A DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE FOR NEW ZEALAND

C. Bagnall

1968

A DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE

FOR NEW ZEALAND

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I am arguing a case for unification of the State social work services. These services are found scattered among the Child Welfare Division of the Department of Education, the Welfare Division of the Department of Maori and Island Affairs, the Departments of Health, Social Security, Justice and Education and Hospital Boards. The Department of Education also provides supporting and specialist services such as the Psychological Service.

Throughout, my intention is to remind the reader that the social services exist for the citizen, for the community and not for bureaucratic or professional reasons. It is only from this point of view that one can begin an enquiry into the structure of the services. Are the services, in their present form, fulfilling their major functions? Are the values that lie behind the provision of such services reaching the consumers or are they being distorted and repressed? What is the effect of the present services on the consumer in terms of these values and goals?

I devote considerable space in the first two sections to discussing the concept of Social Welfare and delineating the area of the social services which I consider to be the province and reason for the social work aspects of these services. I endeavour to show that, despite the tradional bias of New Zealand welfare towards material security and the relative paucity of the present social work services, both in size and depth of philosophic and scientific foundation, that we have given social work a rather special and growing place in the provision of welfare. This growth of social welfare has been on a pragmatic, ad hoc basis and while this has resulted in some good features the growing complexity is becoming disfunctional and the original aims are being lost sight of.

In section three I give an outline of the provision of social welfare by several government departments and boards, concentrating on the social work and monetary aid services. It will become apparent that these two aspects of social welfare provision are inextricably bound together if the consumer of the services is to be kept in mind. Throughout the section I endeavour to show the overlapping and duplicate nature and the consequent disfunction of these services and suggest what might be the case with alternative administrative arrangements of the services.

Before putting forward concrete proposals for a Department of Social Welfare in section five, the various possibilities of cooperation and coordination are discussed. It is felt that more radical changes are necessary rather than further attempts to improve matters through the formation of more coordinating committees. Even with the unification of some social welfare services there will still be the need for cooperation with other agencies and departments but the attempts to provide an integrated system should be built into a more rational structure than exists at present.

The proposals for the Social Welfare Department given in section five tie together some of the loose ends of section three. Reasons for combining social work and monetary services are advanced and some other benefits that would arise from the unification of the services are mentioned.

The final section raises a few of the points to be considered when combining the numerous personnel required to provide the service, so that the original goals may remain to the fore. Few answers are given although some tentative suggestions are made. The need for wide revision of the legislation is not discussed as it is felt this should be part of a further analysis covering more deeply the problems raised during this section.

With these qualifications it is hoped that need for revision along the lines suggested is seen as a realistic and necessary proposal.

C. G. Bagnall

October, 1968

SOCIAL WELFARE, THE BEGINNINGS

The idea of a Social Welfare Department has been around with us for many years now. As each new proposal is advanced the conception of what such an organisation would look like naturally changes until now it is possible to speak to half a dozen different social workers or social service administrators and each will have a different picture of what this means, have different fears for his own position and possibly that of his clients. In other words the multitude of hazy definitions and feelings about it is going to complicate any discussion I might start again on this question. I will not be able to remove all the mist from my point of view in this section but I hope by the end of the paper that you will have a clearer idea of my ideas and proposals. To put some focus on these I do need to delineate roughly what I mean by 'social welfare'. It will be seen that however much factual research can contribute to the understanding for the need or otherwise for a Social Welfare Department these facts must rest on value assumptions made by us as to the place of the individual in society.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary definition of welfare is 'a satisfactory state of health, prosperity and well being'. Often in general usage welfare appears to be separated from wealth and we have a distinction between wealth and welfare. And from some points of view welfare is achieved by consumption of goods and services which money buys and provides (24). Is welfare, then, to be measured in terms of happiness to which a state of health and general prosperity contribute? I feel this is somewhere near the mark but of course the contributing factors are far more numerous than the two noted. At least they appear to be today and this appearance may to a certain extent help to explain the concept of the

Welfare State. A concept it will be useful to look at now because of my implicit assumption that the State is able to assist in the general well being of the people and groups of people it represents.

The sixteenth century in England saw the beginnings of the modern day recognition that not all people were able to provide for themselves all the time. The reasons for this deficiency were variously placed and there grew up the idea of the deserving and undeserving poor. At this stage most communities were agricultural and charity provided for the gaps in the social setting contributing to a person's or family's illfare. It is important to note that help at this stage was family based. With the move from country to town a break away from helping the family to helping the individual began. The persons or family welfare was still measured in terms of health and prosperity.

The nineteenth century saw a second wave of change in the conception of welfare. Dissatisfaction with the Poor Laws grew and continued into the twentieth century with increasing pressure for action. A gradual change in values had meant dissatisfactions were seen and society was not now meeting the general aims and goals. Feelings about misallocation of resources and the reasons behind this and the ways of correcting it were advanced. Real poverty had been experienced and serious dissatisfactions with Poor Law philosophy which had been partly based on the need to save for times of need, was felt because it was an impossibility to save on the level of wages being paid. The wealthy side of society did not see the poor side of society until several surveys of working conditions were published. This was in England. In New Zealand we started with a different heritage in that we had a population of lower middle and lower class workers endeavouring to escape the poor law and work-house conditions or the prospects of these. New Zealand was to be their utopia and from the start

there was more agitation among the New Zealand working population for satisfactory living conditions. New Zealand never went through the lengths or intensive rounds of charity care partly for this reason. Also there was not the same large wealthy group to provide the charitable support necessary to help unemployed or ill persons. It is thus in 1867 that we saw the Auckland Provincial Council making provision for unemployment relief by taking 'tax' from workers' wages (52).

It is in these governmental acts, both local and central, that we see the beginnings of attempts to aid dissatisfaction with the way society was meeting its aims. These were gap filling activities and we have, in these acts, the beginning of a Welfare State. Welfare as far as health and wealth go. The State was meeting the need because no one else would satisfactorily.

Virtually simultaneously we had a reawakening of the value of people as people. John Howard, Elizabeth Fry, Florence Nightingale, Octavia Hill, Lord Shaftesbury and Charles Booth were showing the world that the poor and sick were people too and another side to the concept of welfare can be seen creeping in. Their work prompted more official enquiries and the people's conscience was being brought out of its sleep. (10)

The ills of society were not only attributed to the undeserving poor or on some unfortunate misfortune of a family and a lack of adequate redistribution of wealth, but were being seen in terms of lack of education. In New Zealand there was constant talk about the need to educate the natives so that they may no longer be a blight on the settlers' lives. The need to educate all the illiterates was increasingly realised and again this type of function was taken up by the State. Another gap had been seen and filled and another dimension added to welfare. Possibly two dimensions - not only was the welfare of the individual being served by the welfare of the collective people or nation - illfare was not only a blight

because of individual suffering but because it made heavy demands on society in general and was better therefore removed or even prevented.

The increasing concentration on the value of people as people also ushered in the hedonistic aspect of welfare. The side of welfare where social work has had a particular place and one that continues to cause arguements and confusion about its proper place. In giving cash and kind and other services like health and hospital benefits and education our belief in people and the belief in a right they have to grow and develop and achieve the highest degree of happiness or satisfaction in life they are capable of, pointed to a need to help people achieve this satisfaction and make most use of the other services offered to do this. Social work can also be seen as a means of control over people or, socialogically, social control. D. A. Millard has put it like this, "The caseworker is employed by conventional morality to cajole bourgeois compliance from his clients. And what is more he has a framework of a ready made system in which to rationalise his behaviour"(27). If social work is to be legitimately concerned with social control - with helping people conform - where does our value of a person's happiness go to? Can we reconcile the individual need with the collective need? I must admit I am not certain on this myself, but feel that to a certain extent we can, for if someone is not meeting maximum possible satisfaction in life because of clashes of values then it would seem legitimate to offer help to him to reconcile his standpoint, so that satisfaction and happiness may be greater. P. Halmos has said, "There is no breach of humanity in using all our resources to liberate people from what they can't very well endure, especially when our conscience tells us that they ought not be expected to endure it without our effort to alleviate and help. Of course there is an arbitrary moral iniative taken here, but counselling is a moral iniative and all moral

iniative is arbitrary." (14). If a person is as happy as he can be and continues to go against society's wishes then the society must decide very carefully what its values are, what deviation will be tolerated and what will not. This is not a matter for social work so much as for individual social workers as people along with all other individuals in society who must collectively give legitimation or otherwise to the societal values.

In talking of this development of the Welfare State I believe I have brought in the need for the qualifying 'social' in my title. Apart from the aspect of social justice implied in this concept I also see the implication of the recognition of the feelings and convenience of others. This does then reserve 'welfare' for a satisfactory state of health and wealth but 'social welfare' indicates that we also have to recognise there is more to a satisfactory life for a person than just health and wealth. Today it has the practical recognition that not only has a person a right to happiness but that without this he may not be able to make satisfactory use of his right to other welfare services such as health and income maintenance benefits.

I have done a rather rapid full circle back to the dictionary definition of welfare and indicated how a hedonistic aspect has been added to the concept. A major difficulty of course is that happiness is something personal of which only the individual can really judge. It is also too personal to be the object of all social policy. Social justice to the individual and the group is necessary Before I discuss this further I must enlarge on what I understand as being social policy.

In the recognition that the State had an interest in social welfare in that it was desirable to remove illfare and that this was accompanied by a growing social conscience, policy was formulated to remove the society ills and

individual ills. This policy can be thought of as social policy. This is a fairly restrictive definition of social policy but follows that of T. H. Marshall (25) and is probably most useful for my purpose. Because of the rather wide range of definitions that have been placed on social policy (see the discussion in Social Policy and Administration in New Zealand by C. A. Oram) the resulting services that have been created to put the policy into effect have also gathered a rather wide field so that Titmuss has said, "The term social service has come to be applied to more and more areas of collective provision of certain needs. It has indeed acquired a most elastic quality, its expanding frontiers, formerly/little besides poor relief, sanitation and public nuisances, enclosing now embrace a multitude of heterogeneous activities". (46)

It is with an aspect of social policy, as a proposal to put into effect a legitimate need seen with reference to our social welfare values, with which I am concerned in this paper and particularly how this policy is effected through the provision of a social service. It should be noted that social policy is not of necessity positive, beneficial, or progressive nor need it spring from human sympathy (e.g. Nazi social policy of extermination of the Jews). Neither is all social policy formulated after first obtaining evidence to support its wisdom. In our society government seems free to make decisions without heed of scientific principles and this means they are free to make mistakes. It is also difficult to predict the outcome of social policy despite some known scientific principles or evidence of facts because much of our knowledge is tentative and not really suitable for predictive forecasts. This means that the intent of social policy is not always seen in practice but it also means that in this area of planning (or lack of it) we must be even more ready to admit mistakes and try more carefully considered alternatives.

