

Now published as: Beddoe, L., & Harington, P. (2015). Social work Aotearoa New Zealand: Social policy, risk and professionalisation. In G. Palattiyil, D. Sidhva & M. Chakrabarti (Eds.), *Social Work in a Global Context: Issues and Challenges* (pp. 27-38). London: Routledge

Social Work in Aotearoa New Zealand: Social Policy, Risk and Professionalization

Liz Beddoe and Phil Harington

Introduction

New Zealand social work shares with other countries many of the challenges to identity and autonomy in a mixed welfare system. Social workers work in statutory child welfare services, public health services, youth justice and corrections and in a very broad range of services delivered by non-government organizations, many in partnership with state ministries. New Zealand is a former British colony and is in the Commonwealth. It has a Westminster style government and has had coalition governments under a mixed-member proportional voting system since 1993. New Zealand is a small country experiencing growing ethnic diversity, especially in the North Island and the region of Auckland.

Staniforth, Fouché and O'Brien noted, 'One of the defining features of social work is that it sits within the social context in which it is practised' (Staniforth et al. 2011: 196). Thus, while subject to many global influences, social work in New Zealand has its own unique history and character, having developed from colonial models of welfare, but with increasing impact of indigenous traditions (Nash 2009, Ruwhiu 2009). Social work is a relatively young profession in New Zealand. The first university-based educational preparation began in 1949, and the professional association, the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW), was formed in 1964 (Nash 2009). In 2011, less than half of an estimated 6,000 social workers were registered in New Zealand under a limited system of voluntary registration, based on legislation enacted in 2003 (Beddoe and Duke 2009). The precise size of the social work qualified workforce is difficult to obtain, as there is a limited system of regulation without 'protection of title' and thus people who would not be eligible for registration can describe themselves as social workers.

In a complex local context, moves to strengthen expertise in an increasingly risk-averse climate and a continuing commitment to bicultural practice (incorporating Maori and Western models) have engaged New Zealand social work in a challenging professional project, the preoccupation of the profession with its education, social standing and regulation of its territory. For an increasingly global profession, international issues of risk, contested claims to professional expertise, globalization and indigenization have their local resonances in social work. The profession in New Zealand has been slow to move towards registration, in large part because professionalism was frequently associated with elitism (Beddoe 2007, Beddoe and Randal 1994). In a prolonged debate during the 1980s and 1990s, calls for regulation and educational benchmarks were perceived as acts of occupational closure and seen as antithetical to local aspirations that more Maori, Pacific Islander and working class people would enter the profession. Decisions about levels of education for social work were caught up in debates that seemed to remain unresolved (Nash and Munford 2001), although with every passing decade the professionalization project gained momentum.

By the turn of the 21st century, the call for regulation strengthened; over the period 2001-2003 the profession gained the support of government, and regulation was introduced in 2003 (Beddoe and Duke 2009). In large part, the relative ease with which regulation was established was a consequence of a government mindful of increasing public concern over high levels of child abuse, family and community violence and social dislocation. Continuing public demand for action on child abuse created new challenges for policy makers and social workers. At a time when social work was building its case for greater professional status, the demand for practitioners to gain those credentials that signify expertise and scholarship became more acute (Nash and Munford 2001). Starting from these observations, this chapter will endeavour to explore how local and global forces have shaped the professionalization of New Zealand social work.

Social Work and Professionalization

In the last three decades, scholars have renewed long-standing debates about the nature of professions. Earlier trait models, in which the characteristics of professions are defined and enumerated (for example, Flexner 1915, Greenwood 1957) have been replaced by concern

with process and power relations (for example, Johnson 1972). Much literature focuses on the major themes such as the impact of ‘neo-liberal politics and welfare state reforms’ drawing professional services into organizational settings (Noordegraaf 2011: 1350); the impact of public failures in producing risk-averse environments where trust is lessened (Giddens 1999, O’Neill 2002); and significantly, the challenges to professional autonomy via the management of professionals (Noordegraaf and Schinkel 2011).

