

CHAPTER ONE

A STUDY FROM CASE TO THEORY

The Initial Focus

Professional education is the life blood of a profession. It is the only means which enables a profession to perpetuate itself and develop. As members of a Federal association we accept that our profession is not limited to state boundaries but that we have a common bond with all professional Social Workers throughout Australia and beyond.

Good, V-President AASW (SA), 1965

The intellectual life demands respect for what has gone on before and acceptance of a rigorous discipline to a tradition of learning. ... But orthodoxy is celibate: it breeds no fresh ideas; unless tradition is continually re-examined, it becomes oppressive. So in the course of their evolution universities have learned not only to pass on a corpus of knowledge and ideas but to train students to disclose errors in knowledge and question ideas.

Ashby, 1946

Toynbee has pointed out, only too well, that rigid societies are dead or dying societies and so with institutions. You cannot raise pearls in dead oysters.

Nyquist, 1964

This is a case study based on the Federal records of the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW)¹ to 1977. It is a study of how a developing profession influenced the form of tertiary education for its practitioners (social workers) and for a related occupational group (social welfare workers). It is more than this. By using the case of the AASW, an opportunity arises for the re-examination of the nature of power itself. While the debates, tensions, conflicts and splits are fascinating, there is more going on. It is like becoming excited at the tricks and skills of soccer players on the field when, perhaps, the 'real game' may be being played on other levels and for different stakes than those that excite the crowd.

Social work is a relatively new profession as distinct from religion, law, medicine and the army. It is a profession whose members are predominantly women. It has a long history in charity and service which are valued by our culture. It is a profession steeped in the principles of social justice. This study aimed initially to provide empirical evidence from which to develop further ideas on the role of professional associations and their relationship with tertiary educational

¹See Appendix 1 for full names of all acronyms.

institutions in context. In the process of the study, the emphasis shifted and moved into a more detailed analysis of the nature of power.

The underlying assumptions of this study are that associations like professions do not develop in isolation. They are influenced and affected by a complex web of circumstances existing in a given society at a given time. The decisions made in decades gone by set the framework for the system we now inhabit. This is in the same vein as the findings of Child et al. (1983: 63) which lead to ‘the conclusion that strategic choices about contemporary work organisation were in effect made at a societal level a century ago’. These decisions are able to be found, identified and analysed as a framework for re-examination of the current situation and to assist in the development of new decisions which will set the foundation for the next century. It is, as Navarro (1978: xiv) suggests, questionable to treat the professions as having an autonomy of their own. He says,

I believe that the nature, functions, composition and distribution of services within that sector and its different components are determined primarily by forces outside - not within - it. I consider social policy in social sectors to be the dialectical result of forces that exist both outside and inside those sectors. In a gradient of influence, however, the former ranks higher than the latter.

He says to understand the behaviour, both historical and current, of élites and power groups, we have to realize that, however strong conflicts among them may be, those conflicts take place within a set of class relations. These implicit class alliances and class positions are often the main determinants of policy formation. Élites and power groups have not only professional interests but also class cohesion and solidarity - of paramount importance in defining the political parameters within which those interactions and conflicts take place. In that respect, focusing on the interests and behaviour of groups as the main determinants of policy formation runs the risk of excluding from the analysis the consideration of the non-actors and non-decisions. These non-actors and non-decisions can be as important as, if not more important than, the actual actors and decisions (Navarro, 1978: xiv).

An historical analysis of this type relies on a naturalistic interpretivist base. The study is focused on discovering the contextual conditions, ideas and meanings that were held in social work association members’ minds, reflected in their documents and in their actions, inactions, decisions and non-decisions. A naturalistic interpretivist base can accommodate shared multiple realities from differing perspectives and incorporate factors and influences affecting the

profession over time. Various actors in the process will have different views of social reality. It will be important to acknowledge the views of influential actors like John Lawrence (1965), who believed that Social Work as a profession would never gain sufficient status unless it recruited more men and elevated them to positions of power within the professional association, welfare agencies and organizations. This researcher's own view of Lawrence's analysis is irrelevant. The repercussions of his analysis and ability to persuade are still being felt within the profession and the educational experience of its practitioners. His position and the relative position of others in the status hierarchy within the profession and, in class groupings and alliances outside the profession, are more important. The questions being asked are, what views were held, how were they manifested, what social relationships did they reflect and what are the consequences of all of this for the delivery of education in this particular profession?

I have used names of actual people in this study. This is because all the material used is already in the public arena, accessible to general members of the public. I have used no restricted materials. Critique is directed not at individuals but at the process of professionalization, the procedures of the professional bodies and the strategies used in establishing and strengthening educational opportunities for future practitioners within the parameters set by the profession itself. Only relevant information from the archives was utilised.

Profession and Professionalization

The literature of the nature of professions and professionalization begins with early analyses by Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) and Reader (1966). Since that time, a variety of views on professions have developed, reflecting functionalist, neo-Weberian, interactionist, power, institutional, Marxist and organizational theories (Klegon 1978; Saks 1983).²

²A relatively recent contribution has been from Andrew Abbott (1988) *The System of Professions-An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. In this book Abbott introduces a model of 'jurisdictional disputes in field of work around which relevant professions are clustered'. It enables differences between professions and affirms that their role in educational delivery is revealed in historical context. Abbott's model appears to overcome the criticisms of functionalist theory that it is ahistorical (Johnson, 1972 and McKinlay 1973) and the lack of empiricism of the neo-weberians (Saks, 1983:9).

Writing on the professions has paid attention to status and the processes of growth and development of the professions overseas and in Australia (Abbott 1981, 1988; Becker 1970; Bolger et al, 1981; Boreham, Pemberton & Wilson 1976; Carr-Saunders & Wilson 1933; Congalton 1969; Elliot 1972; Etzioni 1969; Gross & Osterman 1972; Lasswell 1938, 1977; Reader 1966). There have been numerous critiques of sociological analyses of the professions (Abbott 1988; Boreham, Pemberton & Wilson 1976; Klegon 1978; Navarro 1978; Saks 1983). So, too, have professional standards and their setting, the class base of the professions and the ways in which professions wield power been the focus (Abbott 1981, 1988; Baer 1986; Ben-David 1963-4; Boreham, Pemberton & Wilson 1976; Gerstl & Jacobs 1976; Halmos 1971; Illich et al 1977; Johnson 1972; Maley 1970; Moore 1970; Navarro 1978; Reader 1966; Saks 1983; Torstendahl & Burrage 1990). Some of these studies have been based on empirical data; others are theoretical.

There are analyses of the construction of knowledge and the processes by which professions and disciplines encourage or inhibit growth and innovation of knowledge and procedures (Bernstein 1971; Fores, Glover & Lawrence 1991; Locke 1976; Young 1970; Banks 1972; Blau, La Gory & Pipkin 1983; Bucher & Strauss 1961; Child, Fores, Glover & Lawrence 1983; Etzioni 1968; McKinlay 1973; Scott, 1985). While some deal briefly with the socialization and education of new members of the professions, few address the processes by which the professional bodies exercise influence on educational institutions.

The educational institutions, their purpose and form, have changed substantially since the turn of the century. Historical and analytical writers on the origins, forms and changes in tertiary education in Australia and Britain highlight the territorial disputes related to the various levels of education. They include the class base and origins of the students and the notions underpinning the range of courses offered (Davies 1989; Jones 1988; Meek 1984; Murray-Smith & Dare 1987; Pratt & Burgess 1974; Sanders 1966; Spaull 1987; Treyvaud & McLaren 1976; Wheelwright 1965). The processes of change, the influence of pressure groups, the environment, the ease of gaining access to resources and economic and political imperatives are part of the fuller picture of changes in tertiary education (Adam 1973; Bates 1985; Goedegebuure & Meek 1991; Harman 1973; Matchett 1993; Peoples 1993; Simon 1974; Simpkins 1988; Tipton 1973; Venables 1970; Walford 1987).

The literature on the social work profession in Australia and its relationship with educational institutions is scant. In the ten years 1983-1993, there are only nine articles on the profession in *Australian Social Work*: two of these are motivational articles by the association president. Sturmey (1992), Lawrence (1965) and, Marchant and Wearing (1986) are the most useful publications. Marchant and Wearing's *Gender Reclaimed: Women in Social Work* provides a feminist analysis of professional and educational issues in social work. There is a lack of material on welfare work. Other writers on the role of women in the social work profession, particularly with respect to the status perception of the profession (because it has a majority of women practitioners), include Bolger et al 1981, Chafetz 1972 and Healy 1982.

General histories on the social work profession in Australia and the histories of significant and influential agencies like the Charity Organisation Society are useful in establishing context. They help in identifying evidence of early forms of education and training for social workers and welfare workers before the establishment of university based courses (Dickey 1987; Kennedy 1982 & 1985). Bruno's *Trends in Social Work 1874-1956*, (1957) outlines the development of social work in the USA based on the proceedings of the conferences held by the national association. There is no similar document for Australia.

Up until recently, the Australian Association of Social Workers required that only a person who had completed 4 years in a full-time accredited Social Work undergraduate course or a two-year full-time Post-Graduate Social Work course would be eligible for membership of the professional association. Although there is no professional registration and not all qualified social workers are members of the association, all people who wish to apply for a social work position must be eligible for membership. Welfare Workers, on the other hand, may have completed a Certificate, Associate Diploma, Diploma or three-year undergraduate Degree in Welfare. These people are not only ineligible for membership but, in many courses, only the university qualified will gain automatic articulation to a Social Work Course. In some Schools of Social Work in Australian universities, the Associate Diploma and Certificate holders may as well have no qualifications. Even when the university does recognize these awards, the Australian Association of Social Workers may deny accreditation to the course.