Twentieth century welfare has brought into view and must keep in view and pay respect to the whole person. And it is only this kind of individualisation of the whole person that can resist the assault of the mass society. The society in which the individual can become lost in a host of repetitions of himself. We need to help the individual toward what D. Riesman has called autonomy (53). However this individualisation is not always explicit in social policy very largely because it is seen so often to conflict with the interest of the whole society. R. Hoeinigk (quoted by C. A. Cram p.1.(29)) has even said, 'Social Policy must always regard the state and society as a whole; its aim is not to provide for individuals and in this it differs from poor relief'. I do not agree with this and have already indicated one way of considering the individual and society and it is in this combined approach that social work is predominant. New Zealand has stressed the individual approach when combined with general protective measures and placed moderate emphasis on a social work approach for alleviating social problems. It has also placed great emphasis on the elimination of financial need and with the Social Security Act of 1938 and the subsequent consolidating Act of 1964 has continued the emphasis on the place of the indiviaual by allowing much discretion to the three man Social Security Commission in granting financial assis tance when there has been no statutory right to assistance. That there is as yet no right of appeal against a decision of the commission indicates that we still have room for improvement.

It is largely within these two broad areas of social service - the income maintenance aspects and the individualised social work approach - that I wish to examine the implementation of social policy, particularly with respect to administrative and organisational arrangements.

Just before I go on to a deeper analysis of the place and function of

social work it is well to remind ourselves that the Welfare State's institutions, practices, a nd policies were originally designed for a world of shortages, mass unemployment, and gross deficiencies in social provision in which a great number of people were una ble to make any provision for themselves or effect any change in the doings of others as they may effect themselves. We have now left this stage in New Zealand and relative affluence has taken its place. The provision of social services to fill this or that gap in social provision or or fill a need here or there has continued to take place and there is seemingly still more need to be met. As this paper continues I hope to show that this is not just a sentimental need that is being met but one of value to society and one that society's values uphold. Also, however, one that we cannot let get out of hand but that requires efforts, however great these might need to be, to apply some cost-effectiveness evaluation to their continuing provision.(33)

It will have been noticed that I have at times mentioned values when I wrote of the individual's integrity and the need for individualisation. Our social policy is based on these sorts of values and it is one way of distinguishing our line of approach to the sort of problem we see from the problems seen and the approaches to them in Nazi Germany. It is well to keep in mind that it is only in terms of values as such that we can later base our otherwise scientific principles of organisation and methods of implementing our social policy.

SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL WELFARE

2.

From its beginnings, out of the values regarding the individual as a person of worth and times of shortage and hardship, the Welfare State has come to mean a great deal more and be based on wider values. This has led some to question its place in modern society and it is certainly a legitimate area of enquiry. It is not the principle purpose of this paper to look at the why and what of the Welfare State but a part of the 'how'. I feel some of the questions which sometimes appear to be asking why and what are really asking how (e.g. 'choice in welfare' - the place of alternative provision by the 'private sector' of the community) but the why and what certainly creeps in. To a certain extent I will by implication give some answers to these questions and will later discuss briefly the question of choice of sources.

It is now more important to sum up what the objectives of the Welfare State, through its social services, are. Kathleen Slack has identified these adequately and I cannot do better than repeat them here. "1. To prevent or reduce suffering, premature death or social ill when and where this is possible. 2. To protect the weak and vulnerable from dangers or pressures which they cannot stand up against alone. 3. To promote in a positive way the good of each and of society as a whole." (41). These are broad positive objects and reflect the values of the affluent society and in their implementatio in New Zealand we see considerable emphasis on the personalisation of services in the recognition that more than money is required. The personalisation and recognition of the individual has resulted in the provision of social workers to carry out this policy and in some areas of our social services the emphasis

may even have surpassed the bounds of utility and practicability. I make this statement in the framework of lack of adequate training of social workers and of the ad hoc development of many services, and generally recognising a rather haphazard provision of service that has not always been backed with sufficient resources to enable the intent of policy to be carried out. It is also made with the recognition that New Zealand has, in the past, placed great emphasis on monetary and material provision, again often with lack of supportive services. The apparent over-provision of social workers in some areas can thus be seen as an illusion that has arisen because of various difficulties, some of which I have just mentioned. The trend to place increasing emphasis on social workers as resources for the carrying out of social policy is not only seen in New Zealand. In England the 1963 Children's and Young Persons' Act gave Children's Committees the power to work with families to prevent children having to come to care. The primary function of the committees is thus changing from primary responsibility of providing alternative care and assistance to providing a more general social work service for children and their parents.

King has said, "Social work, being concerned with social ills, is an expression of society's altruism and society's fear. The elements of compassion for other people's distress interacting with those of guilt about the distress and self protection against its consequences....". (19). Identifying elements of this duel nature in the rise of social work he traces the formation of the Probation Service (in England) based on social work and stresses its role in both prevention and care. In New Zealand theProbation Service also employs social workers although there are certain features of the structure through which they work that restrict the purely social work nature of their work.

I will not go on identifying the use of social workers in implementing social policy atthis stage but turn to the question of what it is the social worker brings to the situation in which he works, the methods and aims of social work, so that we might have some basis on which to evaluate the effectiveness of this approach especially in relation to the present administrative structure through which the social worker works.

A symposium held in 1967 entitled "An Intellectual Exploration: Universals and Differences in Social Work Values, Functions and Practice" (9) is an aid to us here. I have already in discussion on the values underlying the formation of the Welfare State mentioned some of the values which also of course support social work. It is only necessary to mention that within the context of the Welfare State's social policy social work finds itself seeking after and mediating between the worth and dignity of the individual on the one hand and the well being and integrity of the group on the other. This is a generalised statement of the quote I gave earlier from King. It is a recognition that besides the utility of social work in providing social justice there is also a nee for compassion in its implementation. On the function of social work the seminar is of more interest. What is clearly brought out is that social work may differ from society to society, the mating of various factors like culture, level of economic and political development, priority of needs and many others determining what a particular society will ask of its social workers. It found that the "realm of social relations" was one where social work might claim primacy noting that this implies social work can be committed to the use of individual casework as a method at one extreme to community development and social planning and social action at the other. A uniting theme is, however, found when we conceive of the use of the realm of social relations being in the effort to effect change

in an individual or situation. (12). The social worker uses a controlled human relationship whether this be with an individual client, a group or in contact with administrators or members of the wider community. It is through the understanding of people in the situation that enables social workers to carry out their essential function, i.e. to effect change in their clients. Sometimes, of course, this change can only be seen in rather topsy turvy terms as when we have to recognise we can do little to help a particular person or family improve but that we can prevent further deterioration in their social functioning and in so doing believe we are contributing something to the happiness or satisfaction of the 'helped'.

The controlled human relationship of course has many value, scientific and sometimes expedient principles surrounding its use and as I have indicated, it is a broad term, but I feel, a valid one for identifying the major tool of the social worker. It is through it that he identifies the need for change in the client or the environmental situation of a client and it is with it that he works with his clients and with it he will be most effective in working with his colleagues and superiors. It is not my purpose to enlarge on this, however, but before leaving I note that we still have a long way to go in finding and understanding all its elements. (See the paper on the use of volunteers attached as an appendix and also the reference under 54).

Having identified the essential function of the social worker and the principle tool or method for implementing it or identifying the need of the client, be it an individual, a group or a community, we must now ask whether the social worker is able to do in practice what in theory we suggest for him. What are the deficiences of the present service? How can we improve the service that the social worker through his agency offers? In this search

we must be interested in our clients rather than interested in the politicians, the Director of Social Services or our own professional position. I am concentrating on surveying the administrative structure of the services and in the next section will briefly review the present provision of social services that can only, unfortunately, be seen to have arisen through ad hoc arrangement making. Can we identify function and disfunction and is there a better way of providing the service? Will we find elements of bureaucratic distortion of what was initially a service to the public such as L. Tierney found in an Australian study of social service departments? (45)

Apart from the need to give the best possible service to the client a good hard look at the present social work services is also justified on the need to utilise scarce resources to the best possible advantage. The need to ration services is undoubted, but rationing should be done consciously, and with the services that can be made available arranged in the most efficient manner otherwise an insipid, creeping sort of rationing, that rations out those most easily deterred, the least articulate, those worst acquainted with the system, the least able to wait or those who fall outside the conventional categories of eligibility, will find its way in by default.

SOCIAL WORK, SOME MONETARY AID SERVICES AND THE DEPARTMENTS THAT ADMINISTER THEM

3.

In this brief review of social work services within government social services the provision of monetary services or aid is also going to be noted. I mentioned in the first section of this paper that I would be reviewing both these aspects of social service provision in New Zealand and although the place of social work in the full scheme has been discussed the place of monetary provision has been only briefly mentioned. I will review the justification for the inclusion later, but it will become apparent that it remains inextricably bound with many of the social work services in New Zealand and from the consumers point of view it is important that it remain closely connected with any modified structure for social service provision.

In the review that follows apart from identifying the Departments and Boards offering social work services and to whom these are offered, I also want to bring out the other main functions of the services where necessary and begin an enquiry in to whether these functions are appropriate to that Department or possibly better incorporated in some other administrative arrangement. The review will continue in the next section. For a broad outline of social work and other protective and preventive services including notes on occupational welfare, rehabilitation, disaster relief, civil defense, legal aid and the provision of housing see Social Policy and Administration in New Zealand by C. A. Oram, prepared for use by students studying for the Extension Certificate in Social Studies at Victoria University of Wellington and to be published

shortly. Other brief reviews of the functions of some Departments offering social work services may also be found in Administration in a Multi-Racial Society edited by R. H. Brookes and I. H. Kawharu.

The Child Welfare Division of the Education Department

The present Superintendent of the Division has said that the aim of the Division "...is to ensure, as far as humanly possible, that all children have the chance to become happy members of society, congenially and usefully employed and enjoying the satisfactions which full use of their talents can bring". (1.). Towards this aim the field staff, institution staff, teachers and administrative staff, totalling over 1000, carry out certain statutory duties and there is also a move to extend the preventive work of the Department.

Roughly the work can be divided up into the following: Work with (a) children with no parents or no available parents, (b) children with mental and physical defects, (c) children who suffer because of the defects of their environment, and (d) delinquent children. These four broad divisions cover up many special and valuable areas of work. The State, through the Division, acts in loco parentis in many circumstances and through its social workers or Child Welfare Officers assists families and solo parents in maintaining the child in a family where possible. Where orphans are left without friends or relatives to care for them the Division will endeavour to place them in foster homes. It should be noted here that the Social Security Department is able, in most cases, to pay an orphans' benefit to the guardians of such a child.

There is statutory provision that every illegitimate birth must be notified to a Child Welfare Officer who would then visit the mother to offer help. In quite a number of cases the girl or woman involved would already have been seen by a social security officer, usually one of the social workers.

some two or three months earlier. Counselling or more general social work assistance may have been offered at this stage also.

For children in children's homes, foster homes, and various other sorts of child care centres the division acts for their protection by supervision and licensing of the various 'minding centres'.

Working under the statute of the Adoption Act the division reports on nearly all (not necessary for children of immediate family members) adoptions. The report on the prospective placement is made to the magistrates court which is the sole body which can approve an adoption. In this area of work with children a Maori Welfare Officer has the same status as the Child Welfare Officer.

In a small number of cases the Division will also be called upon to report to the court in cases where there is a dispute about the custody of children of divorced or separated parents. Again we see the possibility of another department's social workers having a say - in ideas put forward for changes in laws concerning divorce it has been suggested that family courts should be set up that would be able to call for reports from Social Security social workers or probation officers.