While other professions were regulated much earlier, social work has struggled with both the internal and external conditions that would facilitate complete occupational closure, although many countries have developed systems of licensing and regulation over recent decades. Based on different theorizations of professions, several possible explanations for social work’s position can be offered: (1) gender and power constraints on social workers’ ability to influence lawmakers; (2) social workers’ qualms about the politics of professionalizing; (3) the lack of a clearly articulated and particular body of knowledge; and lastly, (4) the associated low levels of autonomy within highly managerial public service environments. This state of affairs may have lasted for many more decades but for the changes in the public sector brought about through the ‘audit culture’ (Power 1997), in which governments faced a crisis of trust in the professions. In spite of the marginalized nature of social work, by the turn of the century the importance to governments to at least be seen to be ‘doing something’ about ensuring high standards for public services outweighed any concerns about adding to the number of occupations able to professionalize. In the ‘risk society’ (Beck 1992, Giddens 1999) social work needed to be subject to regulatory scrutiny. For social workers (political patronage aside) the professional project was inextricably enmeshed with aspirations to greater power and control. This unhappy prospect of diminished government and public confidence is often intensified when applied to social work, despite practice traditionally being located in highly managed organizational contexts since the very beginnings of the welfare state. Social work (perhaps alongside teaching) suffers more than other professions from the fate of being at the mercy of fickle government policy. Social work is particularly influenced by policy forged within the risk society (Kemshall 2002, Webb 2005) as uncertainty and anxiety nibble at its confidence. It is vulnerable to diminished autonomy (Powell and Gilbert 2007) and increasingly controlled via technologies of practice (Garrett 2005). Governments are perhaps less inclined to let the social work profession manage its own education and standards. Education for social work was and remains an area of

contestation (Nash and Munford 2001), and in New Zealand as elsewhere concerns about child protection failures drove government action on the regulation of social work to reduce risk (Beddoe 2007).

The focus on risk is fairly central to the ideology of welfare. Management practices shaped by government expectations have seen social work influenced by the discourses of the risk society. In New Zealand as elsewhere, there was a shift to surveillance and targeting schemes that screen vulnerable categories of people in order to pinpoint application of service. Stanley (2007) describes three distinct periods where 'risk' in social work is characterised in different ways. Stanley suggests that in the 1970s, risk 'entered the official discourse of child protection, and social workers were increasingly expected to diagnose and identify risks for particular children and families' (2007: 165). During the last two decades of the 20th century, technological solutions were sought and 'increasingly proceduralized models of practice were introduced to help social workers manage the uncertainty and ambiguity associated with assessment work' and thus risk assessment was employed to organise and determine services provided (Stanley 2007:165). In the current era, there is a shift away from the third risk discourse, which Stanley argued legitimised an approach where there was less emphasis on relationship in the assessment process (2007:166). The critique of such defensive practice is summed up clearly by Dominelli, who argues that 'risk management involves regulation not only of the client, but also of the worker' (Dominelli 2004: 118). Perhaps a fourth discourse acknowledges our anxiety about risk but recognizes that losing the importance of relationship hinders effective responses to vulnerable people (Ruch 2012). What then has been the New Zealand social work experience within this challenging international climate for social work?

Social Policy and Social Work in New Zealand

The journey of social work cannot be separated from the political history in any national context. Decades of political change in New Zealand saw social welfare segue to a social development approach committed to foster greater social participation. Changes in government in New Zealand (and the shift to a mixed-member proportional electoral system (Elections New Zealand 2015) and policy efforts to foster 'social participation' in response to high levels of abuse, violence and social dislocation have created challenges and demands on social service practitioners over the last two decades. At the turn of the century a Labour led government won office, running on a platform of a small increase in taxes for the wealthy,

the re-nationalization of a core government agency, a return of rights to unions to operate in the labour market, and a commitment to engage with social services and communities of need on the basis of contractual partnerships. These measures have readily been characterised as ‘Third Way’ strategies between full state provision of welfare and a neo-liberal market model of provision (Craig 2006). The focus on community partnerships can be read as first steps in an effort to reconstruct a progressive, centre Left tradition to social policy, while eschewing a return to big government and universalism. To form a stable government, Labour embraced the policy preferences of smaller parties to form a coalition able to look to ‘confidence and supply’.

