition of ANZASW as the professional body?
11. What does that mean in terms of the profession?
12. And the Select Committee process?
13. And formation as a Crown Entity?
14. And the Parliamentary debates?
15. Anything else?
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#### Figure 5.2: The 1996 Interviews – summary of data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Template</th>
<th>Interview Responses</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The paper</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interview Responses</strong></td>
<td>( # of interviewees)</td>
<td>( # coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read it?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Themes coded from interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professionalisation of social work</td>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; professionalisation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Psych’ professions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ‘disabling split’</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation &amp; registration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The history of debate within the Association</td>
<td>The Association</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; its history</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; industrial representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value &amp; benefits of membership</td>
<td>&amp; membership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; biculturalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; competency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of competency assessment process</td>
<td>Review of competency assessment process</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prospect of statutory registration</td>
<td>The Association &amp; the prospect of registration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Views for registration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Views against registration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory registration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; professionalisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for registration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition of a Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The context of the current debate</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education &amp; training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; qualifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability &amp; standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complaints mechanism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYPS’s professionalisation strategy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power &amp; control</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflections on change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The political process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social work &amp; the future</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.3: The Association as *the kid on the block*
Plotting the data: Association Members 1996
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**Figure 5.5: The 2014 Interviews – summary of data analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>As coded</th>
<th>Sources (# of interviewees)</th>
<th>References (# coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The SWR Act 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and consequences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SWRB &amp; governance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as the new kid on the block</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on the Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations for</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not realised</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- realised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalisation of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; the SWRB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; other professions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The professionalisation of social work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; professionalism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- advancing, ascending?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalisation</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anything else?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- indigenous development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- practice standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopes of practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indemnity insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5.6: Statutory Registration - *the new kid on the block*
Plotting the data: Association Members 2014
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**APPENDIX 23**

Figure 5.8: The Minister & the Project Manager  
- summary of data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Template</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>As coded</th>
<th>Sources (# of interviewees)</th>
<th>References (# coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for the Act</strong></td>
<td>The workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionalise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>train</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The political context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The design</strong></td>
<td>Model of occupational regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The administrative process</strong></td>
<td>The Ministry of Social Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Association</strong></td>
<td>Its role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- place in legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- professionalisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Tiriti</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response &amp; reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to introduction of legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.9: Statutory registration - *the new kid on the block*
Plotting the data: The Minister & the Project Manager 2014
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### Figure 6.1: Summary of the Predominant Themes drawn from the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Minister</strong></td>
<td><strong>&amp; the Project Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis of the Association as the professional body</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debates</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ‘new kid on the block’</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professional tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consequences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professional identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership criteria</td>
<td>Competency assessment etc</td>
<td>for the Association</td>
<td><strong>Underlying reasons for the Act</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>for the profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy for/against registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Form of registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Te Tiriti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the state</td>
<td>Role of the state</td>
<td><strong>Professionalisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in the Association</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bicultural commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria for Qualifications &amp; training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria for registration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mandatory or not</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concluding comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria for Registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualifications &amp; training</strong></td>
<td>CYPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Concluding comments</strong></td>
<td>MoSP enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The future</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 6.2: Drawing on the Data to Illustrate the Theoretical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of vested interest</th>
<th>Data themes</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Theoretical stances, social, political &amp; legal processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Setting the scene</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>the kids on the block</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The profession</td>
<td>Genesis of the Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Bourdieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Members 1996</td>
<td>Institutional logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the State</td>
<td>Political context</td>
<td>The Minister</td>
<td>Neo liberalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional identity</td>
<td>The Project Manager</td>
<td>New managerialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPS/CYFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Identifying the sources of authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>the rules of the game</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The profession</td>
<td>Professional tools</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For/against registration</td>
<td>Members 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td>Underlying reasons</td>
<td>The Minister</td>
<td>Occupational regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of vested interest</td>
<td>Data themes</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Theoretical stances social, political &amp; legal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating the structure</td>
<td>The profession</td>
<td>Forms of registration</td>
<td>Association Members 1996 Members 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the new kid on the block</td>
<td>Criteria for</td>
<td>Members 1996 Members 2014</td>
<td>Occupational regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td>MoSP enactment</td>
<td>The Minister The Project Manager</td>
<td>Governmentality Biopower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Reflecting on the outcomes  
how the rules of the new game apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The profession</th>
<th>Consequences for the Association/profession</th>
<th>Association Members 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘stateholders’</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>The Minister The Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### APPENDIX 27

**Figure 6.1.2: The kids on the block revisited (after Bourdieu, (Emirbayer, 2005))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The kids on the block</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social space - a set of relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tokens of power as constituted through</strong></td>
<td><strong>Competing sense of common belief through</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sense of place the block</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Govt. social workers</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>NGO social workers</td>
<td>International affiliation</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Private practitioners</td>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key stakeholders</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Community workers</td>
<td>Competency standards</td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>S R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>Tangata Whenua</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>o e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>c g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biculturalism</td>
<td>l i Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>a s u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Ministries</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>- government</td>
<td>Statutory power</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>l t a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Departments</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>- opposition</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>e l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Government outcomes</td>
<td>Political power</td>
<td>W r i C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘stateholders’</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>Funding contracts</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>o e f o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r d l m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k e p A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>d e c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training providers</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>P t c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>r e o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educators</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>o n u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘Public’</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>s a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids as</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>s b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recipients</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Social service agencies</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>i l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>o e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crown Entity</td>
<td>The Act - the Register</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new kid as</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>Practice standards</td>
<td>Reports &amp; reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Course approval</td>
<td>Statutory accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 28

### Tariff of risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- relatively safe service</td>
<td>- potentially unsafe service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary self-regulation</td>
<td>Statutory regulation/licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self imposed codes of conduct &amp; standards</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self monitoring</td>
<td>- disclosure of information re service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ownership of complaints &amp; disciplinary processes</td>
<td>- registration of professional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- licensure of entry to the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- certification of professional title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least public intervention/scrutiny > Most public intervention/scrutiny

Most professional autonomy > Reduced professional autonomy

- self imposed codes of conduct & standards
- self monitoring
- ownership of complaints & disciplinary processes

Trust in professional judgement > Trust in public judgement

Cost to professional service > High cost to public purse

Flexible > Less flexible

- public standing within own hands
- freedom to promote & market
- accountability to a third party
- promotion & marketing subject to regulation or profession’s guidelines

**Note:** The professions of Medicine, Law, Engineering and Accountancy are granted self-regulation under legislative provision, combining both lower tariff and higher tariff provisions, that is, higher regard for professional autonomy under statutory registration or licensing regime.
APPENDIX 29

Seven Key Questions

• Should there be a registration system for social workers in New Zealand?
• Which system is best suited for the social work occupation?
• Which categories of social workers should the registration system cover?
• What should be the function, form and composition of the Registration Board?
• What criteria should be used to assess a social worker’s eligibility for registration?
• How could the registration system best meet the needs of Māori and Pacific social workers and clients?
• What sanctions should apply to social workers who are found to be in breach of the code of conduct?

(MoSP, 2000, p. ii)