In caring for children with mental and physical defects the Division shares some of its responsibility with its parent Department, the Department of Education. This isbecause in this area of provision several institutions such as residential schools for the deaf and intellectually handicapped are the main pillars. Supporting services of the Department such as psychologists, area organisers of special classes, visiting teachers, speech therapists and advisers in reading ca n be called upon (as they can be for other aspects of Child Welfare work).

In the fourth general category, that of work with delinquent children,

there is reasonable cooperation with the Police Department. Through a Joint Committee with that Department, the Juvenile Crime Prevention Section, the cases of those children detected in wrong doing are considered and recommendations made as to whether a child will be prosecuted or whether the case will be dealt with by preventive measures. Unless the 'offence' is very minor and there appears to be little family disturbance when the child is probably 'let off' with a warning, all the children brought before the court or not are likely to come under some sort of supervision by Child Welfare Officers. Through the training programmes of the Division and the training that some will be able to undertake at the Department of Social Administration and Sociology at Victoria University of Wellington, the Child Welfare Officers are assisted in their task by receiving a general training for social work. The training given within the Division is of course oriented strongly to the practical application of the general principles to specific tasks but the point I am making is that the appropriate training for Child Welfare Officers is considered to be training first in generic social work.

The application of these general techniques is also seen in work with children who suffer because of defects in their environment. This, the largest area of work for the Division, involves social work treatment in cases of child neglect or where children are out of control of their parents. This general category of preventive work does, of course, overlap considerably with the one just discussed under the heading of delinquent children. When children are placed under legal supervision by the courts the work can be considered similar to adult probation. The child usually remains in his own home with his parents his natural guardians and Child Welfare Officers as the agents of social control. In England much of this work is actually done by the probation

service, their clients not being limited to children above the age of 17 as in New Zealand.

It does seem preferable for as many of the children's necessary contacts with such agents of social control to be centred on as few different people as possible and for this reason I feel the New Zealand arrangement in this regard is potentially better than the English system. But why do we have to make this division at all? Why at some particular age, which is really rather arbitrary, especially in view of the current controversy (in England, see references[28,8]) regarding the age of criminal responsibility and the proper place for dealing with child offenders? But more of this later.

Before leaving this brief survey of Child Welfare Services there remains two aspects related to economic matters to be mentioned. The first is the provision in the Child Welfare Act for Needy Family Assistance to be paid to certain families in financial need. The Social Security Department is the main provider of sustenance benefits but where a family whose children are under some sort of supervision by the Child Welfare Division, also requires an income supplement to bring the family's income up to a level regarded by the Division to be the minimum for a decent existence, the Division will disburse the expenditure. However the situation is not as quite straight forward as this and the family can become the target of disturbing bureaucratic distortion of the original social welfare aim. If the family's wage earner is unemployed and is receiving an unemployment benefit, for instance, his eligibility for this benefit will be investigated by the Social Security Department and paid by that Department. If there were complicating circumstances so that statutory eligibility was not established it is quite probable that one of the Department's social workers would visit the family and obtain a detailed picture of the family

financial and domestic circumstances so that eligibility for an emergency benefit could be investigated. The family is not however able to manage on the benefit alone and because of high commitments and other financial difficulties even an extra allowance by way of a Family Maintenance Allowance is not sufficient. Chil Welfare, whose social workers also visit the family because of problems with the children then decide extra assistance is necessary. If there is a break-down in communication between the two Departments and misunderstanding of the provisions which unfortunately is sometimes so, it could be some time before it is sorted out that the Child Welfare Division has a responsibility to provide some help by way of Needy Family Assistance. Once this is decided the family then has to repeat its story of financial difficulties and circumstances to the Child Welfare Officer. At this point it may also be decided that the family requires budgeting assistance but as both the statutory agencies involved so far have insufficient time to spend on this aspect of the family's problem the Budget Advisory Service, an organisation of voluntary workers under the wing of the Department of Maori and Island Affairs, may be called in and another person introduced to help the family. This is a fairly simple and ordinary type of problem, but one that has a disturbing effect on the family and must negate at least to a certain extent the social work assistance being offered.

The troubles do not a lways arise with such a division of organisational structure but the effects can be similar. Take the situation when children who are Wards of the State are allowed home in certain circumstances. If the home does not have a regular income from a wage earner it would seem appropriate that the Division, a cting in loco parentis for the children would provide for needs such as clothing and possibly a supplementary income for general provisions. Again however difficulties arise because the Division does not have delegated au

authority to provide for its W,rds if they are living at home. A request to the minister in charge of the Department is necessary but the division is sometimes reluctant to make such an approach, but rather, approaches the Social Security Department with a request to investigate eligibility for a clothing grant. That Department, having discretionary powers to grant assistance in times of need, may after involving its social workers with the family and establishing the need, be a ble to provide some assistance.

A further point in connection with the disbursement of supplementary grants by these two agencies should be noted. The Social Security Department almost invariably disburses cash, the Child Welfare Division by kind in the form of rental subsidies or grocery grants. This can lead to the situation similar to 'case C' in which a woman receiving social work and financial assistance from the Social Security Department felt deeply offended when it was suggested to her that the Child Welfare Division, whose workers also visited her, should take over the disbursement of the supplementary grant which would be given in the form of a rent subsidy. This woman had been budgeting adequately and had kept her rent up to date and felt it was being suggested that she was actually inadequate and incapable of budgeting. The situation washappily resolved by leaving the disbursement of the supplementary grant with the Social Security Department. The question does arise, however, as to whether the present organisational arrangement and differing policies behind the payment of financial assistance is in the best interests of the client. And is it not the client or consumer that is the 'raison d'etre' for the social service provisions I have been discussing?

Two points should be noted from the above discussion, (1) The place of the client in the provision of the services and (2) The need for better

cooperation and coordination between the agencies disbursing the services or some alternative form of provision that reduces the divisions in the services. Both these points will be discussed more generally later.

The last aspect of the Child Welfare Services I want to mention is the obligation on the Department to endeavour to ensure that the parents of Wards of the State meet their obligations in respect of financially maintaining their children if possible. I will not discuss this any more fully now except to mention that both the Social Security Department and the Justice Department have various provisions also for the collection of maintenance from people in certain circumstances and it is conceivable that all departments could be chasing (unfortunately chasing seems to be predominant in the exercise) one family for maintenance for various relatives at the same time as they are trying to keep social work relationships with them.

Maori Welfare

I now wish to discuss the provision of social welfare services for the Maori. (By 'Maori' I mean someone who identifies himself as Maori - unless otherwise stated.) There being no theoretical discrimination against minority groups in New Zealand, the Maori person is free to use the social services offered to all New Zealanders. However, for various reasons, mostly laudible, there is special provision for the Maori as against his pakeha counterpart. Through the Department of Maori and Island Affairs a Welfare Division operates to assist the Maori in making use of the more differentiated services that consist of the other agencies I am discussing in this section. In fact, the Maori Welfare Officer, perhaps more than other social workers, needs to know his ' wares' and know whether they suit the particular situation he has been called upon to help and part of his role is thus what Cooper has called a

'social broker' (55). Besides the broking business which is a part of all social workers' roles, the Maori Welfare Officers also offer general social work help of all kinds. They are not limited by statute to certain areas of work and thus to a certain extent duplicate the general services offered by other departments. Of course, if the nature of the work is properly conducted under law by a Probation Officer or Child Welfare Officer or some other social worker, then it is the Maori Welfare Officer's job to help his client use the other service.

There are also some special services available only to Maoris which the Maori Welfare staff(who may be Maori or non-Maori) are able to use in the general aim of helping all Maori's to take their place in New Zealand society as citizens equal with the rest.

The recognition of the special problems of the Maori has come about because of a number of factors and it is not my intention to pursue these here except to note that the problems are heightened by the rural tradition of the Maori population and their rapid migration to urban centres over the last ten to fifteen years. It is now possible to find many Maoris who would be defined so because of the colour of their skin and their 'Maori stock' who have become completely acculturated to the more dominant pakeha way of life. There is also a possibly even larger group who having come to the urban centres have lost touch with the type of society that reinforces the value system in which they were brought up. They do not belong to the pakeha world so they do not belong. This general group and the group remaining in the rural areas and their families are the main target for action among Maori Welfare Officers. How to help those in the urban areas find their place and how to prepare those in the rural areas and their children for the changes that the dominant culture

is forcing upon them while maintaining their Maori identity are the crucial questions. They are being met with family casework, work among groups and the mobilisation of community resources, encouragement to use educational opportunities and active help in the education of some groups and in some areas of development, and redevelopment of some of the essential features of traditional Maori culture such as assistance in the upkeep of maraes. Thus we see Maori Welfare Officers active in supporting groups like the Maori Women's Welfare League and promoting district Educational Advancement Committees such as the Wanganui one which also publishes a thrice-yearly newsletter "Te Kotuku".

The aims of the Welfare Division are laudable, but I do not agree that we need a separate agency to serve these aims. I feel that possibly some of the other agencies I am discussing could benefit greatly by the experience of the Maori Welfare Officers in mobilising community resources to further their aims. It is undoubtedly through the use of volunteers, coopted through various organisations and groups and through the use of active honorary Maori Welfare Officers and Maori Wardens, often, in effect, working directly with the Division, that so much valuable welfare work has been achieved. To accompany a paper reproduced in Administration In New Zealand's Multi-racial Society (2) Mr Anderson asked the Departments of Maori and Island Affairs, Justice, Social Security and Health to supply statements on the functions of their Departments. The Director General of Health refused, replying (I quote from Mr Anderson's paper) "...the policy of the Department is to provide its services to everyone irrespective of race and with a few minor exceptions (e.g. the provision of iron mixture for Maori babies to counter the widespread incidence of anaemia) this policy is rigidly adhered to. Because of statistically demonstrated

differences in Maori - European standards of health, the board of health established a Maori Health Committee which, generally speaking, has not recommended the establishment of any special services for the Maori people. Your briefing, therefore, does not have any special relevance in this context". This policy does not of course mean that the greater health problems of the Maoris than non-Maoris are neglected. Through the Public Health Nurse service a magnificent service is extended to the Maori population in relation to their greater need.

The statement supplied by the Secretary for Justice at the same request demonstrates even better what I feel is approaching the requirement for the administration of multi-racial social welfare agency. The short note stresses the employment (in the Probation service) of Europeans, Maoris and Rarotongans without distinction as to duties or responsibilities. "A Maori chaplain counsels all inmates in the Detention Centre regardless of race and Maori counsellors work in Waikeria and Invercargill Borstals." The employment of Maori counsellors is also a recognition that there are some problems particular to Maoris, of a social nature, and that a mixed staff will together be able to help each other in understanding particular clients.

The Child Welfare Division also, of course, recruits staff without discrimination (as do all other Departments) and employs several Maoris which again must help the rest of the staff in understanding problems peculiarly Maori. This is assuming the Maori social worker understands his own people, his own racial background. Fortunately for their colleagues, most of them do.