The emergent social policy became known as the ‘Social Development’ approach and forms the background against which this discussion of professionalism within New Zealand social work takes place. The new government set off with a series of initiatives aimed at cultivating a new contract with the community while maintaining the confidence of markets with stable monetary and fiscal policy. The new public management approach gained considerable momentum and Treasury policy favoured ‘organisational efficiency and effectiveness’ (Boston et al. 1991: ix) with diminished public provision of services. This was tempered by the very real and long standing claims by Maori, women, and those whose economic hardship was caused by the blunt impact of deregulation and privatization. Social workers were challenged to stay close to calls for social justice in a changing professional environment (O’Brien 2005). While there were political twists and turns over the next decade, Labour held office in various combinations of coalition partners with a broad social development consensus. Labour lost office in 2008 to a conservative coalition led by the National party, which began its second term in 2012.

The demand for greater confidence in the performance of social services, invariably at less cost, has continued. Simultaneously, communities have been encouraged to have greater input in determining the services that will apply to their circumstances. There is tension between strengthening the dependability of professional practice and at the same time cultivating the impression that community capacity can be activated via lay and local input. A further unique feature of New Zealand is social policy designed to liberate indigenous practices in a response to the claims and rights of Maori (Walker 2004). New Zealand was one of the last outposts of an empire built on colonizing the indigenous people and

appropriation of land sought for agriculture. That history, symbolized in the Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840 between Maori and the Governor acting as an agent of the Crown, had given expression to the view of partnership soon to be denied in the realpolitik that followed. A renaissance of Maori autonomy, stemming from the 1987 High Court declaration, which clarified state obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi (Baragwanath 2007), required the state to honour the long-neglected commitment to protect the rights of Maori. Significant support for Maori initiatives led to devolution of services to Maori tribal bodies and other communities (Walker 2004). The intention was to restore traditional community bonds and build safer lives for children and young people, and the rhetoric was grounded in issues of identity and cultural recognition.

New Zealand social services policy in the first decade of the new century could thus be viewed as a trade-off between two distinct discourses: partnerships at the community level and professionalization of social workers. The partnerships discourse seeks to reduce the distance between state agencies and communities willing to take responsibility for their own challenges. For such partnerships to be effective, governance must be cognizant of issues of trust and control (Walker 2007). In this effort, social work and social policy were aligned by supporting the embedding of practice in the traditions of the communities where services are applied. These policies conveyed the notion that practice can be inappropriate if constructed as merely the imposition of the will of the state, without the engagement of those communities deemed vulnerable. It thus demonstrates less than full confidence in a professional model. The partnership rhetoric in practice, however, was not without significant tensions. Walker notes that in the approaches developed during the early part of the 2000s, 'power imbalances between the players that lead to domination under the contract model might well still be present' (2004: 166). State agencies retained significant powers external to the partnerships 'to define who the target groups were...[and] what services were relevant' and to determine the qualifications and experience required of those working in Maori welfare organizations (Walker 2004:166).

The second discourse is that of professionalization. While the partnerships narrative suggests many elements that can be recognized as part of the de-professionalization thesis (Healy and Meagher 2004), in the midst of the effort to reconstruct the relationship between the state and community, the government introduced legislation to define social work as a registered

profession (Beddoe 2007). In a period when there was stringent oversight of social service costs, the government committed resources into framing the professionalism of social work, especially in the non-government sector, where funds were made available to expand participation in social work education. The Social Workers Registration Act of 2003 introduced a system of voluntary registration, motivated in part by the political imperative to answer mounting criticism of state sector social work and its failure to prevent child abuse deaths. The Act requires the social work registration board (SWRB) to establish a schedule of recognized New Zealand social work qualifications for purposes of registration. The SWRB decided that from 2006, a Bachelor's level degree in social work would be required (Social Workers Registration Board [SWRB] 2012).