In 1992, the Brous Consulting Group was engaged to identify the Social Work and Welfare competencies. In their Interim Report (July, 1993), only one difference in the competencies between the two groups was found. This item was management. Brous found that Welfare

Workers had management skills as one of their competencies and Social Workers did not. If it is verified that there are few differences between groups in terms of their performance in the community and the tasks they identify as having precedence in their daily activities, questions can be asked about the differentials between training and educational opportunities, status, salary and power. Cullen (1985), in his study 'Professional Differentiation and Occupational Earnings', found that some occupational groups derived additional earnings by lengthening and elevating their degree of educational achievement. Social Workers are paid more than Welfare Workers. Welfare Workers cannot apply for Social Work positions but the reverse is true. The question of whether the Social Work profession has set up and maintains a monopoly in the provision of expert welfare services is the focus for future research for which this case study may be useful.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following definitions are set here:

profession

Sak's definition of professions as 'at root occupational groups characterised by some configuration of concrete, usually legally sustained, privileges' (1983:17) is adopted. This is used in contrast to functionalist, neo-Weberian or Marxist definitions. A mere listing of the characteristics and traits of professions and professionals does not account for the historical conditions and contexts in which these groups arise. The definition of profession is more fully canvassed in Chapter 3.

social work

The statement in the International Standard Classification of Occupations (1968:89) is a thoroughly inadequate definition. Ruth Sturmey's (1992) definition though flawed, is useful. 'Social work is that work done to systematically bring about change in individuals, families and communities so as to improve their well-being by a person with accepted qualifications.'

welfare work³

Sturmey also defines welfare work as, ‘that work done to promote the social welfare or social adjustment of individuals, families and communities by a person with some welfare work training. That work tends to be focused on immediate needs and less complex adjustments or change. Generally, the immediate context rather than the wider context is the more important consideration and there is less need for a rigorous application of theory and research.’ (1992:4). The major problem with this definition is a political one. In social work the word ‘adjustment’ is one deemed to reflect a conservative political ideology of requiring people to adapt and adjust to a given situation and not encourage or be involved in, the processes of social or individual change. Welfare workers would dispute this view of their activities. Welfare workers manage ‘small’ agencies (like the Smith Family) and community centres. They are involved in Domestic Violence Services and Refuges in higher proportions than social workers. While they do deal with immediate crises on a regular basis, there is no justification to Sturmey’s claim that the wider context is less relevant or that research and application of theory is less rigorously applied. Social workers, on entering women’s refuges, can be overwhelmed by the up-to-date knowledge, the application of feminist theoretical analysis and practice methods of the welfare workers and, indeed, some of the unqualified refuge workers especially those who are Aboriginal or from Non-English Speaking Backgrounds.

For the purposes of this paper, welfare work will be defined as that work done to systematically bring about change in individuals, families and communities, so as to improve their well being by a person with an accepted welfare work qualification. That work tends to be focused on simple and complex issues and processes of change or to address issues within a variety of contexts and with due regard to theory, research, values and goals. Welfare work includes direct work with individuals, group work, community development work, management and policy work.⁴

³At the Australian Association of Social Work and Welfare Educator's National Workshop (1st October, 1993), the question was put to those gathered, ‘What was the difference between welfare work and social work?’ Groans emanated from the floor. This is the question every student and every practitioner asks, for which there is no adequate response. The workshop was attended by the incoming and outgoing National President of the Australian Association of Social Workers and at least five Heads of Schools of Social Work. It was agreed that this was a debate we are still to have and still to resolve.

⁴ At Curtin University, Western Australia the Head of School reported (1.10.93 AASWWE Workshop) that the university offered post-graduate courses in Social Work and in Welfare. The Social Work post-graduate students were usually studying and researching improved direct service responses (case-work, family therapy, other therapeutic intervention strategies) and the welfare work post graduates were examining indirect service

status

Status is defined as a relative position in a ranked group or in a social system. In order to identify differing status, one must identify the characteristics of the ranks which make up the social system identified, for example, economic resources, political power, level of access to a variety of social relationships.

class

Class is a social stratum whose members share similar economic, political and cultural characteristics. Navarro (1978: xiv) asserts that social class is a most necessary category of analysis of social and political behaviour and that the conflicts and antagonisms among classes are the main determinants of social change. These class conflicts form the parameters within which conflicts between élites and interest groups, including professional ones, take place.

...I do not consider class to be a result of mere structure but also the result of a set of economic, political and social relations defined by the specific stage of development of that specific social formation

Navarro, 1978: xiv

In Lawrence's *History of Professional Social Work in Australia* (1965), the core issues that informed the development of professional social work education in Australia are not identified. It has a poor analysis of the role of women. The study is not contextualized that is, it is not attached to the major issues and difficulties in Australian society of the day. He does identify the development of training courses and tertiary education courses but not from the view of the academic institution and its personnel. Kennedy's *Charity Warfare* (1985) is more powerful: the people involved are contextualized and they 'live'. Some appreciation and understanding of their aims and actions is available to the reader. Dickey's *No Charity There: A Short History of Social Welfare in Australia*, (1987) does not cover the educational issues for the profession. Learner's *Education and Training for Social Welfare Personnel in Australia*, written for the Department of Social Security in 1979, is descriptive and does not identify controversies or debates within social work, between social work and welfare and in their negotiations with academic institutions. Ruth Sturmy's (1992) *Educating Social Welfare and Community Development*

responses (policy, planning and development issues). Social Work graduates were moving to welfare post-graduate study. This was seen by other workshop attendees to be a total switch of the roles of welfare and social work. Indeed, the notion of post-graduate welfare work courses was one that could not be contemplated by some participants. Further one of the central arguments for high quality social work courses was the lack of senior workers who could head organisations and assist in policy development. If this core senior social work area is now the realm of social welfare, considerable difficulty will arise in establishing differentials in status, purpose and discipline.

Workers for Rural/Remote Areas: A Study of Competence and the Provision of Higher Education, is the most recent contribution. Even here she comments ‘there are no standard Australian definitions agreed upon by the professional bodies for social work, welfare work or community development work. Nothing defines their similarities and differences though there is a clearer difference between the first two and the latter’ (1992:59). There is, therefore, a gap in our knowledge about Social Work and Social Welfare education in Australia. It is a gap that needs filling to enable a reappraisal of the profession and to inform social welfare and social work educators trying to bridge the chasm between these two branches of what appears to be the same discipline.

As identified earlier, new post-graduate courses in welfare are being developed which may be perceived as cutting across the territory of social work. Institutions which have traditionally trained and educated welfare workers wish to ‘upgrade’ their course offerings and provide degree courses in social work. Some students prefer social work degree courses to welfare degree courses, as they see greater chances for employment and promotion if they have the former. Some Social Welfare degree courses have honours years; others have masters programs. In what way will these four or five-year degrees be different from social work degrees? A study that traces the origins and key arguments can inform this debate and assist in the formulation of new directions for both the profession and educators.

Through the years of the binary system of tertiary education in Australia, Welfare and Community Development and Counselling courses sprang up across the country. The Colleges and Institutes of Advanced Education and the Institutes of Technology put in place Degree, Diploma and Associate Diploma Courses. In some institutions, higher degrees by course work were offered and some social work graduates enrolled in these post-graduate courses. Over time, the Technical Education System became Technical and Further Education (TAFE). There were more welfare courses at Certificate and Associate Diploma levels offered in small community based colleges, particularly colleges in rural areas and disadvantaged suburbs. More people from a greater diversity of backgrounds were entering the field of social welfare. Social Workers were representatives on most of the course committees related to these new courses. Social Workers taught in many of the courses, particularly if they were labelled welfare.

Casework and counselling, community development and social action, group work, working with specific age cohorts and people deemed to be disadvantaged, administration, management

and policy were taught in these courses. Social work texts were used. Teaching methods used in social work were duplicated, including role-plays, simulations and field education. Some of the courses ran specialist units. Yet only the university courses were deemed suitable to bear the name Social Work.

The Institutes of Technology and Colleges of Advanced Education were not seen by the AASW to be very much different from Colleges of Technical Education. They were certainly not universities. To many technical colleges were unsavoury and intimidating, yet the majority of adults pursuing courses were not doing so in universities but in technical colleges (Robinson, 1968:11-12). By 1965, pressure was being placed on the Commonwealth asserting that commonwealth policies on economics and industry would fail if there were no support for technical education. It was estimated that £30 million was too little to fix and maintain buildings. As the baby boom children were in primary and secondary school, the states had no money to invest in technical education (Spaull, 1987: 136-7). Higher education was the province of the Federal Government. Thus, economic conditions and national policy decisions need to be included in this examination. Social work wanted to be a full profession, with its members having completed a recognized university course. The Association would not easily accept graduates from non-university tertiary institutions. The external pressures were to have a significant effect on internal decision-making about course accreditation.

New Focus and Methodology

This study, therefore, is about profession and the influences, both internal and external which either affect or are exerted by, the professional body in relation to the education of its future members. Hence the study is mostly about *profession* and *power*.

In this case study, professions and power are first examined (Chapters 3 and 4 respectively), then a four-stage method of analysis is developed using frameworks which have come from sociological studies of power and culture. The frameworks used are empirical history; the depth hermeneutics of John B Thompson; three-dimensional analysis of power of Steven Lukes; and integration, using key concepts from Pierre Bourdieu. Chapters 5 through 9 examine the AASW and social work education in Australia, from its genesis through to 1977. Key events in this journey mark the chapter divisions. Chapter 5 presents the historical foundation of the profession and the establishment of the professional organization. Chapters 6 and 7 are focused

on the establishment of the Accreditation function of the AASW and the interplay of this with the development of a Binary System of Tertiary Education in Australia. Chapter 8 is on a major rift within the AASW, 'The Split'. Chapter 9 revolves around the AASW's determination to formally accredit all the schools of social work in Australia and, in particular, the difficulties experienced at Sydney University. These points in the history of the Association and its interaction with Tertiary Educational institutions to achieve the standards of education they desired, exemplify some powerful themes, splits and tensions within the Association, within educational institutions and in the interaction of the two.

This analysis reveals the historical context of the period under examination and also the concepts and ideas used by the AASW to establish and maintain its position in the field of social welfare. It identifies the level of influence the AASW was able to exert on tertiary education by its actions, inactions, decision and non-decisions. In identifying influence, it also shows where, relatively speaking, this influence failed and indicates the positions of the AASW in the broader field of social interaction. C Wright-Mills' notion of social responsibility (can these actors be held accountable?) is considered.

Finally, the whole series of events, actions and inactions is examined in relation to the notion of a field of interaction and social reproduction. In doing so, not only are the bases of the power being exercised clarified but the nature of power itself is re-examined.

Significance

The significance of the study rests primarily in the mining of the records of the AASW and in the uncovering of the issues and themes prevailing in the Association from its formation and through its early years. It provides an empirically based critical analysis of the events and actions which has not occurred to date. The methodology and framework used enable that critique to go beyond the personal or ideological. This is useful in increasing our understanding not only of this profession but the times in which these actions were occurring.

It raises questions and sheds light on potential further research. Is social work in Australia a monopoly? How are class, status and power reflected in the profession and the professional bodies? What is the effect of social work being a female dominated profession on professional education and training? What was the role of the male members during some of the critical

debates, splits and tensions? Were there key influential men and women in the profession and what were their significant personal contributions? What is the difference between social work and social welfare? Is there a social work culture? How have the actions of the founders and elders affected the establishment and maintenance of this culture? Should the enculturation process be examined? And, are there new directions that social work and social welfare education can take for the future?