A recent administrative change (not, I imagine, initiated by those desirous of maintaining a Department of Maori Affairs) that incorporated the

Department of Maori Affairs also indicates a changing outlook on the place of that Department. Islanders from the Cook, Nuie and Tokolauan groups are now included in the common concern of this department. In many areas of life this 'group' is probably as different from any 'average' Maori as any pakeha or non-Maori is. This is not to say that the Maori Welfare Officers would be unable to assist the individuals from these groups but there is no overwhelming reason why they, rather than any other department, should have taken on this responsibility, although the move would indicate that there was some feeling that Maori Welfare Officers should be better able to help. Any social worker working with anybody is better off if he has some understanding of his client's social background - the network of values to which his behaviour is related and probably most comprehensive training programmes for social workers in New Zealand do to a greater or lesser extent endeavour to meet this requirement. If a certain group does need extra help in overcoming a cultural heritage, either indigenous or imposed, that disadvantages it with respect to other groups within the community, then I feel there can usually be made a case on humanitarian grounds, if no other, than some special treatment should be given. I can see no reason why this should not be extended by a general Social Welfare Department rather than a specialised department. I do recongise the current difficulty that exists for many potential clients and not just the Maori client, that they could get 'put off' or 'lost' in trying to find their way to the department that may serve for their particular needs, if indeed it exists.

The main argument that remains for favouring the retention of a Maori Welfare Division is that it is the wish of the Maori people. This sort of statement is very difficult to prove or refute. What, in this context do we mean by 'Maori people'. Does it include those Maoris who have reachedthe point

of cultural no return, who no longer possess enough working contact with or command of Maori culture, who may never have gone near the Maori Welfare Division or even the Department as a whole? Or is it only those people of Maori stock who wish to retain the Department? It may be somewhere in between but my own feeling is that it lies nearer the second sort of definition. Where ever it lies, how are we possibly going to evaluate it for policy decisions for it would be almost impossible to count heads on this basis? Even if we could are we any nearer being able to make a decision? If the present functions of the Maori Welfare Division were incorporated within a general Social Welfare Department would it be that we would bring resentment and deliberate refusal to use needed services and racial antagonism? This is of course a possibility just as strike action is a real possibility to be considered when a section of a work force is dismissed without due notice. However, if the community is prepared for the change, if we utilise social work skills in putting forward the idea, explaining its effects and benefits, in other words involving the community in the execution of the plan, I feel real benefits would be gained all round.

I have spent a considerable time discussing the Maori Welfare Division and its possible relationship to a Social Welfare Department. This has been done in this section because of the general nature of the services which in certain respects represent a general social welfare department for the Maori. It seems, apart from other considerations, a pity that others cannot share in this type of social welfare provision and that the Maori cannot find more of his social welfare needs met within the one department.

The Child Health Clinic

Under the control of the Department of Health the half dozen clinics throughout New Zealand provide specialist treatment for disturbed children. The therapeutic team usually consists of a pediatrician, psychiatrist, psychologist, playtherapist and social worker. The main interest for us is in the place of the social worker in the team. It is probable that quite a number of children at present being seen in the clinics are known to some of the other agencies employing social workers. Child Welfare sometimes makes direct referrals to the clinic, otherwise referral is through the family doctor or some other medica lly qualified person, but this is sometimes at the suggestion of a social worker. At present, therefore, if a child is seen at the clinic he and his parents may be seen by at least two social workers. If there was a general Social Welfare Department there could be a case for a social worker from that Department being seconded to work with the clinic team when the child and his family were not being seen by another social worker from the Department. If, however, the child already knew a social worker from the Department it would be easier for the child if the relationship with the one social worker was able to continue. The major difficulty here is that is would mean all the social workers in an area served by one clinic would have to be well known by the rest of the clinic team to ensure that its work was to continu smoothly. It is a matter of an experiment being required so that the effect on the client in the two situations can be properly gauged.

Even if a social worker is seconded full time and handles the major part of the social work of the clinic, there remains an argument for the Social Welfare Department to be the employer. This arrangement, with provision for regular weekly or bi-weekly meetings with the rest of the social work staff,

would provide the best base for good cooperation and coordination of the social work service and the speicalist child clinic service. It also means the social worker can find easy identification with other social workers. There is also the possibility that, by sharing buildings, cooperation would be increased. The solution is not asquite straightforward as that, however, and I will discuss it more fully under the section on coordination and cooperation.

Psychiatric Social Work and Medical Social Work

The Health Department andHospital Boards employ social workers to work with other medical teams besides the Child Health Clinic. The two major areas here are Psychiatric Social Work with the Health Department and Medical Social Work which is public hospital based. There is also a growing tendency to use Public Health Nurses (Health Department) for Psychiatric social work needs (e.g. at Lake Alice Hospital) and recent moves indicate that some Hospital Boards are moving into general social work apparently to fill seen gaps in social work coverage in the community.

In New Zealand psychiatric social work does not generally have the same status as it does in England and the sort of work undertaken varies considerably from hospital to hospital. However, most of the work can be seen as social work and may often involve the obtaining of social histories from patients or relatives to assist diagnosis. Helping in rehabilitation and the return of the patient to the community should also be a major section of work. The concept of the therapeutic community, once it is understood and accepted, implies a great deal of work for social workers in this field also. Could not more thought be given to this and to the need for a comprehensive social work team so that community organisation can proceed without the disorganisation and rivalries that at present mark some areas of our social work scene? The use being made of town-

based Public Health Nurses in lieu of Psychiatric Social Workers based at the hospital for some country psychiatric hospitals indicates that the physical separation in this way is not considered a handicap. It would certainly seem no more difficult for a doctor at a hospital to contact one central agency with a request for social work aid than to contact the social worker in another part of a rambling hospital complex.

The move to have psychiatric hospitals placed under local hospital boards and the increasing emphasis on smaller psychiatric units attached to public hospitals also means that these services are likely to become more closely linked, physically and emotionally, with the local community. As with the Child Health Clinics, if it is felt necessary to have a resident social worker then the secondment of a worker from a general agency will probably aid co-operation and improve the client's chances of receiving the best, conflict-free help possible.

The same general comments could a pply to Medical Social Work. There are also additional factors to note with regard to the sort of work undertaken by them. The hospital boards have developed their own system of financial aid, separate from that availablethrough Child Welfare or Social Security, but in many respects similar and often overlapping. The medical social workers are usually engaged to assess the need of the client for this sort of assistance. Additionally, they can disperse relief in the form of food, fuel and clothing, and arrange for the meals on wheels and laundry services. These services are not universal over New Zealand but depend partly on the hospital board and also on community organisation. These overlapping provisions, especially in the field of material aid, unfortunately invite 'buck-passing', more often of problem clients when a social worker's patience or tolerance wears thin. The client's needs

thus suffer not only because of the division of labour between agencies but because of the multiplicity of provision of similar services. (Sometimes, of course, the client is able to 'profit' because of this!)

Social Security Department

Some of the work of this Department has already been mentioned when discussing other social service agencies. Its main function is to provide security against loss or reduction of income below the amounts accepted by the community from time to time as the appropriate levels below which no person or family should fall". (30). Towardsthis general function it administers Social Security cash benefits, war pensions and allowances, supplementary assistance and related special benefits such as family maintenance allowance and also provides a supporting social work service.

The social work service was begun in 1958 and initially the emphasis was on social casework. Most of the clients were beneficiaries of some monetary assistance from the Department but who also had some personal problem that marred the effective use of the monetary help. However from the beginning the service was developed as a general one, and in some ways is similar to the general service of the Maori Welfare Division. The predominant method was, however, individual casework. As the service was extended the social workers also tended to take on the functions of a field officer in the Department - the field investigation of eligibility for benefits. Two main points favoured this development in the beginning. First the social workers were in a better position to identify persons and families in need of casework support, and secondly it provided something more tangible with which the social work staff could interpret their function to the clerical and administrative staff. In recent times the extension of the social work service has sometimes merely

meant that a former field officer's job has been given a change of name and the new incumbent to the position employed as a social worker. This has led to the situation where the Department in its annual report for the year ended 31 March 1968 states: "In the main these workers have carried out the investigation and inquiry work required in the administration of benefits and pensions." (42) However in a booklet on the services of the Department the social workers have been described as being available for: "Family guidance and counselling, marriage guidance, individual guidance and counselling, help for the aged, rehabilitation.." etc. In other words a general social work service.

It is natural, that offering an open service (in theory open to anyone who requires the sort of help the social workers can give) like this, that there is some overlap with other departments. Some of these have already been mentioned, particularly in the discussion on Child Welfare. Other examples can be found. A pregnant single woman, if herppregnancy is regarded as an illness for benefit purposes, may, so long as she fulfills the other eligibility requirements, qualify for a sickness benefit for the last three months of her pregnancy - and for up to three months after the birth of her child if she keeps it and breast feeds it. Many of the women qualifying for such a benefit suffer not only loss income but also from stressful emotional conflicts. The social work staff carries out a lot of work with such people and will assist them in coming to decisions such as whether to keep their child or not. Underthe Child Welfare Act there is also a statutory obligation for a Child Welfare Officer to investigate the living conditions of all children born out of wedlock. Thus the woman will be confronted with another social worker and be subject to a certain amount of repeat 'investigation'. Of course, Child Welfare Officers

also do similar counselling in appropriate areas to those I have described as being done by Social Security social workers. The point I am trying to make is that there is unnecessary duplication of services because of unnecessary division of labour and that this can give the central figures in the social services, the clients, an additionally difficult time, when the social services were supposedly set up to eliminate this. This is undoubtedly largely because of the ad hoc nature of the development of the services, with each new department focusing on part of the seen problem, the division usually relating to who the client is seen as. Thus the Social Security Department would tend to see the client, in the situation described above, as being the mother. The Child Welfare Division would see the client primarily as the child. I feel it is this damaging division that provokes many conflicts between the various social service departments. There is a feeling 'you can't have my client' and accompanying this the feeling 'my client matters most'. Some of these barriers are being broken down and the testimony of the growing awareness of the family and the more general social relationships that influence a particular client may be seen in the papers delivered at the Social Workers' Conference at Lincoln in February 1968 and reproduced in The New Zealand Social Worker.

As with other departments surveyed, training, when it is given, is either in general social work, or assistance in relating these principles to a particular setting. It is of course necessary to know the requirements for eligibility for the various forms of financial assistance that are available because much of the work, whether it be social work or straight field enquiries involves helping people obtain the income they are entitled to either by right or by need. I have often heard it said that it would be an impossible

task for all the present social workers employed by the State to understand the workings of every other Department and the burden of comprehending the social security system is insurmountable. I am not aware that Social Security social workers are markedly higher in intelligence than other social workers, nor am I aware that many of them (unless they have an aggressive resistance towards understanding the system) have any difficulty in understanding their own department's regulations and where necessary the workings of another department. There is also a growing interchange of workers among departments and the Social Work Traineeship scheme which aims to give those entering the scheme some time with several departments, has shown that reaching an understanding of social work in many settings is not by any stretch of the imagination insurmountable.

The Probation Service

The major social work force of the Justice Department is the Probation Service. Some prisons also have social workers permanently attached while in many cases probation officers are seconded to work largely with the inmates of various penal institutions and their families.