When looking back from some distance, it seems entirely plausible that improving the services to communities would also lead to moves to strengthen the workforce. The first point to note here is that the pervading socio-political climate was making this relationship take a particular form. In the new political construction of the 'third way', the drive was to disaggregate generic and universalistic notions of service so that new approaches could be created which valued diversity, rapport and targeting (Walker 2007). The New Zealand government responded both to the global trend to reform the state in a neo-liberal vein and also appreciated the shift to greater regulation of social work in other jurisdictions (Orme and Rennie 2006). Social work in the New Zealand setting had itself been engaged in its own professionalization project, and despite considerable resistance to professional status (Beddoe and Randal 1994), there had been a willingness to form a unique stance on what may constitute professionalism in the New Zealand context (Nash 2009).

The social work profession in post-colonial societies faces compelling arguments to indigenize practice and teaching (Briskman 2007, Coates et al. 2006). Tensions occur between a traditional professional model characterised by the drive for 'scientific' practice and the call from indigenous people to make space for culturally and spiritually derived practices (Coates et al. 2006, Passells 2006). Webb has argued that for all the rhetoric about global social work, the promotion of relationships at the level of 'local cultural practice' (2005:202) is social work strength. In New Zealand social work has experienced strains between the push for practice and education to become more indigenous in order to better serve local service users, and the pull to prepare graduates for the growing global labour

market (Beddoe 2007). Ruwhiu (2009) argues that bicultural practice in New Zealand must understand and implement three significant recognition points in order to fully support the aspirations of Maori people, who are generally most adversely affected by health disparities and social inequalities (Ruwhiu 2009: 107). The first recognition point is the significance of the history of colonization in New Zealand and the impact on Maori rights, well-being and socioeconomic status. The second recognition point is the strength of narratives, stories and cultural practices of indigenous people considered alongside the colonial narratives of 'displacement, discontinuity and cultural oppression' (Ruwhiu 2009: 113). The third recognition point asks for bicultural social work to understand and incorporate Maori concepts of well-being, which are multifaceted and include spiritual, physical, psychological, philosophical, relational and political aspects of worldview and the cultural practices and customs that support these aspects of humanity).

In New Zealand, these dimensions of identity and recognition have led to significant change in practice. They require a reconciliation of Western individualist perspectives and the more collectivist worldviews of indigenous people. The ANZASW Code of Ethics, for example, while inclusive of international principles, addresses the tensions between these paradigms by having two sections. The first is the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) Code of ethics, and the second is a Code of Bicultural Practice, unique to New Zealand (ANZASW 2008). In two significant respects, the Bicultural Code of Practice extends the codification of indigenous rights further than most codes. The first is an explicit requirement to acknowledge and engage with extended family as the primary source of care and nurturing of individuals. The second extension of an indigenous rights perspective into professional ethics is the assertion of the rights of Maori service users to have access to Maori social workers. Thus, the code has taken an explicit stance in relation to indigenous rights and rejected the generalization of individual self-determination that is frequently central to the Western perspective.

Professionalization and Social Justice

Social work in New Zealand continues in its journey to professionalize. The results of a consultation in 2012 suggested that mandatory registration of all social workers; with

‘protection of title’ had considerable support (SWRB 2012). Of the 422 submission received, 95% were in support of moving to mandatory registration, with only 5% submissions supporting the continuation of the current system, under which most government-employed social workers are registered, but registration remains voluntary in the non-governmental sector. Most commonly cited benefits of registration are: compulsory minimum standards, accountability and qualification levels for all social workers; improved social work practice as practitioners meet, maintain and develop standards; and greater protection for vulnerable people by minimizing the risk of poor social work practice (SWRB 2012). In spite of this strong support the New Zealand government decided not to pursue comprehensive mandatory registration and protection of title, with a major report citing concerns about ‘possible negative consequences of mandatory registration include the financial costs involved, the reduction in the social work workforce, and the possibility that people will change job titles to avoid registration’ (Ministry of Social Development 2012:148).