The significance of this study goes beyond the needs and interests of the AASW, AIWCW (Australian Institute of Welfare and Community Workers) and social work and welfare education in this country. The study is also a re-examination of the nature of power. The four-stage method for the analysis of power might be useful in other circumstances and its conclusions may contribute to looking at power beyond that based in economic, symbolic and/or cultural capital.

The result of this case study is that one learns less about the AASW, universities and social welfare and much more about profession, professionalization, power, structure and the structure of society. It reveals too, that universities are not powerless against professional associations. Finally this study is an example of a social critique - of historical sociology:

social critique aims ultimately to perform three very important functions for any social order: to purge language of double-speak and the twisted values of commercial culture or in a non-capitalist society, the distorted values of a bureaucratic culture; to keep our social institutions up to their professed objectives, especially political parties which claim to champion the real interests of the have-nots; and to extend democratic principles and practices into every relevant aspect of the national and collective life, in the belief, ... , that democracy thrives best in a context of equality

Kennedy, 1989:1

There is a risk in critique as Bourdieu states most clearly,

In the social sciences, as we well know, epistemological breaks are often social breaks, breaks with the fundamental beliefs of a group and, sometimes, with the core beliefs of the body of professionals, with the body of shared certainties that found the *communis doctorum opinio*. To practice radical doubt, in sociology, is akin to becoming an outlaw.

Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:40

The main aim therefore of this study is to produce from the empirical evidence an analysis which will be critical and which the writer accepts will be contestable and contested.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Using the Empirical Base

My initial intent in this study was to engage in an exercise of classical empirical historical analysis using the records of the Australian Association of Social Workers Federal Council and Federal Executive records held in the Manuscript Library of the National Library of Australia (See Appendix 2 on referencing). Most records are available to the public, except for those related to individuals' applications for accreditation and eligibility for membership to the Association, records of ethics committee meetings where actions of individual members are discussed, financial records, membership accounts and personal addresses. The remaining material is a rich supply of minutes of meetings, reports from state branches, conference proceedings, newsletters and some articles circulated to members who were part of the executive or on standing committees of the Federal Council of the AASW.

Other useful sources of the period under review are the AASW journal; Hansard (both State and Federal); Calendars of Universities and Institutes of Technology where there were social work and social welfare courses; State and Federal Government reports on technical, tertiary and higher education; as well as books and articles analyzing or critiquing these reports. Histories of major educational institutions, such as Sydney and Melbourne Universities, RMIT (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology), Footscray Technical College and SAIT (South Australian Institute of Technology) were available, as was the history of *The Social Work Profession in Australia*, written by John Lawrence after his Ph.D. thesis.

During the document search, names of people would appear who were active participants in the debates and decisions (See Appendix 3). Articles and books written by these people were uncovered to assist in the understanding of their views, opinions and interests at the time these activities occurred. A number of those actively involved in the 1970s are in senior positions in schools of social work or in practice today.

In relation to the documents held in the manuscript library, I read each document and took notes. I used a loose-leaf binder and referenced the document and its location (in which folder, in which box and the date of the document at the top of each page). I kept the pages in the order of their appearance in the document boxes and the contents of each document box were not separated. The documents in a box do not necessarily run in chronological order, nor are the contents of the same committee meeting. The necessity of recording each document precisely was invaluable, as it protected against the recording of a document twice and it ensured that, in the translation of the notes into a chronology, the sequence was accurate. I only recorded decisions, discussions and debates that related to issues of education, accreditation and eligibility for membership. In doing so, I noted some key points in the history of the AASW in Australia where there were more debates about issues related to education and training and the differential positions of social workers and social welfare workers. These sometimes coincided with major structural changes in the tertiary educational system in Australia, for example, the development of the Binary System. I treated each key point as a separate event, although some overlap chronologically.

I entered the notes on one side of the page only. As I read, any personal comments, questions and ideas about cross-referencing or definitional issues were recorded on the back of the page. In this way, the notes retained their factual accuracy and any interpretation or emotion experienced on reading the material could be acknowledged without affecting the record. Once all the notes were taken - in pencil by hand - they were transferred to computer. I set up a format with a narrow column on the left-hand side of the page indicating the box number from which the document was taken and the date of the document. On the right was a wider column, into which the full reference of the document and complete transcript of the notes was placed. In an exercise book I numbered each line, recorded the date of the document entry, the computer file it was in, the page number and the line number in the computer file and, finally, a three to five word description of the item. By the end of this exercise, there were over 3000 separate entries in the exercise books. By surveying the pages in a systematic way, I was able to put each entry in a month and year chronological order and also sort them in terms of issues.

As a result, every statement in the narrative can be referenced back to the page of the document in the correct box within the sixty-five boxes. These occupy 35 shelf feet in the Manuscript Library and within my computer record, its line and page number can locate each statement.

For books and reports, again I took notes by hand if the book could not be removed from the library and these were segmented from the manuscript notes by a file divider. Otherwise, I put the notes directly into the computer. Each series of authors around a particular issue, for example the Binary System, was given a separate file.

On Subjectivity

At times I found an argument used in a debate to be spurious or that the assumptions of the speaker or writer indicated a value position in opposition to how I interpret the AASW's current code of ethics and my understandings of 'appropriate professional behaviour'. I noted my view on the reverse of the paper at the time and moved back to the document recording.

My response could be very strong and, on occasions I took a break from reading to reflect on why I completed a social work degree and why I still call myself a social worker. At times, it reinforced my view not to join the AASW. I am a social worker who has practised for over 10 years and managed multi-disciplinary teams. I have headed a child welfare team (abuse/neglect), where the majority of the team members were welfare workers and only one or two social workers. I have supervised social workers and social welfare workers in field education practicums. I have taught in TAFE colleges and an Institute of Technology. I was teaching social welfare students at university along-side other social workers who primarily taught social workers at the time that I was reading these documents. From time to time I gave lectures to the social work students and supervised them in their field education as an off-site supervisor. My reaction to the manuscript material before me raised the question of bias and subjectivity. I had to decide, was I too close to this material and should I proceed? I made a deliberate decision to not analyze beyond 1977, when I was active in student politics in the School of Social Work at the University of NSW. Later, I made contributions to the establishment of a school of social work by working on the needs analysis (Signadou, Australian Catholic University, Canberra) and have been somewhat vocal during the debate on competencies for social work and social welfare during the Federal Government National Training Reform Agenda. I have been on the Federal Executive of the Australian Association of Social Work and Welfare Educators. I did not want my own actions and behaviours to become enmeshed in my study and analysis.

The Shift in Focus

Using empirical history (finding the relevant sources, reading, recording, thinking interpreting and writing) was going to provide a description of the events and the times. The responses I had to the material could influence my interpretation. Further, sociological theory and critical analysis has progressed in the intervening years. Using a modern framework to interpret the past may well be invalid. Furthermore, even during the time under examination, social theory and critical analysis had changed. If I wanted to know why and how things occurred and to appreciate the meaning of events held for those involved, I had to go beyond history. For example, it was going to be pointless to conclude that the empirical record was further evidence to support the general theory of state organized and ideologically secured social reproduction. The features I was observing were not neatly related to class and the structure of our society with its patriarchal emphasis. I was examining records from a female dominated profession, where there were senior professional women, the majority of the profession's 'heroes' were women and many of the senior academics and authors were women. Nor did it seem to fit this profession, in which the commitment to social justice is strongly articulated, nor where, in their core documents, it is stated that poverty is a result of structural features of society, like the distribution of resources and not merely due to individual inadequacy.

It seemed to me that the documents I was reading from within the Association reflected the late 19th Century and early 20th Century concepts of profession. I could not help wondering why, given the more critical analysis that was available in the 1940s to 1970s, these concepts kept recurring as if they were immutable truths. It was precisely these concepts that were used in discussions preceding decisions about the position of people who did not meet the association's eligibility criteria, the quality and standards of tertiary courses, the status of non-university institutions of tertiary and higher education. It was easy enough to identify when these concepts were used and to see the outcome of their use in the cementing of the Association's position vis-à-vis government, tertiary institutions and personnel deemed to be sub-professional. The two big questions were, then, why and how? Why would a profession like this continue to do this and how, in the face of sociological and political analysis and in the face of major restructuring of tertiary education in Australia, were they able to sustain these worn-out arguments and their position?

At this point the focus of my study began to shift. There was something going on in Australia within the AASW. The study then became one of this Association at this time. It became a particular case. The themes that would emerge may not necessarily be able to generalize to other professions, nor, to the same profession in another location or time frame. The case study became the limiting condition of the historical analysis.

Uncovering the Theoretical Framework

The first two themes that emerged were, therefore, the nature of profession and the nature of influence. I conducted a thorough literature search of profession and incorporated, not only classical and respected works in the area but also those which were written in Australia during the period under review and by people who were well known in social work academic and professional circles. Some were colleagues of the major protagonists. Second, I reflected on the nature of power and influence and retrieved Steven Lukes' essay on power in which influence features within his three-dimensional model. Lukes' model incorporated interests (covered in detail later) and was able to be used in the examination of the records, even though I did not have equivalent records or evidence of what might have been the view of social welfare personnel at the time. Lukes gave me pause to ask also why there was no active opposition from social welfare people as a group? Had some issues had been organized off agendas? Had the consequences of non-decisions or inactions not affected the interests of the profession, therefore not been reviewed? One non-decision and inaction, for example, occurred after the then Federal Education Minister, Senator Kim Beazley, requested advice from the AASW in relation to the education for social work personnel in Papua New Guinea⁵. No decision was made by the AASW. No advice on course development or on the pathway for social work was provided, as far as the record shows. The short-term consequences of that inaction had no effect on the AASW. Thus, a non-decision and inaction has not been reviewed and the long-term consequences have not been investigated.

During an academic seminar, one of my colleagues (Marie Macklin) reported on the application of Thompson's, *Ideology and Modern Culture* (1996) to an ethnographic study of a small rural town and their usage of social welfare services. The operational definitions in Thompson's model named the strategies I had seen used by the AASW. This appeared to be a useful tool but,

⁵NLA MS6202 51/1/Minutes of Meeting with Mr K Beazley (sic) 9 April 1973

on examining Thompson's work, clearly he had developed a more comprehensive methodology which he called Depth Hermeneutics.