The Probation Officer's job, to put it bluntly, is social work, the majority of his clientele being referred to him by the courts. As an alternative or as an adjunct to imprisonment, convicted persons may be released on probation. Certain statutory requirements ensure such a person is seen by a probation officer and the court may also impose certain other conditions to the conditional release. To assist the court in reaching a decision on the correct sentences to impose, a magistrate may call for a Probation Officer's report. The Probation Officer in this work calls on the same skills as the Child Welfare Officer would in preparing a report on a child, or as a Social

Security social worker would in preparing a report of a client's need for a special benefit to aid in rehabilitation.

As all human beings have the same basic feelings, the social work agency he gets landed with will be determined by the manner of the expression of the problem, but the social worker will be dealing with the same basic problem and using the same body of basic knowledge and skills. The client's most immediate problem, because of the specialisation of the services, will determine which agency deals with him.

The Morrison Committee, reporting on the English Probation Service in 1962, stressed that the service was essentially a service of the courts and the individual officer a servant of the courts, and thought it was desirable to preserve the employer-employee relationship between magistrates and probation officers. The same allegiance to their employer is found among many probation officers in New Zealand also, and naturally so. The same feeling that this is how it should remain is also often expressed. However, the situation is not the same in New Zealand as that pertaining in England. In England the Probation Service has among its clientele children who in New Zealand would be seen by Child Welfare Officers. In England the Probation Service can claim that it does most of the probation work and in the lack of any evidence to the contrary, feels any other arrangement would be unsatisfactory. The fright at a possible change isshown in the reaction to the suggestion that juvenile courts should be abolished and all services dealing with children should be unified. (4). In New Zealand 'probation' work is shared by Child Welfare Officers and so the same argument cannot have the same weight. The fact that Child Welfare Officers can have the satisfactory relationships with the courts that they do, indicates that with proper statutory provision the relationship of a Social Welfare Department and the courts can be a satisfactor

one. It does not appear that the courts or the Department of Justice has to be the employing agent of the social workers who would act in the role of probation officer.

There could possibly be gains for the Probation Officers themselves. An English study into the role of Probation Officers and the role expectations of others appears to have some relevance to the New Zealand scene. A significant outcome of this inquiry was the positive correlations between the Probation Officers conception of themselves as, generally speaking, dedicated people with high moral standards and the role ascribed to them by the magistrates who emplo them and the clerks who control the courts in which many of them work. This contrasted with expectations held by fellow professional social workers who emphasised professional skills rather than morals and vocational dedication. (17.).In such a situation where the role expectations of employers and some of the other closely related groups differ markedly from the expectations of fellow social workers, elements of role conflict are likely to arise. The conflict is likely to be greater with professionally trained workers and the strain could have a detrimental effect on the functioning of the social workers involved. If Probation Officers (or other social workers similarly placed with conflicting role expectations) could find their employers among their professio al colleagues or with a department that was in sympathy with professional social worker values it is probable that they would feel more comfortable because of a reduction of the role strain.

If social workers, helping people referred by the courts, were to be drawn from a general social work agency, there would naturally be certain facets of application of social work principles that would have to be considered in greater depth by those who had not worked with such people before. For

instance, many people become 'eligible' for probation help simply because the court wishes to avoid the alternative fine or punishment. ( ) The person may not wish to see a Probation Officer and in New Zealand he does not have the choice as he does in England to 'turn down the offer'. This may be a good thing of course. The necessity to maintain contact with a social worker may prove in itself an opportunity for growth and change for in continuing a relationship which he would have ended if entirely free to do so, the client may become aware of his own needs and discover that the social worker can help him after all.

It might also make some of us look harder at our present successes in social work. The Probation Service deals with many who are the failures of other social agencies. Why have they been failed? How many of us have been relieved when one of our problems or failures has fortuitously become the client of another agency because the client expressed his feelings in a different manner?

School Based Social Work

I have now come to the last of the categories I wish to consider in this brief look at the social work agencies of the State. (I regard 'boards' such as hospital boards and education boards as part of Central Government.) The social work and allied services are to be found undersuch titles as visiting teacher, vocational guidance, psychological services, school counsellors.

With centres established in 17 districts the Psychological Service (under Department of Education) through its psychologists and organisers of special classes for backward children, etc. provides an important supporting service for teachers, parents, and other social workers in the treatment of 'problem' children. The main user of the services besides the schools is the Child

Welfare Division. Thirteen years ago (I have not obtained up to date information on this) in at least one district Child Welfare care occupied a great deal more of the services time than cases from any other single source. ( ). It is probable that Child Welfare, in districts where there is a resident psychological service, continues to be one of the main users of the service. Not only do the children seen by them for other than problems noticed at school, often require specialist diagnostic services, but in many cases Head Teachersrefer them direct to the Child Welfare Division.

At present many Child Welfare Districts (and other agency offices) have only a limited service from visiting psychologists. For example, Wanganui (urban population 38,174 (44)) has a visiting psychologist for a couple of days 2-4 times a month. In this time he has little time to see any but urgent cases and is unable to see a large number of children whose treatment would be better planned and possibly more successful if a psychological report was available. It also means that other agencies outsidethe Education Department gambit have even less chance of getting the services of a psychologist.

The need for the services of a psychologist for the most satisfactory functioning of a social welfare agency is increasingly being realised. If a general social welfare agency was to be formed to meet New Zealand's needs then there would certainly be a strong case for having a psychologist on the staff. If this could be achieved what would be the place of the psychological services? I am discussing the possible need to incorporate these services in a social welfare agency in this roundabout way because it is realised that there would be a good deal of resistance from the teaching profession towards such a move. We don't know how an alternative to the present arrangement would work, but there certainly doesappear to be a case for trying it. There

are, of course, indications. There are many testimonials to the good relationships enjoyed between the Child Welfare Division and the schools. This has little to do with their both being connected ultimately to the one Education Department (There are separate ministers at parliamentary level.) but it does indicate that when a department, through its social workers, is able to carry out a satisfactory service from the schools point of view then an increase in mutual understanding and dependence will result. Initially the experimental situation could be in cities like Wanganui where there is no resident psychological service. A social welfare department whose workers are able to minister to the total social service needs (the total being discussed in this paper) of the child and his family would also provide the psychological services to the schools, but, of course, with the integrated backing of social workers.

At present the social work backing is carried on by Child Welfare Officers and Visiting Teachers in the main, with some of the psychologists and assistant psychologists of the Psychological Service also doing casework. Visiting Teachers also function in a variety of categorised roles . The scope of their work will vary widely depending largely on the individual visiting teacher and on the use the school makes of them. Some are largely truant officers treating this sympathetically as a disciplinary problem, others will see a greater element of social work need in the truanting child and some are actually doing a considerable amount of more general counselling and guidance among the community. There is little doubt that the main method of working can be conceived of as being social work.

A recent development in New Zealand is the school counselling service. An increasing number of secondary school principals are endeavouring to get an

extra 'position of responsibility' for their school so that a school counsellor may be appointed. The ultimate qualifications for this position are generally seen as being good experience in teaching along with proper training in counselling and guidance (along with personal qualities, of course). There is no doubt that there is a general feeling that to be a school counsellor one must have had experience in teaching. (35,43). There is disagreement as to what his duties should be but still some emphasis on the fact that he should have been, and should remain, a teacher (35).

Again I feel the fact that 'outside' social work agencies already are able in many circumstances, to set up good relationships with schools which their young clients attend, shows that non-teachers can work with a school. Can they work in a school? English experience indicates that well qualified psychiatric social workers are able to do so successfully (16). If they work within the school what is their relationship with the principal and with other social workers to be? Anne Jones makes the point that the school counsellor, especially if he is fresh from a year's training, will certainly need regular case discussion ( ). Where is he to get this from in the schools? Not, I think, from a non-trained principal as has been suggested (35). Better if well qualified colleagues from a social welfare agency can fulfill this function. This would be easier to obtain were the counsellor attached to such an agency and seconded to work in the school. He would obviously have to have a very close working relationship with the principal of the school and other staff members and would be subject to some oversight from the Principal. Within the school situation the Principal has responsibility for guarding the needs of pupils, staff and parents and this must be respected if a satisfactory working relation is to be obtained.

I have discussed the 'school counsellor' without really discussing his role. I have done this partly because in discussing it now I can lead it on to a consideration of the place of vocational guidance. There actually is no set list of a school counsellor's functions, each school really defining its role to fit in with its own scheme of things and the other social work resources in the community. However, possible areas of work would be divided for purposes of analysis into the following: (1) educational guidance or help with subject choice, etc., (2) vocational guidance, (3) personal guidance, (4) Social Education for Living courses. Some argument centres around the question whether the counsellor should also do part-time general teaching (assuming he is a qualified teacher) but strong arguments against this sort of teaching have been advanced by Stacey (43).

Reports by two New Zealand principals with counsellors in their schools i indicates that the Social Education courses can be a valuable aid to the counsellor in becoming known to the pupils. There was an increase in self referral in both cases during and following the courses because more pupils realised the way in which the counsellor could help them and more had seen his open, natural and confidential approach to their personal problems. It does mean that the counsellor has less time to do the counselling required, and both schools find they really need further appointments to cope with the previously unseen need.

In most countries now beginning to employ school counsellors vocational guidance services have been operating for some time. Often through the school's career adviser, a teacher offering some counsel and advice to pupils on careers, the vocational guidance service reached a wide audience. The service would assist with trained personnel able to do psychological testing that the teacher would not usually be able to administer. This is the

situation in New Zealand. The vocational guidance service is theoretically available not only to school children but to young people who have left school and are then finding they have made a wrong choice of job or career and seek some help in finding more suitable employment. The theory works in some urban areas where pressure of work on the vocational guidance service is not too great, but in rural areas and many urban areas including some quite large cities, the service is not only not practically available to the public when it is needed but the service to the schools is also limited to a few visits a year. For example, the Wellington branch of the service at present serves also both Palmerston North and Wanganui. If a young person wants to see a vocational guidance officer in Wanganui in May he might either have to go to Wellington or wait till a planned visit to the area in September.

Vocational guidance officers can certainly be considered as social workers in that they often may have to do thorough case work enquiry concurrently with the assessment of the client's potentials and abilities. They also should ideally have a good deal of technical knowledge about job opportunities and qualifications. They could perhaps be considered a specialit within the social work services and were they to be incorporated within a social service agency offering a general social work service, so that fewer workers would be necessarily seeing the one client, it could mean that we would be asking all social workers to be qualified as vocational guidance officers. This would clearly not be helping anyone and would certainly be detrimental to the clients because it would probably mean a lowering of standards all round. Are vocational guidance officers to be a specialised group with in a general social work agency or should they remain a specialist group within the Education Department as at present? Before any decisions can be made on

this, I feel we ought to look at other 'vocational guidance' agencies in the community. The only other State agency open to the general public is the Department of Labour employment section. This department has not fulfilled its potential function within the community. I am not in a position to analyse thi deeply, but it is of course relevant to note that New Zealand has only recently passed back into a period of unemployment. In better times the department did not put across any image that it was a place to go to be helped to find work. When it was used by the public there was little matchingof worker to job but generally it s eems to have been avoided by both the public and the employers. One pointer to this is the rapidrise in the last few years of private employment agencies. Not only do these agencies run 'hire pools' of temporaries but some have sophisticated assessment facilities. I am not thinking in terms of the management placement type of agency but of more general services.