The debates about registration continue, despite this support. In New Zealand there has been concern that preoccupation with professionalization has had an adverse effect on the mission of social work to work for social justice. Professional associations, being located in civil society and driven by their membership, are often thought to enable greater social activism. O’Brien (2005) in New Zealand and Gillingham (2007) in Australia both noted that in the first decade of the 21st century, professional associations’ activities reflected preoccupation with structure and governance. Membership activity has been more focused on improving the public position of the profession and “achieving professional legitimacy”, (O’Brien 2005:17). Both commentators also suggest that professionalization does not automatically mean diminished public advocacy; rather they suggest that greater legitimacy can be applied to a strong public voice in partnership with groups disadvantaged by structural inequality, poverty and marginalization. The moral imperative remains in the codified tenets of the profession.

Traditionally, social work in former colonies has derived much of its values and principles, theories and practices from the United Kingdom and the United States. Until the 1990s, New Zealand social work was taught largely from overseas texts. New Zealand social work, as a member of the IFSW, adheres to the international definition, although this is currently under review (IFSW 2000). Staniforth et al. note that there is pressure to move away from attempts to have one global definition but to develop ‘strengths based non-exclusively on Western perspectives that recognize the importance of local and indigenous cultures’ (Staniforth et al.

2011: 196). More recently, a growing literature and increasing links with Australian social work, along with the writings of indigenous and Pacific scholars has led to the growth of more local perspectives, echoing the call to keep 'global' social work in perspective and not accept uncritically the claims for a global profession (Webb 2003). These trends to develop the local will expand; however, the fundamental commitment to human rights and social justice continues to underpin social work in countries like Australia and New Zealand.

The struggle of indigenous people in Australasia has kept some degree of social work focus on structural inequalities, in spite of an avalanche of risk-focused individualising discourses. As elsewhere, most social workers often struggle to articulate 'doing' social justice work, given their location in managerially dominated contexts. This begs the question: are social workers doing what they say they do in the public statements of their mission? Staniforth et al. (2011) report on the analysis of more than 300 responses from social workers in New Zealand to the question 'what is your definition of social work?' In this study, 53% of respondents indicated that 'the aspect of helping individuals, groups or families to change' formed part of their definition, while 27 % of respondents reported 'social change' as part of their definition (Staniforth et al. 2011: 202). Staniforth et al. suggest that results may also be 'at odds with the current IFSW definition that places social change at the forefront of social work's core business' (Staniforth et al. 2011: 202). In order to explore social justice in the everyday work of social workers, two recent studies in Australasia have explored the way social workers constructed and defined their practice with a view to understanding where social justice ideals fit.

In the first example, O'Brien (2009) asked New Zealand social workers about their definition of social justice, the factors which had shaped their thinking about and approach to social justice and the current social justice priorities affecting practice (2009:4). The practitioners in O'Brien's study gave examples of social justice underpinning practice actions, though he notes this was almost entirely about 'individual actions aimed at more socially just outcomes and experiences for users' (2009:9). Only occasionally did the data provide examples of actions aimed at 'broad structural levels around issues of redistribution and recognition and respect' (O'Brien 2009: 9). It was notable from this research that social workers who participated in the study retained a clear expression of a social justice orientation, while their

actions focussed on the individual worlds of service users, rather than at the structural level. Thus O'Brien notes that reports of the 'death of social justice in social work' are premature; 'social justice is in fact alive in the work of these practitioners' though not at the level of structured social action (O'Brien 2011:177).