For Thompson, as for Lukes, any research needs to be analyzed in relation to its socio-historical context. For Thompson, socio-historical inquiry is not just an object domain but a subject domain, partly made up of subjects who 'are constantly involved in understanding themselves and others, in producing meaningful interactions and expressions and in interpreting the meaningful actions and expressions of others' (1996:21). The object domain of socio-historical inquiry is a pre-interpreted domain in which processes of understanding and interpretation take place as a routine part of everyday life of the people who make up the domain. Lukes adds that 'the domination of defenders of the status quo may be so secure and pervasive that they are unaware of any potential challengers to their position and thus of any alternatives to the existing political process, whose bias they work to maintain' (Lukes 1986:21). Any study, therefore, of power and ideology must be first embedded in a *socio-historical analysis*.

This means clearly investigating and describing a number of elements. The spatio-temporal setting refers to where these people located and in which decade or century. The fields of interaction are all those places where discourse and exchange occurs. This can include meetings, conferences, picket lines and social welfare agencies. The social institutions involved will include associations, unions, governments, universities and colleges. The social structure will include social status, authority, beliefs and culture, economic conditions and political influences. The technical media of transmission of symbolic forms will include meetings procedures and minutes, conference papers, letters, telephone conversations, motions and resolutions. Thompson insists that this is the first and essential stage of his methodology 'Depth Hermeneutics'. A detailed and embedded historical narrative attends to this requirement. Therefore, each segment of the history of social work and social welfare education and the key points of action from the AASW, is described in detail. The conditions in Australian society relevant to those periods are outlined as the stage on which the players in the field of interaction meet.

In what Thompson calls the 'hermeneutics of everyday life', systematic study requires that one endeavours to uncover the meaning(s) which actions and events had for those involved at the time. I chose not to interview those involved for a number of reasons. First, some of the key players are dead or very frail. Second, one to whom I spoke early on was still very angry about the treatment of his course and students by senior social work academics and an AASW senior

member and wanted the thesis to be a weapon against the AASW. Another, person highly active in the Sydney University dispute, did not remember being involved in a key event, so his memory was clearly unreliable. Some social workers who were active in the AASW in the time under examination or who are active now, have made direct comments that this research demonstrated an anti-AASW bias. They have therefore taken the view that, if interviewed, they would answer defensively. Therefore, there are people eligible to be interviewed but who have positions they wish to push through the medium of this research. Third, all those contacted indicated a desire to show themselves in a positive light. While this is natural, it is perhaps less useful. Some indication of reflection and re-examination of a position taken years ago may be more helpful. Reflection could help identify why a particular concept appeared to be so valuable, so pressing that one would submit a letter of resignation or threaten to resign or write a minority report or bang a table or leave a meeting and consequently be disenfranchised in the decision-making process. Fourth, knowledge and analysis have changed and it would be difficult, as an interviewer, to ask questions which were not steeped in the new analysis and therefore challenging and discomforting to those being interviewed. It becomes investigative interviewing, rather than more simple reportage. Fifth, I, too, am embedded in a structured set of economic and social relationships. I exist in the field of interaction that I am investigating, even though I have separated myself out. One of those active in one of the key events was my Professor and head of the academic section in which I worked. Other people are Head of Schools of Social Work across the country. Some are consultants and advisers who sit on selection panels for university appointments in social work schools. I have a career trajectory that I would like to see progress and, as Corrigan and Leonard so neatly remind us in *Social Work Under Capitalism* (1978), we too have mortgages.

I decided that individual interviews would increase the possibility of personalizing the critique, rather than being able to step back and analyze the processes, concepts and mechanisms being used. If possible, I wanted to have a methodology which would uncover the meanings but which could do this examination *ad rem* and not *ad hominem*.

The framework for analysis of the material collected was therefore an amalgam of Lukes and Thompson as outlined in Chapter 4. The operational definitions are explicated in Chapter 4 with an examination of the frameworks used. They are given in greater detail in Chapter 9 when they are applied to examples from the historical record.

Finally, in making sense of all the data and bringing the analysis together into a meaningful whole, I utilized concepts depicted by Pierre Bourdieu on the nature of fields of interaction. Bourdieu encourages the researcher to look at the social context (field of interaction) and the development of individuals and their careers (trajectories). Again, this is using a method of analysis which assists the researcher in seeing what is happening from within (the view of the players) and from without (the view of the crowd and, sometimes, rank outsiders). By doing this systematic examination of the material, removing myself, step by step, from the actual people involved, space was available for a more critical examination of the theory of power itself. That, for me, became the exciting direction of this study.

CHAPTER THREE

PROFESSIONS

Social Work as a Profession

The terms ‘profession’ and ‘professionalization’ are virtual non-concepts, since there is little consensus about their meaning. As Freidson ... notes, the ‘occupations to which the word has been applied are so varied as to have nothing in common save a hunger for prestige.

Forsyth & Danisiewicz, 1985: 59

Social work in Australia is an occupation that is considered to be a profession (Broom, Lancaster and Zubrzycki 1976). In terms of two surveys of occupational status in Congalton (1962, 1963), it comes at the lower end of professions, close to nursing and clergy with no university qualifications (Congalton, 1962). For some, feelings are stronger, seeing social work as a despised profession: an arm of social control, of interference, of middle and upper class intervention in the lives of the poor and disadvantaged.⁶ The community conception of social work in 1962 and 1963 was out of step with the views of those within the profession. For the community, any person who is engaged in social welfare work is a ‘social worker’: this would include unqualified Salvation Army personnel, for example. It is only when people begin to be aware that social workers in Australia talk of themselves being separate from social welfare workers, as if social work was somehow not a part of social welfare service provision, that they ask, ‘What is the difference between social work and social welfare?’.

In its most simple form, social welfare is the context or field in which social work in Australia occupies its position as a profession. There are, then, social welfare workers, who are people without the necessary qualifications to make them eligible for membership of the professional body representing social workers but who work in the field, often in similar positions, undertaking sometimes equally technically difficult tasks. These people may have high academic qualifications in disciplines other than social work, for example, public policy, community development, social planning, family therapy, child protection or they may have a range of other qualifications or none at all. They may receive salaries or be unpaid workers (ACOSS, 1973).

⁶This is reflected in Congalton’s findings that the results of his survey on occupational status in 1963 showed that there was a broad disagreement of the status of social work, with some people rating it high and some rating it much lower. This indicated to him that the profession was either poorly understood, or in the process of dynamic change. Congalton’s survey did not have a category for social welfare worker.

Being academically qualified to perform tasks in the social welfare field does not make a person a social worker in Australia; nor does specific technical or technological training in the tasks and methods of practice; nor is having a genuine commitment to the client group or a sense of vocation; Nor is adherence to an ethical code embedded in requirement for membership to the Australian Institute of Welfare and Community Workers. Individually and even corporately, these are not enough (ACOSS 1973; Lawrence 1965; Learner 1975). There is no legislative requirement for registration to practice or registration of the title social worker. The separation of what constitutes a member of the profession rests on understanding of the characteristics of professions and occupations, the process of professionalization and decades of sociological study and analysis of the nature of professions. Without this understanding, it is hard to fathom the differentiation between professional social work and welfare work in Australia.

Equally, the way in which professional associations interact with institutions of higher learning to ensure that the future members are adequately equipped academically, technically and culturally for their role, continues to be the subject of investigation. This investigation has been sociological, economic, legal and political. These have sometimes resulted in accusations of monopolistic practices of professions as they restrict people's entry into professions and try to limit the practising rights of others who are not part of a particular professional sub-culture (Albon & Lindsay 1984; Baxt 1994; Hilmer 1994).

Systematic sociological study on professions began in the 1930s with a descriptive analysis of the characteristics of professions (Carr-Saunders & Wilson 1933). At that time, according to Joseph Ben-David (1963:247-248), the middle classes, the white collar workers and the professions, in particular, did not fit any of the then prevailing conceptions of social class. 'Professional people, writers and artists were, from the point of view of prevailing class theories, particularly disturbing phenomena, since their relationship to the industrial order was even less clearly defined than that of other white collar groups' (Ben-David 1963: 248). As technological change brought about changing patterns in the work-force, there appeared to be levels of professions, semi-professions and quasi-professions (Etzioni, 1969). The concept of a continuum from occupation to profession developed (Pavalko 1971), followed by studies of the processes of professionalization (Boreham 1983; Johnson, 1972; Caplow 1964b; and Wilensky 1964). With the greater pace of the technological revolution, came the analysis and prediction that professions would become proletarianized, that the essential elements of professional

practice would be codified and rationalized, so that they could be performed by technicians rather than more expensively educated professionals. To some extent we are still in this era. Further observation and analysis of professions found that some were resistant to this codification and rationalization and, instead, seemed to be able to attain continued high status. This brought about a re-examination of the assumptions at the foundation of previous studies and an analysis of the way in which professions assume, utilize and retain power for example Klegon, 1978; Pemberton and Boreham 1976 and Saks, 1983.

Four elements go some way in explaining the mechanisms professions use to maintain their élite status. First is the role analysis of the professions and their process of training (Merton 1957). Second is their alleged modifying influence on modern society - ensuring moral order (Durkheim 1893; Marshall 1939 and Parsons 1958 - the latter took a contrary view). Third is the construction of professional knowledge as being indeterminate and therefore requiring discretion based on higher principles (Pemberton and Boreham 1976). Fourth is the discussion of expertise and professional standards (Baer 1987).

Professions have been separated from other occupations by virtue of a set of characteristics. They are said to have widely accepted high status, involve prolonged training and education, their members are altruistic organized, autonomous and controlled by ethical codes (Barber 1963; Carr-Saunders & Wilson 1933; Cogan 1955; Evan 1969; Goode 1960; Greenwood 1957; Gross 1958; Harries-Jenkins 1970; Kormhauser 1962; Lewis & Maude 1953; Maley 1970; Millerson 1964; Moore 1970; Roth 1974; Simon 1965; Wilensky 1964). Ben-David (1963:251) adds

the existence of a vocational sub-culture which comprises explicit or implicit codes of behaviour, generates an *esprit de corps* among members of the same profession and ensures them certain occupational advantages, such as equalitarian rather than authoritarian type of supervision in bureaucratic structures and monopolistic privileges to perform certain types of work...

It seems that professional sub-cultures and the rest of professional characteristics emerge on the basis of prolonged study and training in a certain field and can be maintained by research activity, professional literature, legislation etc., even where professional organisations are not very prominent and do not possess official privileges.