The Department of Labour Employment Section, in some districts, has been endeavouring to fill some gaps, and with the use of Special Placement Officers has been offering a limited specialist or individualistic attention to some of its clients. I feel there is room, in fact a need, to do a lot more in the employment field. Either the department offers a full service or none at all. The limited service at present a vailable should be extended so that i becomes a vocational service in the true sense of the word. At present many people are seen who have probably made a wrong choice of career earlier in their life and this factor can hardly be brought out under the present arrangement. If a person is out of work there ought to be available, as part of the social wervices of the State, a service that can assess that person's abilities and potentialities in order that he can be assisted into finding work in the

type of occupation to which he is most suited. An extended scheme such as I have suggested may also have to encourage both State and private employers to provide more training schemes for both young recruits and those older people who now find they are redundant or have made a wrong choice of career at some stage.

Having outlined the needed development of work placement services within the Labour Department it is now possible to see where the present vocational guidance services would best be located. Not in the Education Depa rtment or in a Social Work Agency but as part of and integrated with the employment services of the Department of Labour. Possibly the department could have a 'Youth Employment Section' that would be primarily involved with young people both in the schools and those who had left, but there is no real reason for this sort of division except as a political expedient so that people can see the 'job as being done'. Arbitrary division of clients by age is something we are trying to get away from because the person with employment problems at 24has similar needs to be met by a vocational placement agency as someone of 17. The way the needs are met will differ from individual to individual and, as far as one can group individuals, from group to group, but there would be room for these different emphases within a more losely structured service than one offering 'Youth Sections' etc.

By using the present vocational guidance staff of the Department of Education in such an enlarged service the improved service could be offered relatively quickly after a decision was taken to implement it and it would also mean that those smaller cities and towns which have 'Employment Offices' but not Vocational Guidance Services would be able to offer both, providing a much improved service not only to the public but to the school of the area. A service which the Department of Education cannot at present offer.

COORDINATION, COOPERATION OR WHAT?

4.

Having surveyed the present social work services and discussed some of their common points, some of the overlaps, and suggested here and there possible modifications, I now want to look in more detail and to discuss what could be done to improve the functioning of the various departments. Before I go any further I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning about aims, goals or functions of a social service. We must keep steadily and firmly in view that the social services grew up to help the community. In the social work sphere the emphasis is on the individual but on the individual in his social or community environment. The social work services are not with us to serve the distortions of bureaucracy or organisational patterns. Nor are they with us to serve professional role definitions. They exist for our client whether the client be conceived of as an individual, a group or a community. Ultimately, of course, the service is answerable to the community, and it must answer questions about its service to its clients.

Throughout this paper I have concentrated on the client as an individual and his family, and in the discussion that follows I will continue to do so reserving a few comments on future possible developments, such as greater community organisation, for the last section. I have also implicitly assumed that a client does not like being visited by several different social welfare workers or have several calling at his house to see various members of his family. Most social workers would agree with this, some saying it is not as bad as made out. However, there is ample evidence in the existence of a Maori Welfare Division of the recognition of how difficult it is for people

to accept being shifted around among social services and how easy it is to get put off.

I think also we tend to overlook that many of our clients probably see mor clearly than many social workers, that all social workers are basically doing the same job. Social work clients are people or groups of people looking for understanding of their problems and social workers are supposed to offer this to them and help them to come to a better understanding of them or, more simply, offer hope of the opportunity for growth which we all appear to have naturally within us. When a client turns up another problem to the social worker who then proceeds to refer his client on to another agency he may, in effect, be saying to the client, "I can no longer understand you." At least this is the way it may appear to the client who could then feel resentful at the referral and of course at the new social worker. "Are you going to misunderstand me too?"

Reports of some attempts at offering a unified service also lend support to the idea that it is not helpful, or at least it can be very worrying, for one person to be seen by many different social workers. An American report discussing this said, "...many families have told us it was confusing to them to work with more than one social worker. There is more than mental confusion involved here; there is emotional confusion as well. We have seen that it was difficult for deprived families to learn to relate to any social worker. Then we compound this trouble by asking them to relate simultaneously to more than one. The important part of the helping is in the relationship." (31)

A report in England has suggested the need for a general purpose social worker ( ). This recommendation was made in the recognition of the points I have been discussing above. The point was also made that this did not mean an all purpose social worker. What is the difference? The point is fairly

important and one that seems to be a stumbling block to the acceptance of a Social Welfare Department for many social workers. For instance, Mr Anderson, Superintendent of the Child Welfare Division, has said quite recently that he could not conceive of any one person filling the roles of "a psychiatrist, a physician, a psychologist, a housing expert, a Child Welfare Officer, a visiting teacher, and a Social Security social worker". (3) I do not think that anybody has ever really suggested that anybody should or could carry out all those functions, but it is an indication of the distortion that can pervade thinking about a general purpose social worker, and something we must guard a gainst. In my earlier discussions I certainly have not been suggesting one person to carry out all those roles, but I do think that in the interests of the welfare of our clients and for bureaucratic efficiency we could recognise the essentially social work functions of the various 'specialisations' and in some circumstances eliminate the divisions pertaining at present. It may be important to have various specialists, such as psychologists, within a Social Welfare team and this could make for even closer contact and more beneficial use being made of these services than is at present enjoyed even by the Child Welfare Division.

Before going on to discuss how a Social Welfare Team could be made up I want to discuss two other important aspects of the administration of social welfare services: coordination and cooperation. Muriel Brown has made a plea for increased coordination and cooperation and said these are more important than the amalgamation of the numerous social welfare services although recognising the need for a certain amount of reorganisation. (6) While agreeing that these two elements of successful administration are immensely important in the field we are studying, we should be realistic as to how far they can be taken

and to what extent they can be used to improve the service.

Cooperation is perhaps something a little more personal than coordination but if there is not cooperation between the elements of various coordinating machinery, that machinery will fail to work satisfactorily. Whenever two people have to work together cooperation is more likely to produce the desired result than antagonism. However, coordinating machinery designed to foster cooperation is worth considering. Marsh has said it is possible to distinguish at least two kinds of coordinating machinery; that which is 'service' centred and that which is primarily client or consumer centred (23). This is the basic distinction I have been concerned with all through. Are we to be more concerned with improving the running of the bureaucratic structure for the sake of bureaucracy or for the sake of the client? It may seem more efficient for each service, department or sub-department to employ its own staff of specialist workers, yet from the client's point of view it may be more acceptable and, in the long run, more efficient for one worker to deal with several problems.

In New Zealand we have, however, several coordinating bodies, some serving the client, some the various departments and some a mixture. A great deal more study is required into the running of these and their actual effectiveness, but it will be well to look at some of them. It is difficult to get published or unpublished reports on these various quasi organisations and I rel heavily on an unpublished paper by W. Robinson for the following (38). Some of the comments are from personal experience. C. A. Oram also has a section on coordination in his booklet on Social Policy and Administration in New Zealand. (29)

Robinson identified three types of committee: (1) inter-departmental committees; (2) ad hoc committees; (3) mixed governmental-voluntary committees. Of the first, the Social Welfare Advisory Board (S.W.A.B.) set up in 1961

with the responsibility of coordinating social welfare activities is one of the most important. Representatives from the Health, Justice, Education, Labour, Social Security and Maori Affairs Departments, and the Child Welfare Division make up the committee which sits from time to time. The findings or recommendations from the committee are apparently not usually made public and although some of the matters dealt with may indirectly affect the clients it appears essentially to be a 'service coordinator' and because of its composition it is probable that it suffers from what the Curtis committee has described as 'traditional inter-departmental antagonism' (15). Actually S.W.A.B. was charged with reporting on the desirability of a Department of Social Welfare and it is understood that a recommendation has been made but with no feed-back or decision received yet.

I have already mentioned the Juvenile Crime Prevention Section which acts in coordinating some of the work of the Child Welfare Division and the Police Department in the interests of their common clients.

Another locally based attempt to coordinate various social service departments has not been as successful. Consisting of only statutory organisations, the committees still exist in some centres but have largely gone into recess. Part of the reason of the failure was the lack of cooperation among the various representatives, often because of differing professional background which apparently limited the ground for common understanding. There was perhap an over concern with the ethic of confidentiality which more often than not was a screen to prevent cooperation rather than a meaningful reason limiting coordination.

Another problem of some coordinating machinery has been the move by some of the committees to take up social work themselves to fill seen gaps rather than to work out how better arrangements can be made among the various

organisations represented to do the work required. This tendency can be seen with some of the committees endeavouring to coordinate the work of organisation helping old people. This of course leads to the ridiculous need for coordinating committees to coordinate the coordinating committees!

However the various difficulties encountered with these bodies are small when it is recognised that the effects on the client of the present multitude of specialised or divided services are mitigated little by these various coordinating committees. Despite all the attempts to lessen overlapping services and cut down the frequency of calls on some of our clients, the basic division still exists that apparently necessitates many calls being made and increases the likelihood of unnecessary duplication of work.

As social work becomes increasingly professionalised, a growing commitment to social work rather than to the limited organisational goals as at present is also likely to produce conflict with the agency goals and practices. In New Zealand bureaucratisation has advanced further in the social welfare system than has professionalism and although the essentially prognatic approach to the alleviation of social problems has many good points it has, I feel, led not to the best possible use of resources for the attainment of the aims but to a loyalty to one's department with the consequent antagonisms towards other agencies. This now lessens the chance for successful coordination for the reasons already outlined. The need has gone past the point where such minor organisational solutions are really helpful. They should be built in from the start, of some alternative arrangement of social welfare provision so that good liaison may be obtained with specialist services outside such an organisation. The same problems of coordination should not exist because the essential grounds for rivalry and jealousy would have been removed and the need

for coordination and cooperation would be based on respect for ones own and the others sphere of work.

THE SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

5.

To begin this section I wish to state which social work activities I feel should be part of a Social Welfare Department and then to build on my arguments for these moves, that were put forward in Section 3. The services are: The present Child Welfare Service, The Social Security social work service, the Probation service, the Maori Welfare Division, and visiting teachers. Social workers from such a department should also provide other school-based social work services possibly on secondment. I favour this arrangement also for social work in the medical situations - medical social work, psychiatric social work, and Child Health Clinic.

I feel I have established that the present dividion of social work services has arisen through focusing on different aspects of a common problem. Sometimes this hashappened because an implicit (not exphicit) judgement has been made as to the relative value or importance of some part of the problem and at other times because of a different mode of expression for theproblem has resulted in a different service. In the past the Child Welfare Division has focused on the needs of the child. TheProbation services exist to deal with expressions of problem situations that have been defined as criminal. If the disturbance had been expressed differently the person may have been seen by a Child Welfare Officer or a Social Security social worker or a School Guidance Officer. At present, because the problem may show itself in many ways, it is possible that many social workers could become involved in counselling the one client.