In a second study carried out in Australia, Zuffery interviewed 39 social workers from diverse settings who were known to work with homeless people and asked them about the 'unique contributions' that social workers could make in the homelessness field and what were the 'tension and dilemmas' faced in their practice in this field (2011: 9). Zuffery was interested in how social workers constructed their professional identities in this context. The main themes emerging from her study were that social workers struggled to define the 'contribution of social work as a profession independent of organizational contexts' and struggled with the profound influence of 'tensions created by managerialist organizational processes' (Zuffery 2012: 518). Zuffery found that a critical social work knowledge base enabled resistance to 'dominant managerial and individualist practices'. She also found individual examples of workers resisting managerialist domination and use of 'merged individualist and collective approaches' in their advocacy for homeless people (Zuffery 2012:525).

Conclusions

In a very brief review of social work in New Zealand, there are mixed conclusions. On the one hand, there are strong signals of a commitment to social justice in respect to the rights and aspirations of Maori people: bicultural practice is embedded in professional and educational requirements. On the other hand, patterns of employment and the perpetuation of a persistent managerial environment in social services seem to engage social workers in a never-ending struggle to rise above a preoccupation with delivering the services that governments are prepared to fund. Such services increasingly focus on targeted 'at risk' populations, with little attention paid to the impact of poverty and marginalization. Social workers' voices seem muted in the public realm. And yet in everyday practice, the analysis of

injustice and the stubborn determination of social workers to get fair treatment for users of services remains a powerful motivating force in New Zealand social work.

References:

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (2008) Code of Ethics and Bicultural Code of Practice (reprinted, first 1997 ed.). Christchurch: ANZASW.

*Baragwanath, D. (2007) 'New Zealand Maori Council V Attorney-General [1987] 1 NZLR 687: A perspective of counsel'. Paper at the 'In Good Faith Symposium', University of Otago, 29 June 2007. Available from <
<http://www.otago.ac.nz/law/conferences/otago037106.html>> (accessed 29 July 2013).*

Beck, U. (1992) Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, London: Sage.

Beddoe, L. (2007) 'Change, complexity and challenge in social work education in Aotearoa New Zealand', Australian Social Work, 60(1): 46–55.

Beddoe, L., and Duke, J. (2009) 'Registration in New Zealand social work: The challenge of change', International Social Work, 52(6): 785–97.

Beddoe, L. and Randal, H. (1994) 'NZASW and the professional response to a decade of challenge', in R. Munford and M. Nash (eds.), Social Work in action, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallott, J. and Walsh, P. (eds.) (1991) Reshaping the State: New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution. Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Briskman, L. (2007) Social Work with Indigenous Communities, Sydney: Federation Press.

Coates, J., Gray, M., and Hetherington, T. (2006) 'An "Ecospiritual" perspective: finally a place for indigenous approaches', British Journal of Social Work, 36(3): 381–99.

Craig, D. (2006) 'Community wellbeing strategy and the legacies of new institutionalism and new Public Management in third way New Zealand', in L. Bauld, K. Clarke, and T. Maltby (eds.) Social Policy Review 18, Bristol: Policy Press