Altruism

Taxonomies like those listed above are useful if there is agreement about the definitional criteria. This is not always the case. The characteristic of altruism, for example, appears to have developed from Talcott Parson's translation of Weber's *The Protestant Ethic*. According to Fores, Glover and Lawrence (1991:84), Parsons (1958) translated *Beruf* as both 'calling' and 'profession', yet others translated the same word as vocation. Weber's argument was that the early capitalists themselves, not those whom we would now term professionals, were 'called'. This notion based in Christian asceticism, was central to Weber's thesis of Protestantism's unique role in generating 'the spirit of capitalism'. In the view of Flores, Glover and Lawrence (1991:85), Weber believed that the early capitalists were called but that, as capitalism was established, the sense of calling declined and entry became more mechanical. A 'system' emerged. In their view, Parson's translation tends to give a spurious dignity to the idea of professional. They go on to also critique the translation of *schaffen* (to shape, mould form or make), noting that all of Weber's terms are constructs. Nothing is absolute and, more particularly, that *Wissenschaft* (knowledge) was only ever an aid to understanding, 'yet in the traditional dialogue it has become a thing to be explained. This is not helpful and has again lent an esoteric lustre to the idea of professions.' (1991:85). They close their argument by quoting Weber (1921-2:630)

Only ascetic protestantism completely eliminated magic and the supernatural quest for salvation... It alone created the religious motivations for seeking salvation primarily through immersion in one's worldly vocation (*Beruf*)

The notion of calling in the religious sense is one where a person feels moved or directed by a force outside the self to engage in a life of service. The person called, therefore, no longer acts on the basis of self-interest but from altruism. The service provided is in the nature of a gift, based in other religious concepts, for example, the quality of grace which can be seen to be the provision of assistance, love and care to humans, without hint of worthiness or return.

Altruism and the lack of self-interest, are essential in understanding the professional-client relationship. Durkheim's view (1893) was that professions had a moral component that would ensure the equilibrium of civilizations as industrial change increased. Halmos (1966) returns to the noble ideal of professions as having a moral value. Like Durkheim, he sees professions exerting a moral influence in society through their altruism (Millerson 1964:4-5). Marshall (1939

in 1963:150-170) states the essence of professionalism is the welfare of the client, not self-interest. Tawney, in 1921, used this argument to compare industrial to professional behaviour and called for the subordination of industry to the needs of the community. He had the idealized view that professions serve others selflessly and required that industry do the same.

As Ben-David outlines (1963:248), for Carr-Saunders and Wilson, professions were an emerging new type of occupational structure, exempt from the capitalistic relationships of production and regulated by collective control rather than by individual competition for profit. For Marshall (1939), professionals were a class with new interests, concerned with social efficiency rather than particular interests and might be the class to ‘find for the sick and suffering democracies a peaceful solution of their problems.’ Parsons (1958) took a contrary position. Altruism, he held, was expected behaviour within the client-professional relationship and could not be generalized into broader social attitudes. The display of sympathy and understanding towards clients were only necessary requirements for the efficient performance of the service. In modern societies, personal problems were taken to people outside the family, neighbours or the community. People needed to be able to trust the professional. Autonomous professional organizations with ethical codes were necessary to legitimize and control these arrangements. Ethical codes and professional organizations were deemed to be positively functional for the maintenance of ordered social relations. The display of altruism also had a function in ensuring the continued use of the professional’s services. For Parsons, there was no idealism; there would be no emergence of a new collectivist type of class.

Theodore Geiger (1950), in his development of a sociology of culture, defined intellectuals, scientists and artists as the producers in the cultural process; the members of the learned professions; the major appliers of cultural creations; and the educated people as the final consumers. In this way, he made an analogy with the economic class structure and explained the relationships between these three. Parsons and Geiger effectively refuted the idea that the professions would become a vanguard for resolving class conflict (Ben-David, 1963).

Professions, however, have been accused of blatant self-interest. Control of entry into the professions through protracted education has been a successful argument for higher salaries (Ben-David, 1963:250; Officer, 1984: 28). Kessel (1958:20-53) showed that the American Medical Association’s constitution and organization constituted an economic monopoly. The Monopolies Commission (UK, 1970 Cmnd 4463) revealed a number of restrictive practices in

professions which tarnish their image. The Association of Consulting Engineers (Australia) ran foul of the Trade Practices Tribunal and Commission, as their regulations substantially lessened competition in a market for goods and services. Their expulsion clauses were judged to ‘allow certain members of the organization unfettered powers over others for undefined or vaguely defined ‘offences’ and the code can thus be used to stop members engaging in price (or other) competition’ (Nieuwenhuysen & Williams-Wynn, 1984:19). The function of professional associations, in what can be defined as restrictive trade practices through occupational closure, is coming under increasing review (Baxt 1995; Hilmer 1994; Madden 1995). Millerson (1964:30-31) reported that professional codes of ethics show professions more concerned with protection of self than of clients. Altruism has been tempered by desire to extract the maximum reward for service. It appears that professional status depends less on altruism and more on ability to demand high rewards and control a market.

Knowledge

The knowledge base of a profession is defined as a set of esoteric and abstract principles that have been mastered and organized by a profession into a theory under its exclusive control, thought to be applicable to the concrete problems of living (Baer, 1987:533). As a definitional criterion for professionalism, knowledge, too, has come under considerable attention and debate. The defining and organizing of the knowledge base seems to rest, in the first instance, with the profession or occupation itself in establishing how their work can be seen to derive from recognized knowledge and how their development and utilization of this knowledge becomes organized and controlled as work.

Pavalko (1971:18) observes that the body of knowledge may be a theory or intellectual technique which may be based in science, as is the case for medicine; or it can be highly elaborate systems of changing rules and customs that are essentially normative, rather than scientific, as in law; or a complex body of non-scientific lore and ritual, as in the clergy. These are the archetypal professions, about which Fores, Glover and Lawrence speak when they say, ‘Archetypal professions have a special competence for certain specified tasks which are often accepted to be specifically theirs; that members of the group exhibit a special stance of service to their local communities and that members have a particular link with formalized knowledge’ (1991:91). For Fores, the Anglo-Saxon professional groups claim special standing for their

members, based on this link to a body of knowledge or science (recorded and tested knowledge), thought to be applicable to the tasks in which they engage.

It is argued that there is very little evidence to support the existence of a corpus of specialized knowledge in social work and social welfare. Both borrow heavily from sociology, politics, psychology, psychiatry, economics, social policy, administration and management. Further, a proliferation of ‘therapeutic’ rationales has appeared as the ground-structure of organized welfare action (Boreham, 1983:695; Locke, 1976:59).

Freidson (1970) remarks that professional ideologies are intrinsically imperialistic, claiming more for a profession’s knowledge and skill and a broader jurisdiction than can be justified through an examination of professional practice. Wilensky (1964:148) could not be specific when trying to determine how one tells if an occupation has sufficient knowledge to claim a monopoly of skill or even a roughly exclusive jurisdiction. He states that the knowledge base needs to be ‘neither too vague nor too precise, too broad nor too narrow’. There is also the problem of the division between craft, where there is a requirement for high manual dexterity and professions, allegedly based on mental prowess. As Klegon (1978:263) comments,

According to these criteria we might argue that surgery is a craft, for are surgeons any different from mechanics who understand the theory of engines and must go through complex search procedures to diagnose difficulties and repair components (perhaps, then, they are professionals too)?

On this, Freidson suggested that the real difference between crafts and the professions is where the knowledge is obtained.

The contemporary professions might be regarded as an educated, middle-class variant of the occupational principle of organization already represented by the working-class crafts, the difference between the two being that the claim for autonomy and self-control among professions is usually based on formal ‘higher’ education rather than on trade school or long apprenticeship in practicing some manual skill said to require complex judgement.

Freidson, 1973: 22

The debate then turns from one on the type of knowledge to one cementing the differentiation between craft and profession in the realm of a class issue. Klegon (1978: 264) reiterates,

This suggests that the granting of professional status to an occupation is partially a class issue. Rueschemeyer (1964:30) has also suggested this arguing that ‘many features that are considered specific characteristics of the professions seem to be in fact aspects of upper-class and upper-middle-class life and sub-culture.’ Any attempt to differentiate professions from crafts which relies on criteria such as the nature of knowledge but does not consider the social position of the practitioners, nor the social role of their activity, is essentially ignoring the critical variable of the relationship to the wider social system.

Jamous and Peloille (1970: 117) state that this leads to the individual professional being forced to control practice by formalizing and rationalizing techniques, thus making it more technical. However, this makes practitioners’ activities more accessible and liable to intervention from those outside the profession who would normally be excluded from such positions of power.

While Freidson (1973) believes that the dominant professions will control and supervise the new technologists, Gouldner (1979) and Bell (1974) take the view that knowledge has replaced ownership as the major determinant of social class and that the new technologists will become professionals. In particular, Gouldner’s view is that the power and autonomy of the new class is ‘grounded in the specialized knowledge or cultural capital transmitted by the educational system, along with the emphasis on the obligation of educated persons to attend to the welfare of the collectivity’. Here we are introduced to the enculturation aspects of the ‘professional’ courses in ‘higher’ education. The cultural dimension may well be a more relevant difference than the depth or breadth of knowledge and technical expertise. To ensure this transmission of culture, it is imperative for social workers to be engaged in the education and training of future professionals.

Status of the Educational Institution

At this point in the discussion, the status of the educational institutions themselves becomes relevant. As Meek (1991: 465-466) points out, until immediately after World War II, there were, in Australia, 6 state universities, teachers and agricultural colleges, ‘and a few mostly poorly funded and undistinguished technical schools (under the control of state departments of education)’. In the 1964-5 Martin Committee report, it was recommended that colleges of advanced education (CAEs) be established, equal to but cheaper than, universities. In the colleges, research was of lower concern than vocationally oriented teaching. Some of the technical schools were reframed as institutes of technology (ITs), with equivalent status to the colleges of advanced education. Professions were ill inclined to see these new colleges as having

the same academic standing as the established universities and did not accept that a three year degree from one of these colleges or institutes was in fact equivalent to a degree of equal length from a university.

In Australia , before W.W.II, higher education was perceived, as including only universities. After the Martin Report, CAEs and Institutes of Technology were considered part of higher education and the technical colleges became part of what was termed tertiary education. Technical colleges were for crafts people and trades requiring apprenticeships or lower level courses. Their purpose was to improve the lot of the working class and to supply capital and skilled labour (Birrell 1974 in Meek, 1990:206). The CAEs and ITs found themselves framed as centres for the learning of technology, maintaining the division that only in universities did education occur; the colleges and institutes confined themselves to training. Only education was suitable for future professionals and those who would construct the knowledge and methods of the future.