Recognising the common base, it is possible then to sort out the social work activities from other activities that may be carried on by people in

the helping professions. I have attempted to show how the Vocational Guidance Service could possibly be better situated as part of the employment section of the Department of Labour because of the great deal of specialised knowledge about job opportunities and requirements that is required, and because of the need to be able to administer numerous psychological and aptitude tests which takes their work beyond that of social work. These 'extra activities' are an essential part of their work and must be recognised as such. However, the social work content in Probation work, Child Welfare work, Maori Welfare work, Social Security social work, and the work of Medical, Psychiatric, School and Health Clinic social workers is much greater and the 'co-variance' much higher. This is not only suggested by job analysis but also by a study of the training undertaken by these various 'helpers'. All departments employing these social workers assist a certain number, each year to receive training in generic social work. The State Services Commission runs short courses and the only extensive and intensive training available in New Zealand is in generic social work from the Department of Social Administration and Sociology at Victoria University, Wellington. Although the fact that only a small number are able to begin the course leading to the Diploma in Social Science, each year is lamentable, agitation is directed towards providing more places for similar training rather than for specialised training in 'casework' or 'probation work' or 'group work'. Possibly by default, New Zealand is thus in an advanced state in comparison to some other countries where the true generic nature of social work is only just being realised leading to changes in training methods.

I have already highlighted, by job analysis, the similarity of the work of Social Security social workers and Child Welfare officers. It is easy to see the general nature of both Maori Welfare work and Social Security work and

I have discussed the racial objections to combining Maori Welfare work with other social work activities. It is certainly preferable from several points of view that the family requiring Child Welfare, Probation, and Maori Welfare oversight be seen by the one worker. Not only is this bureaucratically efficient, but the client or clients would suffer less privation and confusion and the necessary social work relationship would be stronger. The particular social network would also be seen more clearly as the unit that it is rather than as isolated pieces of a jig-saw puzzle.

There is an increasing recognition that the sooner developing problems in psychological and social functioning are dealt with the greater is the likelihood of successful treatment. For this reason school based social work must increase. There is a strong case for social workers working <u>in</u> the schools so that they are relatively freely available for all pupils rather than just working with the schools once a pupil's problem has shown itself as 'needing' Child Welfare help. This preventive work must increase over the next few years and it is well that it be fully integrated with other social work services from the start. I feel the solution suggested - that as many social workers as are required by a school be seconded from a central social work agency - is most likely to meet this need through the practical recognition that professional ties and contacts will foster such integration. Where, for some reason a child is referred to the social work agency other than via a school, the worker who becomes involved in helping would of course be able to visit the school as is done at present by Child Welfare. Similarly, if the problem uncovered by a child's referral to the school based worker discloses much wider problems in the family then these could be dealt with by that worker. If, following a man's conviction of a crime and referral to probationary supervision by one of the social workers, his child displays signs of the

disturbance at school, then the worker involved with probationary supervision would also be able to do the necessary counselling of the child.

The need for separate truant officers and visiting teachers would also be eliminated, the functions of both being shared among the workers at the 'Social Welfare Department'. Truancy generally involves something more than just a disciplinary problem but in any case a social worker is probably best qualified to discriminate where a 'little discipline' rather than deeper social work assistance should be given.

Remaining with our family example, if one of the parents was taken ill and had to spend a period in a hospital, 'public' or 'psychiatric', then there is no reason why the social worker already working with the family should not be able to provide any necessary social histories for the medical staff. Other problems that can sometimes turn up with hospitalisation could also be dealt with by the one social worker. For the rehabilitation of long-term patients the resources of such a unified department should enable better provision being made than is at present available. As I suggested earlier, community development or use of community resources is sadly neglected in New Zealand, partly because when the already small population is divided further by being asked to show primary allegiance to some particular form of social service provision there is not sufficient resources to make the ' mining' economical. A unified approach should help greatly in making use of the therapeutic community.

Apart from the social work base of the services I have been discussing I have also endeavoured to indicate that many, if not all, find it necessary to be able to hand out material and in all its various forms. The Social Security Department is, of course, paramount in this respect. The Child Welfare Division administers the Needy Family Scheme and is also able to make emergency

payments to families in certain circumstances. It also provides for Wards of the State and thus has to consider cost of living and maintain extensive accounting records. The Probation Service also is able to make loans to probationers in certain circumstances and is a collecting agent for fines imposed by the courts. Hospital boards are able to make a wide variety of 'welfare payments' in cash and kind and even education boards have authority to provide a 'book grant' in extreme cases of need. The list is longer but the trend is apparent. Social Welfare is an essential ingredient of social work.

In New Zealand we have never really lost this way of looking at Social Service provision as did United States of America. There, many social work agencies were that purely and simply and even Governmental provisions tended to stress the casework ideal. However, a recent swing back to the realisation that casework alone does not relieve poverty has produced increasing pleas for m monetary provision. From the stance of relieving poverty, Alvin Schorr, of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare has argued cogently for more aid in cash rather than kind. (40). Trying to help problem families with family counselling, psychiatric treatment or advice on home management will not be successful because although these services are needed they do not provide sufficient leverage to alter the external circumstances of very many people. Schour is not arguing against the personal services but pointing out how in many situations they are not enough. Another difficulty to be considered in the provision of social services is, how many who need them can be reached? Schorr feels purely personal services are limited in the number they can reach but because of a quality of visibility, greater in comparison to the provision of money, a nation is permitted to believe it is doing much when it is doing little. He says, "Because of this quality of visibility, national policy

based on personal services tends to be inexpensive. This is not because such services are themselves inexpensive; they are frequently more costly per person than the annual income they are meant to produce. But if they reach comparitively few people their overall cost is, of course, small. The choice that is made to develop an expensive service which in inexpensive overall is not necessarily deliberate or thoroughly understood - particularly on the part of the electorate. We may intend more, but unfortunately our understanding of how to engineer and deliver personal services is as yet primitive."

I feel that if New Zealand were to set up a separate Social Work Agency there would be a grave danger of the need for monetary assistance being lost sight of or at least its importance being deprecated. For if its importance is deprecated, depreciation w ill follow at a faster rate than is already apparent. Now only is this belittling of economic assistance likely to occur but by sheer necessity there would be a growth in the already numerous provision of 'hand-out' or 'emergency' cash boxes. The present division of economic assistance increases the number of calls that many clients have to make to various social service agencies and if the major income maintenance Department were to remain apart from a Social Welfare Department, the problems I have outlined above would remain. Not only would this be so but for reasons similar to those leading to the development of a social work section within the Social Security Department over the past ten years, the Department would probably find it more convenient to employ its own social workers in the future. I have demonstrated the need to have access to some sort of income assistance provisions and this being so it is reasonable that there be one unified, comprehensive department to disburse this. Because any such comprehensive provision is naturally involv it is essential that social workers using the provisions to assist their client should be thoroughly versed in their administration. This is only possible

if the provisions become part of one's reference frame governed by using them frequently in one's work. For the above reasons I believe all present income maintenance and other economic assistance measures discussed should form part of a Social Welfare Department.

Once the concept of such an organisation is grasped many other benefits that will follow from it will become apparent. At the client centred level I have been working from, it will be apparent that the availability of general counselling and advice services should eliminate the growing moves for Boards of all sorts and Councils to get on the Welfare Band-wagon. A disturbing element (for present social welfare provision) in the 1968 local body elections was the number of candidates or groups of candidates who, realising the deficiencies in the present services, felt it necessary to advocate the employment of Welfare Officers by local body governments. Some envisaged the 'welfare officer' would serve as yet another coordinating agent, others felt the welfare officer should actually offer some undefined sort of social work service. Throughout this paper I have stressed the strain that results from the present multiple provison of services and it would be sad indeed if local body government also endeavoured to dabble in this very complex field. There are of course many other good reasons for leaving social welfare provision with Central Government rather than allowing small, local body organisations staffed with lay persons to run such a service. New Zealand is not another England which in any case is unable to provide the uniform approach to social services that New Zealand is able to. The uniformity of provision and standard of provision is something that would actually be increased were the services to be dispensed by a Social Welfare Department. I have already indicated how services in a place like Wanganui would be improved beyond recognition through the elimination of duplication and some other

reorganisation. It would also mean that small areas like Taihape would also have increased service with resident Social Welfare Officers, an impossibility were the service to be the responsibility of local government. At present such small towns are not served adequately either, because it is impossible to justify separate local offices for the Probation, Child Welfare, Social Security Maori Welfare and school social services.

Other benefits, which I do not want to do more than mention, are the possibility of improved advisory services to Government, earlier recognition of various 'problem areas' which may justify more intensive treatment, the wider use of experimental therapeutic situations to find more effective methods of treatment and the wider use of research techniques generally to improve our understanding of the needs we are trying to meet.

To make the department maximally effective with our present level of knowledge it is possible to suggest various specialist services that could form part of such an organisation. The employment of psychologists is one such supporting service that could be usefully part of the department. Apart from bringing these qualified people to centres at present receiving inadequate psychological services, the specialised knowledge would be of assistance in the general treatment of some of the clients of the department. The Report of the Department of Justice for the year ended 31 March 1967 also makes the point that like other professional groups professional contact is important for the recruitment and retainment of psychologists. They suggest that a decentralised, regional psychological service that besides providing a service to institutions would also act as consultants to other departmental services would be more appropriate than the present arrangement. I believe this would be best achieved through the attachment of psychologists to certain of the offices of the Social Welfare

Department.

Close contact with hospitals or the part-time employment of medically and psychiatrically qualified staff could also be considered. Like so many of the personal welfare services, the exact need cannot be stated before some service is provided, the true need only being realised once a start is made. This means that it may be best to wait and assess the need for supporting services once the Social Welfare Department was functional as far as the social work services are concerned. It will be recognised, however, that a unified Department is much better able to utilise any such extra services than the present divided arrangement.

SOME IDEAS ON THE BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE

The administrative setting in which a service is provided will reflect and help to condition the approach to the problems or needs defined when the service was observed as being required. In the previous sections I have shown that the problems being tackled by several of our social welfare organisations are basically similar and that there is a commonly recognised method of approach - the social work method. In bringing the practitioners together under the form of a Social Welfare Department we must be concerned that the administrative structure preserves or enhances their ability to carry out their essential functions. Through social administration as a subject of study we must be concerned to make social administration as a process something that will ensure that the aims of our social welfare policy are carried out.

In the administration of social policy, or a part of that policy that can be effected through such an organisation as I have been discussing, we come up against several problems, although these are not all as clear as may at first be thought. We have the question of the professional trying to work in a bureaucracy which I have complicated by suggesting that the organisation should not merely be a social work agency but also should be responsible for disbursing material aid such as that with which the Social Security Department is concerned. This increases the clerical and administrative staff in relation to the social work staff and may increase conflict between the two. The reasons for seeing this conflict have been well summarised by Peter Leonard (21). They basically are the differing justification for one's acts; justification for the professional act being that it is 'right' professionally and for the administrative act that it is in line with the organisations rules

and regulations.

But should we necessarily have this conflict? Should not the ideology and aims of both the professional act and the administrative act be more complementary than is suggested by Leonard's analysis of the situation? That professionals are generally able to work effectively in administrative structu indicates that there is adaptibility and flexibility somewhere if, indeed, there is not a good deal of common ground. The picture is clouded (or perhaps aided) also by the fact that social work still has difficulty in claiming for itself the status of professional. The untrained volunteer social worker often has as muchsuccess in assisting his clients as does the professionally trained worker. This tends to make some social workers more humble in their claims and possibly assists integration with the organisational pattern. It is true, however, that social workers are tending to accept a written code of ethics that governs certain aspects of their behaviour. This is often seen as being one of the necessary moves before the claim for professionalism can be truly made, but many of the 'conditions' in the code would arise naturally out of the value background of social welfare policy that I discussed in the first section. At times because of this 'extra' commitment social workers may find it easier to avoid the distortions of aim and ideology that sometimes beset the administrators within the bureaucrati structure. The problem is not then that"the administrator is concerned with the maintenance of the organisation as such" or that he is "primarily concerned with results" (지) and that these orientations conflict with the social-worker orientations, but how to avoid these distortions of social policy aim.