- Dominelli, L. (2004) Social Work: Theory and Practice for a Changing Profession. Cambridge: Polity Press.*
- Elections New Zealand (2015) New Zealand Voting System. New Zealand Government. <http://www.elections.org.nz/voting-system> (accessed 30 April, 2015)*
- Flexner, A. (1915, reprint 2001) "Is Social Work a profession?" Research on Social Work Practice, 11(2): 152–65.*
- Garrett, P. M. (2005) 'Social work's "electronic turn": Notes on the deployment of information and communication technologies in social work with children and families', Critical Social Policy, 25(4): 529–53.*
- Giddens, A. (1999) 'Risk and responsibility', Modern Law Review, 62(1): 1-10.*
- Gillingham, P. (2007) 'The Australian Association of Social Workers and the social policy debates: A strategy for the future?' Australian Social Work, 60(2): 166–80.*
- Greenwood, E. (1957) 'Attributes of a profession', Social Work, 2(3): 45–55.*
- Healy, K., and Meagher, G. (2004) 'The reprofessionalization of social work: Collaborative approaches for achieving professional recognition', British Journal of Social Work, 34(2): 243–60.*
- International Federation of Social Workers (2000) Definition of Social Work. Online. Available: <<http://ifsw.org/resources/definition-of-social-work/>> (accessed 8 April 2012).*
- Johnson, T. (1972) Professions and Power, Basingstoke: Macmillan.*
- Kemshall, H. (2002) Risk, Social Policy and Welfare, Buckingham: Open University Press.*
- Ministry of Social Development (2012). White Paper on Vulnerable Children Volume 2. Ministry of Social Development, New Zealand Government: Wellington, NZ*
- Nash, M. (2009) 'Histories of the social work profession' in M. Connolly and L. Harms (eds.), Social Work: Contexts and Practice, 2nd edn, Melbourne: Oxford.*
- Nash, M., and Munford, R. (2001) 'Unresolved struggles: Educating social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand', Social Work Education, 20(1): 21–34.*

Noordegraaf, M. (2011) 'Risky business: how professionals and professional fields (must) deal with organizational issues', *Organization Studies*, 32(10): 1349–71.

Noordegraaf, M., and Schinkel, W. (2011) 'Professional capital contested: A Bourdieusian analysis of conflicts between professionals and managers', *Comparative Sociology*, 10(1): 97–125.

O'Brien, M. (2005) 'A just profession or just a profession', *Social Work Review*, 17(1): 13–22.

—(2009) 'Social work and the practice of social justice: An initial overview', *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 21(1&2), 3–10.

—(2011) 'Social justice: Alive and well (partly) in social work practice?' *International Social Work*, 54(2): 174–90.

O'Neill, O. (2002) *A Question of Trust*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orme, J. and Rennie, G. (2006) 'The role of registration in ensuring ethical practice', *International Social Work*, 49(3): 333–44.

Passells, V. (2006) 'Pasifika location and privilege: conceptual frameworks from first year Pasifika social work students', *Aotearoa Social Work Review (Tu Mau II)*, 18(1): 14–21.

Powell, J. L., and Gilbert, T. (2007) 'Performativity and helping professions: social theory, power and practice', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 16(3): 193–201.

Power, M. (1997) *The Audit Society: Rituals of verification*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ruch, G. (2012) 'Where have all the feelings gone? Developing reflective and relationship-based management in child-care social work', *British Journal of Social Work*, 42(7): 1315–32.

Ruwhiu, L. (2009) 'Indigenous issues in Aotearoa New Zealand', in M. Connolly and L. Harms (eds.), *Social Work: Contexts and Practice*, 2nd edn, Melbourne: Oxford.

Social Workers Registration Board (2012) *Mandatory Social Worker Registration: A Discussion Paper*, Online. Available <<http://www.swrb.govt.nz/news-and-publications/publications>> (accessed 31 August 2013).

Staniforth, B., Fouché, C., and O'Brien, M. (2011) 'Still doing what we do: Defining social work in the 21st century', *Journal of Social Work*, 11(2): 191–208.

Stanley, T. (2007) 'Risky work: child protection practice', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 30: 163–77.

Walker, P. (2004) 'Partnership models within a Maori social-service provider', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 13(2): 158–69.

——(2007) 'Trust, risk and control within an indigenous–non-indigenous social service partnership' *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 16(3): 281–90.

Webb, S. (2003) 'Local orders and global chaos in social work', *European Journal of Social Work*, 6(2): 191–204.

Webb, S. (2005) *Social Work in a Risk Society: Social and Political Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zufferey, C. (2012) "'Jack of all trades, master of none?" Social work identity and homelessness in Australian cities', *Journal of Social Work*, 12(5): 510–527.