It is clear from studies of access to institutions of higher education in Australia during the period of this study, that is 1850-1977, it was only in the last decade that higher education in Australia began to extract itself from limited class access (Hyde, 1983; Meek 1990). As Meek notes, from the start, the universities in Australia were only for the élite and primarily for males. He records that, in 1946, 1.7 per 1000 attended university, compared with 3.8 per 1000 who resided in insane asylums (from Ashby in Meek 1990: 196). Universities were closed, drawing their students from the upper professional classes and acting as agents of bourgeois hegemonism in Australia (Hyde 1983:111). The technical colleges, too, served a hegemonic function (Meek, 1990:197), instilling in their participants that part of the bourgeois ideology which led to acceptance of the view that the professional and managerial élites emerged from the universities.

It is not intellectual or scholarly function which is reflected in academic prestige. The universities enjoy the highest status and consequently attract the greater proportion of the most highly qualified entrants and those from higher social classes and the more expensive schools. In return, they prepare these entrants for the occupations which command the highest social status - the traditional learned professions, secondary teaching of academic subjects and tertiary education itself.

Treyvaud & McLaren, 1976: 14

These comments are reflected later in Treyvaud and McLaren, 1976:71 where it is stated that the chief determinant of occupational status is educational attainment. It correlates more highly with family status and aspirations than cognitive skills and job performance.

Occupation to Profession

There is a very strong link between education and the professions. In turn, the professions affect the educational system. Pavalko (1971:18) cites a body of knowledge which serves as a basis for legitimizing the actions of the members of the profession as the first of eight characteristics of professions. Millerson (1964:1-46) shows that occupations become professions as a result of deliberate action on the part of their members. It is dynamic not static (Klegon, 1978:268-274). The status of professions is based largely on a claim to specialized knowledge acquired through advanced training and education. In the end however the standing of the profession in society may depend on its assessed value by users and non-users. Occupations undergoing a process of professionalization rely heavily on an ability to raise the entry level into the occupation and to raise the standard of competence acquired through training and education.

This suggests that practitioners may be able to manipulate their knowledge base, a situation echoed by Freidson and, Jamous and Peloille (1970:117), who raise the dilemma of a profession as:

Either to act with a view to greater and greater control of their practice by making it more technical, by codifying it but in doing this, to give the possibilities of intervention and access to all those whose social qualities set them outside it. On the other hand to make use of their qualities in order to continue to monopolize their field by ideological rationalizations about its nature, its functions and so to avoid all possibility of intervention and reappraisal from outside.

The content and length of training of an occupation, including abstract knowledge of theory, is frequently a product of a deliberate action of those who are trying to show that their occupation is a profession and should therefore be given autonomy. If there is no systematic body of theory, it is created for the purpose of being able to say there is.

Freidson, 1970b: 79-80

Boreham (1983) comments that, ‘...the failure to explicitly take into account the ability of occupations to manipulate their knowledge base has resulted in the meaning of specialized expertise, whether in terms of mystification or routinization, being overemphasized in attempts to speculate about the future of professionalism’ (1983:279).

Freidson (1970b) examines the role of expertise in constructing aspects of social reality that are then erroneously extended to other areas. Johnson (1972) comments that expertise is, in part, the knowledge that permits the professional to control both the definitions of the needs of the consumers and how they should be met. Larson (1977) sees expertise as the base for the

standardization of the product and then standardization of the producers, in order to provide a monopoly of competence over the market for that type of service.

Culture and Indetermination

The student must not only learn the knowledge and the skills necessary for competent practice but also the culture, beliefs and priorities of the profession. Competence, (or tacit knowledge) in social welfare, then, is defined as culturally specific knowledge required to specify and produce plausible and appropriate action. Through accreditation processes, the profession places limits on staff selection to those who are qualified in the profession. This effectively standardizes the producer as well as the product.

During the process of the student's professional socialization organized systems of attitudes and values surrounding the application of professional knowledge are constructed. Knowledge becomes institutionalized as expertise. This is very similar to Mary Richmond's call to transfer 'know-how' to the following generations of social workers, that spurred her to write *Social Casework*. Therefore, education and tertiary education in particular, is not only about transfer of knowledge and craft but also professional socialization. If professions can be seen as cultures or sub-cultures, then it is about the transfer of culture (Anderson and Western 1976; Jones 1976; Throssell 1976). This is reflected in the early AASWs instruction to members to not teach 'method' in courses that were not social work. They could teach history and theory but not the specific methods of practice.

In this process of attachment, belief and ways of being, the tendency develops in many professional occupations to believe that their work is of such a complex character and requiring so much judgement, that formal standards or rules cannot be applied.⁷

Social action... is far more complex. What is ordered - how acts, objects and relations are sensibly and intelligibly constructed and interpreted as the grounds of our acting is enormously diverse. An examination of recent literature in ethnoscience and ethnomethodology is sufficient to point out the centrality and difficulty of this problem of the rationality of action in diverse and discrete spaces - in cross-cultural situations and in pluralistic societies!

Locke, 1976:59

⁷See Sturmy, 1992, on the difference between social work and social welfare. Chapter 5.

For James and Peloille (O'Neill, 1991: 63), professions are drawn in two different directions. One is towards codification of tasks, skills and processes, the other, the means that cannot be codified, the ‘how’ which responds to individual client and group and community difference, that moves with changes in ideology underpinning the practitioner’s or agency’s practice. It is the social forces, the system of legitimacy, the politics of professions and their relationship to the communities of support that will determine the value or worth of the profession at any given time. This may be related to where they fit in the scale, from technical codification or ‘technicity’, to indetermination. They go on to say that the production process of any given occupation could be characterized by its indetermination/technicity ratio. The greater the proportion of indetermination, the closer an occupation moves to being considered a profession. That is, the means that can be mastered in the form of rules is low in proportion to the means that escape rules and, at a given historical moment, are attributes to virtualities of producers.

One of the great fears for professions is that the codification of the technical expertise of the occupation may lead to proletarianization (McKinlay, 1982; Meiksins 1986) and or managerial and bureaucratic control (Derber 1982). Knowledge based occupations are at risk, through rationalization, to being codified and turned into technologies. Consequently they may be brought under the control of bureaucracies rather than autonomous professionals and professional associations. This has the capacity to proletarianize the profession, reducing practice to a series of pre-set procedures. The next fear is that this would provide the conditions for external intervention in the activities of knowledge-based occupations. One suggested response to this is for professional associations, through the imputed expertise of their membership, to continue their domination by ensuring they are embedded in the central decision-making structures in bureaucracies and in society (Boreham, 1983: 693-718).

Freidson (1970), takes the view that the knowledge based work of professionals is, by its very nature, not amenable to mechanization and rationalization. The organized occupations that institutionalize specialization are alternatives to administrative rationalization and, as management cannot rationalize the work, it can only maintain an administrative framework around it. This offers little risk to the continuity of the profession and to control of its expertise and practice. Parsons (1958) calls rationalization or the giving of primacy to the valuation of cognitive rationality, the attribute that has come increasingly to characterize western society (See footnote 26: 699). Non-transferable skills and individual genius appear to be linked to cognitive indetermination or to what cannot be standardized in the cognitive basis and the

practice of the profession (Parsons, 1958 footnote 22:699). In genius and high order expertise, formalized knowledge is applied, but this is filtered through a number of social processes, the social characteristics of membership of the profession which reflects the criteria for inclusion/exclusion and the norms of appropriate professional behaviour articulated by the leadership in those groups.⁸ The leadership of the profession will attempt to define those areas that are not amenable to standardization. They will seek to establish the place of special talent and the notion of unique individual skill deriving from the subjective elements of professional training and enculturation. Unique talent and skill, without the subjective values of the profession, makes one an eccentric worker (with the added sense of erratic and irregular, even if this is unjustified) not one who has high levels of attributed professional expertise. Indetermination, therefore, need not be entirely cognitive. It is a subjective dimension of professional ideology that may be developed and emphasized, as rationalization and specialization begin to erode the autonomy of certain professions, especially where computer technology has eroded many tasks formerly the prerogative of trained professionals.

As Boreham (1983) states, the dialectics of indetermination versus technicity become overt as conflict intensifies over the control of organized knowledge. First, there are attempts to exert administrative control over professional production. This is almost always through technological intervention in the division of labour and is generally focused on lower level professional work. Second, there are conflicts internal to the profession which derive from the competition between paradigms or alternative definitions of what constitutes the modes or functions of professional practice. When innovations in technology occur, the supporters of the new attempt to gain control, the old guard makes an appeal based on indetermination and to virtualities in the occupation. Both professional and administrative élites share a need to control ‘dissident elements’ at the lower and middle levels of professional hierarchies.

⁸In social work, there has been a case where a member acted in a case with genius. John Tomlinson returned an Aboriginal foster child to her community of origin, against the instructions of the government agency which employed him. His actions were determined by the professional association to not be in keeping with the social characteristics of the profession (social workers at that time were not approved to ignore stated government directives and policy, even when racist).

It is further argued that this is not a process of mystification but one of deliberate creation of an aura of indetermination about the activities of the profession that denies the possibility of rationalization and codification. This creation of virtualities of occupants of professional roles forms the social base of their mystique and the source of their legitimation. These correspond with professional ideologies, thus creating the conditions of uncertainty or indetermination, with respect to the production process. They are the conditions that provide the framework for an occupation's successful resistance to administrative authority (Boreham, 1983: 697-8; Goldner, Ference and Ritti, 1973; Jamous and Peloille, 1970).

Monopoly and Dominance

The predominance of cognitive rationality is less clear cut than might be imagined from a reading of the dominant literature in the sociology of professions. This is, firstly, because of cognitive indetermination but, secondly, because the actual choice of educational institution and the selection methods required by the professional association are themselves products of 'a particular congeries of social forces' (Boreham 1983).

the 'natural' selection of technical aptitudes carried out by the school or the university is also a ...social selection... mixture of competence and social qualities confirmed by a diploma .

Jamous and Peloille, 1970:115

The chief illegitimate barrier is poverty. Of every hundred children who entered primary school ten years ago, only ten stayed on to take the Leaving Certificate. This means that partly through lack of intellect but partly also through poverty, ninety per cent of Australian youth is not even eligible to apply for entrance to a university. In some States this situation is due not only to individual poverty but to public neglect of education

Ashby, 1946:87

In the case of professional associations requiring that matriculation or equivalent be a pre-requisite for entry into a course of study, a significant number of applicants are removed from the eligibility pool, especially in the period up to and including the 1970s in Australia. A bias toward applicants from professional families was evident, reinforcing the notion that many of the qualities of professionals may well be upper or upper-middle class behaviours.