This is a difficult problem and one that needs careful study. Leonard Tierney's study of child welfare in Victoria, Australia, shows how those responsible for administering an initially generous and far-sighted programme

were led by the exigencies of day to day decision making to pervert it into a timid, legalistic, and radically ineffective set of operating procedures. Examples given by Tierney are many but a couple of comments will illustrate. "Much of the poor planning and care provided for children derives from an insistence that the welfare of the child is the community's only concern. This had led to a lack of interest in parental problems, a gross ignorance about their lives and aspirations and a far too ready assumption that society stands between the child and the ignorance and cruelty of his parents." Some of these difficulties may be alleviated simply by the wider approach to the problem possible when working in a general Social Welfare Department, but other safeguards are necessary. "A file was created which contained the essential data about the child, a decision was made about his disposal and then the case was filed away. It remained in the files until some new decisions had to be made and the process repeated. From time to time the file would proceed through a series of 'in' and 'out' trays, from one sub-department to another when one officer after another made annotations. The holistic nature of the child's needs were lost" (45).

This gross distortion is not common, but it is the partial distortions that breed conflict. Another conflict that would probably be lessened with the advent of a Social Welfare Department is that arising between the usually limited service goals of a department and the profession's relatively unlimited commitments.

It is not always the administrative side of the organisation that is open to distortion however. We must guard against the service becoming a context for professional practice which is not the same as being engaged on fulfilling social policy aims.

Robert Vinter has identified four mechanisms designed to achieve control while respecting professional claims to autonomy. These are, with some of Vinter's comments: "(1) Commitment to organisation goals. Unfortunately, high ideological commitment tends to increase doctrinanism and parochial perspectives among agency personnel. These in turn impede pragmatism and rationalism in organisational operation and innovation. (2) Maximising colleague controls - case conferences, staff meetings, etc. While providing reassurance that the less profecient will be guided by the more expert, such interchange also supports idealogical commitment and conformity. (3) Segregation of tasks and roles. Activities with case competencies should be grouped, others separated out. (4) Superordination of professions - has only transitory usefulness for control of performance in treatment organisations. On the one hand the press towards attainment of full professional stature impels each subgroup to affirm the authenticity of its own special knowledge and competence On the other hand, enlargements in the knowledge base of each profession jeopardise continued dependence on another group." (48)

Some of the points raised above really form part of the findings from the detailed studies of the Hawthorne factory by E. Mayo. In essence, these showed that an organisation ought to give social and psychological satisfaction to those who work in it. If for some reason of poor administration, or lack of social skill among management, people are robbed of these satisfactions, they will find ways to compensate, informally and unofficially and most probably in ways damaging to efficiency. We must pay attention to human relations. However the human relations model and the earlier fashion of 'scientific management' advanced by F. W. Taylor are not enough. They are not bad, but insufficient. Joyce Warham has suggested that a synthesis be found in the 'task' approach -

both instruments and people are considered but in relation to the work that has to be done. (49). This brings us back to the theme of this section so far: that we must have a clear identity of agency purpose and the mobilisation of resources in relation to them.

How can we achieve all this with an organisational set-up that still allows Parliament to keep a watching brief, on behalf of the community, on the day to day running of the organisation. Obviously controls are necessary and provision for inspection is also required. We need responsible officers, in the sense that they are responsible for seeing that the service aims are carried out. The organisational structure that will provide the necessary conditions will have to be, in a way, looser and more unified at the same time than the present hierarchical arrangements. The unity must come from a work team approach that allows scope for individual competency, that diffuses power into a network of mutual influence instead of concentrating it. Eugen Pusić has called this the "process of social self-management". (36)

The work team consists not only of the field worker but also the supervisor and the psychologists and other individual specialists with knowledge and skill to use in solving the social or individual problem. Pusić suggests that in such a loosely structured organisation the decision to be made "at higher levels" would be worked out "by a system of collective bodies with changing membership and very elastic rules of procedures which would have to be convened at various levels whenever a decision about indeterminate alternatives involving interests - i.e. not a purely technical decision - has to be taken. The membership in each instance will depend on the content of the decision, giving voice or fair representation to the individuals or the work teams whose interests are touched." (36). It will be apparent that such a structure provides for some of the mechanisms identified by Vinter as aiding control

while respecting professional autonomy.

This type of organisation of the social workers and other allied workers does of course have to be integrated with the clerical staff concerned with pr viding action on income maintenance matters and in keeping records. There must be some meeting of overall responsibility for both sides of the organisati probably possible through work teams, operating in a similar fashion to those already outlined. However, this is to be the subject of a further paper to follow on from this.

One final point I wish to make on the organisation of a Social Welfare Department is on its size. Fears are always held for the well-being of one's clients when it is suggested that many social welfare services be integrated. Administrators and social workers alike point in horror to some of the troubles they feel arise from what they regard as the already too large service departments. First we must note that there is very little systematic study relating to the impact of administrative size or service unit size on clientele. (47). And secondly, there is no reason why the local offices of a Social Welfare Department need be large. One of the major advantages of a unification of services is that rather than have half a dozen offices scattered over a town supplying half a dozen different services, these half dozen offices would now be able to supply the one unified, 'complete' service. The geographic location of the offices could be made more rational in that they could be located closer to the clients - within communities rather than in the middle of the commercial centre of a city, often miles away from any residential area where it is required. The sizeof the office could thus be kept to a convenient administrative size and would also provide a better service than could ever be given under the present scheme.

Although in this last section I have suggested some wider benefits that would accrue from a Social Welfare Department I have been concerned, in the main, to argue the case for such a department from the point of view of the general citizen who is likely to make use of the services offered. It is for the individual citizen and the community as a whole that such services exist at all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations used:

O.U.P.	Oxford University Press
R. & K.P.	Routledge & Kegan Paul
N.Z.I.P.A.	N.Z. Institute of Public Administration
M.U.D.E.S.G.	Massey University Department of Education Study Guide

1. Anderson, L. G. "Child Welfare in N.Z." in New Zealand Social Worker 1/2 '6
2. " "Welfare Requirements in a Multiracial Society" in Administration in N.Z.'s Multiracial Society (Eds) Brookes, R. H. and Kawharu, I.H. O.U.P. 1967
3. Barker, P. (as editor of New Society) "The Seebohm Report" New Society 25.7.68
4. Bessell, R. "Probation Service Troubles" New Society 4.1.68
5. Boss, P. Social Policy and the Young Delinquent R. & K.P. 1967
6. Brown, M. "Reorganising Social Welfare" New Society 30.12.65 (a similar article is to be found in Social Service Quarterly Dec. 1965)
7. Cassen, R. "Welfare: States Role" New Society 10.6.65
8. Cavenagh, W. E. & Sparks, R. F. "Out of Court?" New Society 15.7.65
9. Council on Social Work Education An Intellectual Exploration: Universals and Differences in Social Work Values, Functions and Practices 1967
10. Dyos, H. J. et al. "Origins of the Social Services" beginning New Society 1.2.68
11. Ferguson, J. T. "Administrative Problems in New Zealand" in Welfare in New Zealand (ed) K.J. Scott. O.U.P. 1955
12. Fox, W. G. "Ideals and Reality in Social Work" Journal of International Social Work 7/2 1964
13. Green, W.A.E. et al Social Services in New Zealand N.Z.I.P.A. 1955
14. Halmos, P. The Faith of Counsellors Constable, London 1965
15. Hopkins, J.S. "The Making of a Department" Case Conference 14/7 Nov. '67
16. Irvine, E.E. "School Based Social Work" New Society 10.3.66
17. Jarvis, F. V. "Role Conflict in Probation" New Society 12.10.67
18. Justice, Report of Department of for Years ended 31.3.67 and 31.3.68
19. King, J. F. S. The Probation Service Butterworth, London 1964
20. Lapping, A. "Is a Family Service Enough New Society 5.8.65
21. Leonard, P. "Social Workers and Bureaucracy" New Society 2.6.66
22. Lupton, T. "Social Science and the Manager" New Society 8.4.65
23. Marsh, D. C. (ed) An Introduction to the Study of Social Administration R. & K.P. 1965
24. Marshall, T. H. "Welfare in the Content of Social Development" in Welfare and Wisdom ed Morgan, J. S.

25. Marshall, T. H. Social Policy Hutchinson University Lib. 1965

26. Minn, W. G. "Typical Administrative Problems" Welfare in New Zealand (ed) K. J. Scott O.U.P. 1955

27. Millard, D. A. "Imaginative Imperative" Case Conference March 1968

28. Morris, T. "Struggle for the Juvenile Court" New Society 10.2.66

29. Oram, C. A. Social Policy and Administration in New Zealand 1968

30. " Administration of Social Security Cash Benefits and War Pensions in New Zealand 1968

31. Overtin, A. et al. Casework Notebook Family Centred Project St. Paul, Minnesota.

32. Parker, R. A. "Social Administration and Scarcity: The Problem of Rationing" Social Work 24/2 April 1967

33. Peston, M. H. "Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness" New Society 21.4.66

34. Pringle, M. L. K. (ed) Investment in Children Longman

35. Print, J. M. A Guidance Counsellor in My School M.U.D.E.S.G. 776

36. Pusic, E. "The Political Community and the Future of Welfare" in Welfare and Wisdom ed J. S. Morgan

37. Robb, J. H. "Decentralisation and the Citizen" in Decentralisation in New Zealand Government Administration (ed) J. L. Roberts O.U.P. 161

38. Robinson, W. Statutory Social Services in New Zealand (unpublished research paper)

39. Ryan, T. M. "The Administrative Structure of the Child Guidance Service an Historical Note" Social Work 24/3 July 1967

40. Schorr, A. L. "Poverty and Money" New Society 17.8.67

41. Slack, K. M. Social Administration and the Citizen P. Michael Joseph '6

42. Social Security, Report of Department of for year ended 31.3.68

43. Stacey, R. S. A Counsellor in My School M.U.D.E.S.G. 777

44. Statistics, Department of N.Z. Census of Population and Dwellings 1966

45. Tierney, L. Children Who Need Help

46. Titmuss, R. M. "The Socia l Division of Welfare" in Essays on the Welfare State Unwin University Books, 1963

47. Vinter, R. D. "The Social Structure of Service" and
48. "Analysis of Treatment Organisations" both in Behavioural Science for Social Workers (ed) E. J. Thomas

49. Warham, J. An Introduction to Administration for Social Workers

50. Wedge, P. J. "Overlapping and Cooperation" New Society 27.7.67

51. Williams, G. The Coming of the Welfare State Allen & Unwin 1967

52. Sutch. W Quest for Security in New Zealand.

53. Riesman, D. The lonely Crowd.

54. Carkhuff. + Berenson. Beyond Counselling + Psychotherapy