Using a relatively simplistic black-box analysis, Baer (1986:533-536) looks at the inputs (years of training), outputs (patients cured or law suits won or the kinds of issues raised in malpractice suits) and outcomes (autonomy, social status, licensing, level of professional income) of engagement in a profession. In this, he covers the issue of the cognitive knowledge base and the

empirical results of the actions of the professions. He makes the statement that the professions take a sportsman (sic) model in dealing with outputs of professional practice, particularly when it has been less successful than hoped - 'it is not whether one wins or loses but how one plays the game'. This construction and response to empirical study that can potentially be damaging to the profession enables the profession not to be shaken from its tenuous hold on high status and demonstrates the power of social indetermination within the professional culture itself.

Claims to and proof of, a unique knowledge base are neither easily established, nor sufficient for a profession to retain its tenure in the status stakes. The social and political activities of professional associations are likely to reveal more about the nature of professionalism than claims to specific esoteric knowledge. As Klegon states, 'More important... than the existence of theoretical knowledge in any objective sense is the social meaning of knowledge and the social conditions which allow practitioners to control their knowledge' (1978:272). He goes on to say that the social definition of profession is more important than the degree of mental prowess required. Boreham (1983) agrees, saying that determination of authority to those occupations which have been accorded professional status is as much established through social and political processes.

In this context, the selection of what is applicable is determined in large measure by at least its congruence with the needs of capital as expressed through parallel administrative structures. As Johnson says (in Boreham, 1983:701), the legitimacy claimed by professional élites is subject to wider social structures of power which condition the success of the indetermination process.

An historical perspective is also useful in explaining the position of particular occupations, as it provides a better understanding of the social meanings of professionalization and the circumstances surrounding the achievement or lack of achievement of professional status (Klegon, 1978:271). In engineering historically,

it was the rise of large companies such as Westinghouse and General Electric which provided a key impetus to the push for professionalization by creating the demand for such a 'product' (the people with university qualifications)... the advocates of school culture lead the way to professionalization.

Klegon, 1978: 275

Equally there can be contextual changes that weaken the monopoly held by professionals. Locke (1976) says there is evidence of client dissatisfaction resulting in greater demands for equality in

services and the client-practitioner relationship. Haug and Sussman (1969) suggest that the expansion of education, technological changes, changes in the division of labour within occupations and the rise of consumerism have resulted in a weakening of the knowledge monopoly. This has combined with a decline in public belief in professional good will and a decline in professional autonomy. There is an external attack, he says, on the power of expertise.

Freidson takes the view that, in the extensive and increasing domains of health, welfare, law and education, the growing corps of technical workers, while themselves having few prospects of attaining power, are organized around delineating and supervising authority of key professions. ‘When they are licensed, certified or registered, the legitimacy, even the legality of their work hinges upon their nominal supervision by [the] dominant profession; in many cases only the dominant profession can order, interpret, evaluate and consume the service they provide’ (Freidson, 1977:25 in Boreham, 1983: 703). This means that hierarchies of traditional professions will retain a monopoly and dominance in a division of labour in which new, technical professions, while outwardly evidencing the trapping of professional status, will remain subordinate. This is also known as professional closure, made more rigid by the limitation of the use of the occupation’s title to those who have the requisite tertiary qualifications from the accredited educational institution (O’Neill, 1994:67).

There is also the argument that a segment of an occupation lacking a sufficient resource base cannot, however, expect to become dominant. Therefore relations among segments within an occupation are not necessarily conflictual and less prestigious segments do not necessarily serve as the focal point of occupational change. This may well be the case with social welfare which has traditionally been the poorer sister to social work, both in terms of educational resources, influence, well-paid employment and successful professional organization. Although lower status practitioners lack the resources to maintain the professional claim by themselves, what has emerged is a symbiotic relationship, in which the appearance of professionalism may benefit various segments of the occupation (Klegon, 1978: 276). Hence the conflict within the profession or closely allied professions, is held at minimal levels.

The ability professions have to retain autonomy and resist administrative authority is largely determined by the nature of the work of the profession and its centrality to the global functions of capital. Freidson argues that professions have extensive and intimate connections with formal political processes, through arrangements and negotiations for licensure or ‘the organization of

privilege on a legal basis.' Freidson goes on to argue that it is the knowledge of the professions learned in formal institutions of higher education and phrased in abstract terms that is far more likely to be able to successfully claim privilege on the basis of its esoteric character (Freidson 1973:29 in Boreham 1983:696). Professions, as a result, lay claim to high levels of individual discretion and reject the reduction of expertise to formal rules.

The power of professional élites resides in their monopolisation of the approved symbols of legitimization and these are precisely the symbols which are least accessible to innovating elements whose claims are centrally located in the area bounded by cognitive rationality and technicality. It is precisely the real of activity that is most accessible to administrative intervention and control.

Professions in Bureaucracies

Social work and social welfare are usually located in what can be called task discontinuous organizations. These are bodies where the promotion of the individual to a more senior position is not dependant on having the ability to perform the tasks at the lower level and where orders include discretion and room for interpretation. Subordinates must develop their own complementary goal interpretations and their own independent commitment if the planned result is to be achieved (Offe, 1976). Simon (1965) adds that the broader the sphere of discretion, the more important those types of influence which do not depend on the existence of formal authority. Unless the subordinate can do the work unaided, the tasks of supervision become burdensome. The problem of the organization becomes the problem of recruitment. If people are more highly trained, broader discretion can be given. Fox (1974) reiterates this by saying that, in low discretion jobs, the activities of the worker are prescribed, constrained and regulated. In high discretion jobs, supervision or surveillance are inappropriate and irrelevant and, where coordination is left open to mutual adjustment, require exercise of initiative, expertise and judgement with respect to organizational goals. 'It is in these essentially complex organizational roles that the commitment and reliability of incumbents is of crucial importance.' Salaman (1979) requires that those in high-discretion roles perform the activities associated with these roles responsibly.

Such responsibility is engendered 'not through direct ownership and control of hierarchical structures but through hegemonic forms of domination involving all the norms, values, interests and motives which is expected will be obeyed within the institutional structure of the work process' (Boreham, 1983:712). The organization will, therefore, buy personnel who have

complex rules built into them. They bring these into the organization and are expected to act upon them without further reference to their skills. The ‘extra organizational standards and principles which provide the non-technical elements of professional knowledge are unlikely to be incompatible with organizational requirements’. In this way professional associations, their cultures and codes of ethics, fulfil the needs of employing bodies for workers who can deal with multiple, individual complex problems. This is the situation in most social work and social welfare agencies, even those whose core business is the provision of material goods to individuals and families in need or crisis. It is more so as we move to areas of child abuse and neglect, retrenchment, unemployment, aging, etc.

It can be argued that professional élites depend on negotiated positions of authority within bureaucratic organizations for their more tangible means of power. It can, however, also be argued that it is precisely through the negotiation of this legitimacy that control is exerted over high discretion roles in task-discontinuous organizations (Boreham, 1983:713). Offe says that reciprocal expectations are therefore critically important:

Only to the extent that both the set of reciprocal expectations within a set of reference groups and the self-interpretation and self-understanding of the role partners remain constant can any long-term maintenance of the norms be assumed and these norms now have to control in an ad hoc fashion the area of discretion that is no longer covered by formal rules

Offe, 1976:34

and,

it is clear that the wider social structure determines what rules are followed at work and that any attempt to evaluate performance in individualistic terms must end up disguising the social origins of the rules themselves.

Palloix, 1976

There are a number of issues raised in relation to professions in bureaucratic organizations. Gouldner (1957) studied academic staff in a small town college and discussed what he termed their manifest role versus their latent role. He saw the academics as bringing a cosmopolitan flavour to the local community, while the local bureaucratic structures of the college and the community limited the behaviours of the academics. Gouldner sounded a warning about the powers of formal organizations to modify externally accorded occupational roles at the professional level. ‘If even professionals with their long training, high education and presumptive ideals, foreshorten their vision, revise their personal objectives and truckle to the power needs of particular institutions and their environing communities, then how is individual freedom to be maintained in Western democracy?’ What is clear from this example and

highlighted by Fores et al. (1991), is that there is no real cut-off between professional jobs and other jobs. Professionals, like other employees, have limits imposed on their actions and behaviours by bureaucratic requirements, marketing and image making forces of the organization and the social restrictions of the communities in which the universities and colleges are located. Similarly, social workers and social welfare personnel are constrained by the organizational and community requirements in relation to their practice. Social workers are not exempt from the stringencies of writing case file notes or reports to courts, in the same structure and format as those of welfare personnel. Indeed, in some smaller and less bureaucratic agencies, the welfare personnel may be under less stringent bureaucratic control than senior professional social workers in larger organizations or government departments.

Professions and Social Change

This brings us to Halmos's views on the permeation of society by professions and how the ideology of professions can begin to permeate the quality of and set the direction for, social change (Halmos, 1971:584). So, instead of seeing the bureaucracy and community as acting in a necessarily restrictive way, Halmos sees professions and professionals engaging in the leadership of society, mitigating the extent of external control and, in fact, directing change from within. In this, he is not dissimilar from Talcott Parsons who saw the primacy of the professions in the occupational structure and argued that 'the massive emergence of the professional complex is the crucial structural development in twentieth century society' (Parsons 1957).

As Palloix states (1976), the hegemony of capitalist domination at this level is exercised not only through control of production of commodities and reproduction of commodity relations but also through the integration of new occupational strata into class alliances. This is accomplished by broadening those strata in society which can be brought in to function ideologically within the ruling 'historical block'. It is in such positions that the professions are predominant. That is, they are the dominating elements in the reproduction of the hegemonic strata of the bourgeoisie. Their function is 'to disguise the contradictions that develop at the level of production and of the organization of the labour process of mass production.' These are the essential elements of knowledge-based occupations that must provide the focus of a more adequate theorization of professional work.

These seemingly contradictory views of professions reflect Derek Phillips' statement (1971:29), 'What we know about social behaviour is dependent on our methods of studying it, while our methods for studying it are dependent upon what we know about social behaviour.' This does not produce a vicious cycle. Rather, it exemplifies the fundamentally interpretive nature of social analysis - a hermeneutic circle (Zijderveld, 1972). It is important, then, to review what has been said about professions as the knowledge base and different perspectives for critique expand and develop. It is one of those never ending spirals, where one returns to analyze something previously examined and to re-examine it with a different set of parameters, a different metric.

Professionalization and Codes of Ethics

Boreham defines professionalization as a process wherein an organized occupation negotiates the right to perform certain types of work and to have a controlling influence in training for and, hence, entry into, the occupation and in determining and evaluating the way in which work is performed. This is usually managed in conjunction with various elements of the administrative apparatus of the state. In this, claims of special competence, based in esoteric knowledge and accompanied by concerns about the quality of work and its special value to society assume an important role in occupational credentialling (1983:694). Pavalko (1971:15-43) developed an Occupation-Profession Continuum which, when applied to a given occupation, seeks to answer the question 'To what *extent* is a particular work activity a profession?' [original emphasis]. The continuum is based on a taxonomic approach to the definition of profession. He makes the point that a work activity exhibiting all the characteristics to a high degree does not exist. Neither is there a work activity in which all of the characteristics are entirely absent. In a sense, then, all occupations can be located on the continuum, whether or not they are intent on negotiating their way to being considered a profession. Pavalko (1971) acknowledges that there is no determination of the weighting of each dimension or whether some may be necessary for or sufficient on their own for, determining professional status.

Caplow (1964b) and Wilensky (1964) both identified a chronological sequence of activity occupations engage in to become professions. First, for Caplow, comes the establishment of a professional association concerned with defining criteria for membership in the work group. This is followed by a change in name used to identify the work group, a code of ethics and, finally, agitation for and attainment of, legal restrictions on who may and may not perform the services and activities that the group claims exclusively as their domain. Training facilities are, in

Caplow's view, directly or indirectly controlled by the group and develop during this process. Wilensky (1964) has five stages: a substantial number of people doing the work, the establishment of a training school, the formation of a professional association, activities to gain legislation to protect the activities of the group and the development of a code of ethics. In Wilensky's (1964) model, social work is determined as being a 'profession in process', 'marginal', neither 'established', 'new' or 'doubtful'. Etzioni (1969) examined these professions in process and called them semi-professions. He warned them not to parade as something they were yet to become, citing, in particular, the concerns of the older and less qualified members of the occupation, as the younger and higher qualified people begin to seek recognition for increased status. Pavalko (1971) proposes the question of whether professionalism is natural and inevitable or a deliberate process. It would appear that, if it were deliberate, there must be some advantage or outcome for the members of the profession to go through such a lengthy and demanding process.

One of these outcomes is sufficient status, autonomy and control of the right to perform particular work activities and, through the degree of specialized skill, to enjoy a monopoly *vis à vis* clients who are typically incompetent to judge the quality of the service rendered (Pavalko, 1971:23-26). As Daniels (1973:40) notes, this ideal image of the relationship between client and professional is based on the free professional in a fee-for service setting. It is so strong that it has influenced other professions that have never existed in private practice arrangements, like the military and teaching.

And this structure of practice becomes support for the ideology that the professional group should supervise or police its own members. It is argued that a professional group must have this power because peers or colleagues are the only persons qualified to judge professional performance; they alone have the necessary background knowledge and technical training. Obviously, much technical and theoretical expertise is involved in reaching professional decisions. And professionals believe that only persons with proper training and experience can evaluate how this expertise should be used. An *educated* evaluation requires a professional education.

She goes on to point out that it is not just the question of technical adequacy but that the professional will make many unique and special decisions based on the singularity of the client-practitioner transaction. The practitioner will need to make judgements on the spot, that only another qualified professional can determine were appropriate for the conditions at the time (1973: 41). As a result, not only are codes of ethics vital for the profession but also the profession will also seek to control recruitment and certification. The values and techniques of the profession need to be learned properly and only from members of the profession itself.

the right to control training creates a monopoly for a given credential or type of education which, in the absence of uniform professional control, encourages abuses and laxness within the system.

Daniels 1973:52

As for codes of ethics, this is best summed up by Roth (1969:159) and re-iterated by Collingridge (1995) in his critique of the Australian Association of Social Work code of ethics, who found that such codes are primarily designed to:

1. Reduce the conflict among members of a professional or business fraternity (or at least the public manifestations of such conflict).
2. Maintain a monopoly of lucrative professional tasks.
3. Ward off criticism from outside the fraternity. In so far as codes of ethics make a claim to protecting the public against improper professional or business practices, the codes are a fraud. The way in which they are actually used tends to protect the fraternity against the public rather than the other way around.

Daniels (1973) ventures that the history of professions and professionalism does not seem to support the contention that professional autonomy contributes to high standards of professional service. She cites Hall (1968) in saying that the more powerful the profession, the more serious the charges of laxness in concern for public service and zealousness in promoting the individual interests of practitioners. She concludes in challenging those studying professions to be more critical of what professions say about themselves when justifying their privileged status above ordinary occupations. She suggests it may be better that these statements be studied as political ideology than as an indication of intrinsic differences between professions and other types of occupations.

Professions and Power

For Boreham (1983), the process of professionalization is intimately tied to the control and influence over training, entry into the profession and evaluating the way in which work is performed. Central to these activities is the claim of special competence, based in esoteric knowledge, expressions of concern about the quality of practice and the special value of the profession to society. Linking with the administrative apparatus of the state leads to a variety of levels of response to occupational credentialing. The determination of this authority rests clearly on social and political processes. Hence, it is difficult to avoid analyzing professions and professionalization from a perspective of power and its utilization. Forsyth and Danisiewicz (1985: 60) comment,

Of the prominent approaches to theorizing about professionalization- process (for example, Wilensky, 1964); trait (for instance, Goode, 1969); and power (for example Johnson, 1972) - we are inclined to share Ritzer's belief that the power approach is the most theoretically promising (Ritzer, 1977:63 see also Johnson, 1972:18; Kelgon, 1978: 272; and Jamous and Peloille, 1970: 109-153).

Power, as perceived by professions, is frequently manifest in attempts by a profession to achieve autonomy. That is, the feeling that the practitioner ought to be allowed to make decisions without external pressures from clients, from others who are not members of his (sic) profession or from his employing organization (Hall 1969: 82 in Forsyth & Danisiewicz, 1985:60). There are a number of problems for social work in this discussion of autonomy. First is the location of the majority of social work positions in statutory or large non-government organizations, with strict controls over their ability to provide services, legislated obligations to act in certain ways and significant funding constraints limiting practice choices. Second, many of the methods of social work practice are based on principles requiring that the worker works 'with' not 'on' the client, that the worker 'empowers' the client and that the worker is ethically obliged to be responsive to client needs whether as individuals, families, groups or communities. The notion of the autocratic practitioner is frowned upon even within traditional casework. The operational definition of Forsyth and Danisiewicz's concept of autonomy indicates a lack of awareness on their part of the fundamental principles and methodology of social work and social welfare practice.

This in itself is a key to the problem of the definition of professions. Taxonomies and definitions that are based on models of professional practice which have themselves been based on assumptions of superiority of one group of people over another, will be inappropriate for analysis of professions where human dignity, equality, social justice and equity are the foundation principles underpinning practice. As research proceeds to identify other valued concepts, for example, the capacity for caring and nurturing as hallmarks of a particular profession, the operational definitions of profession currently in vogue will become obsolete.

To reiterate Boreham's (1983) position, there primarily has been a failure to adopt or draw upon instruments of critique developed in different contexts within sociology and apply them to professional organizations (see Burrell and Morgan 1979 - radical organization theory). The theme of the radical structuralist paradigm is that organizations can only be understood in terms of their place within a total context, in terms of the wider social formation within which they

exist and which they reflect. So we would then look at the organizations as the locus of social contradictions between the relations and means of production, the processes of the social division of labour and the mechanisms of class reproduction within the production process. Second, the theories have not adequately articulated the concept of power. Third, all the views of professions have tended to confuse the acquisition of professional or academic qualification with the actual needs of the job for which they supposedly qualify their holders. Boreham holds that the real key to up-graded skills needed is what are the skills required by management. Management attempts to control professions, through senior positions being in administration and, in fact, out of the practice of the profession itself. Therefore, professional hierarchies are a symbolic reward structure to demonstrate a blocked or unsuccessful professional management career. Thus, for many, professionalism is an indication of career immobility. Finally, he asserts that one has to recognize the inapplicability of definitions of occupations as professions that stress homogeneity, based on technical, educational or skill levels. Technicality is the dominant element in the occupational organization of work and saturates occupational ideologies. Such professions are agents of the collective labourer and incomes are wages. At certain levels of the occupational organization, the conditions for indetermination are created: this applies to specific professional positions, the activities of which are associated with the global functions of capital, particularly in respect of the work of control and surveillance and including the reproduction of labour. In fulfilling the global functions of capital, such occupations are protected from the processes of work devaluation which constantly affect the collective labourer.

Summary

Social work is the formal professional group of workers in the field of social welfare. There are other social welfare workers who have organizations and associations. This chapter has outlined the mechanisms articulaed at the time, that an occupation was thought to need to employ in the process of professionalization. In chapters 5 –9, it will be clear that social work went through this exercise, using the known methods of establishing and maintaining a superordinate position within the field of social welfare during the period under study. Their new candidates (especially in the period under review) came from families with high status and aspirations, who were willing to exchange their economic capital for cultural capital - to pay for education up to matriculation and into university. As an occupation, social work elevated the entry level for the occupation and deliberately acted to establish university-based courses and then longer courses. They have developed a culture, through creating a specific body of knowledge and ‘know how’

or method and, through the educational process, transfer that culture - the process of enculturation. They have used occupational closure by recognizing only accredited educational institutions and limiting the use of the occupation's title to only those who are eligible for membership (i.e., those who have attended an accredited institution).

There are a set of structured social processes within the professional association, especially in relation to membership eligibility, norms of behaviour, as determined by the ethical code, a leadership dedicated to legitimize special talent and the unique nature of the profession. There was deliberate creation of indetermination tested out in battles over the location of courses.

Social welfare workers had a lower level of resources available due to their background. They received lower salaries and had reduced access to higher education, resulting from socially structured conditions. They were unable to reach the same level of dominance and the social workers at the time of this study were not about to share. The social welfare workers may not necessarily always be unhappy with this arrangement, as it allows them to appear professional and yet to distance themselves from poor practice or the process of professionalization that would separate them from close alliance with their client and consumer base.

Social work, on the other hand, has formed alliances with large bureaucratic organizations (Commonwealth and State Public Services, Hospitals and Health Services etc), by negotiating positions of authority through consultations on job classifications, titles and the employment to social work positions of only people eligible for membership of the association. These agreements may have benefited the large organization, by mitigating the extent of external control, disguising contradictions and strengthening the alliance with the ruling group but that is not the focus of this study.