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Social work education in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia

Barbara Staniforth and Carolyn Noble

Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia have unique histories which have strongly shaped the development of social work education within their settings. This chapter explores the commonalities and differences of each country in relation to the development of the profession and the provision of social work education. Particular emphasis is placed upon the role of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s bicultural status and Australia’s incorporation of indigeneity in the shaping of the delivery and curricula within social work education. This chapter also explores how social work education in the South Pacific is offering a valuable contribution to the development of an indigenous-centred social work education.

Social work education posits itself both as a universal (global) and local endeavour. However, the International Association for Schools of Social Work’s (IASSW) Global Standards (Sewpaul & Jones 2004), while encouraging sufficient interpretation and application at local levels, provides quite concrete criteria on such things as: social work’s core purpose; program objectives and outcomes; standards regarding core curricula (including field education); staffing; school structure, administration and governance; and a code of conduct for the social work profession as a way of setting the benchmark for professional standards for both education and practice. This prescription, we argue, introduces tensions as to how the global and the local (indigenous models of social work education) are to be balanced. While Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia’s professional associations also set concrete criteria governing national education standards for social work practice, there has been a more conscious attempt to privilege and include the indigenous voices to enrich and enhance the educational project. This is despite the history of oppression and displacement of indigenous peoples, the traditional landowners before white settlement. How this inclusion has been undertaken will be presented in this chapter.

While we, the authors, are both white female academics and as such we recognise the role in colonisation that our ancestors have played, we have been fortunate to teach in programs where strong indigenous voices have shaped the way that social work is taught and practiced. Therefore we have chosen to focus this chapter on the influence of our countries’ histories and indigenous contributions as one way of addressing the tension between the global and the local in curricula design and delivery.
Historical settlement: Australia

The impact of European settlement in Australia continues to have a profound impact on the indigenous peoples of the land – socially, culturally, politically and educationally. Australian Aboriginal culture is believed to be among the oldest continuous cultures in the world (Bennett 2013). The word Aboriginal is a unitary construct that deflects attention away from the rich diversity in Aboriginal communities. At the time of white settlement there were believed to be about 700 tribal groups and languages in common use, each placing a different emphasis on kinship, relationships with families, each other, and the ecosystem of the land and country. While contact with its nearest neighbour, Indonesia, dated well before the 15th century, was based on trade and cultural exchanges, the European contact was motivated by colonisation and control over the country’s wealth, resources, land and peoples. So in 1770 when Captain Cook arrived in Australia he declared Botany Bay and Sydney Cove as the first of many British settlements across this vast land. Ignoring the indigenous peoples, the British settlers declared the land and area as terra nullius (empty land) and ready for colonisation, sending convicts to populate the land on their release from custody (Bennett 2013). The British imported their system of governance and culture, including their welfare system based on the Poor Laws introduced in Britain in 1601, relying on the church and its parishes for the provision of welfare for the ‘destitute and homeless’, mainly women and children. Post-colonisation, the newly federated states assumed the role of providing welfare assistance as Australia moved towards a universal welfare system when the social and economic impact from the Great Depression of the 1930s and both World Wars resulted in previously viewed deserving citizens uprooted into poverty and unemployment as a result of structural factors outside their control (Chenoweth and McAuliffe 2012). A welfare state continues in some form today with the state and federal governments providing assistance for their citizens in health, education, social planning and the development and delivery of social and welfare services to mitigate against social impacts such as poverty, crime and unemployment which resulted from rapid industrialisation and uneven urban growth.

Australian Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islander peoples have their own histories of human problems and ways of addressing them; mostly passed down by oral traditions. However, when the state assumed responsibility for the welfare of Australian Aboriginals starting in the latter part of the 18th century to the present day, the policies have moved from protectionism, to assimilation, to cultural genocide, to recognition of past harms, to cultural protection and self-determination (Bennett 2013). In addition to the Indigenous population, Australian welfare politics were also influenced by selected immigration from peoples from Europe, the Pacific and more latterly Asia as well as a small number of refugees from war-torn countries from across the globe resulting in a growth of a vibrant multicultural society. In brief, Australia’s welfare policies have been forged in the tensions between its colonial settlers, its indigenous inhabitants and more latterly its immigration policies and practices, creating both a bicultural and multicultural society, also with its own inherent tensions.
Historical settlement: Aotearoa/New Zealand

The indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand are the Māori (also referred to as Tangata Whenua, or people of the land) who are the descendants of the great Polynesian ocean explorers who are said to have settled in Aotearoa/New Zealand in the 13th century (King 2003). By the 16th century most of the country had been settled and the beginnings of tribal Māori society were in evidence. In 1769 Captain James Cook of the British Royal Navy arrived (King 2003). While the French arrived soon after, like Australia, the country was to be colonised by the British. Unlike Australia, however, the Crown recognised that Tangata Whenua had rights, and in 1840 the Crown and different Māori Chiefs throughout the country signed the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi), which would become the founding document of Aotearoa/New Zealand. As in Australia, the English imported a welfare system similar to the English Poor Laws, which became the basis upon which Aotearoa/New Zealand's welfare system for Pakeha (European settlers) would be based. Different systems were initially put in place for the Māori, and Pakeha settlers (Tennant 1989). Colonisation, death by imported European disease, land confiscation and other factors would all play a devastating role for Māori and relations between Māori and non-Māori would form a significant backdrop of the country’s development.

The evolution of social work as a profession

For both Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand, formal social work was initially a global endeavour, being imported from the UK and the US. The developing trajectories, however, were to be influenced by their local contexts. Their indigenous peoples, social and economic movements as well as the space that they occupied geographically would all play a part in creating a social work identity unique to each country.

Nash (2001) and Walsh-Tapiata (2004) acknowledge that Māori were engaged in many of the roles and tasks associated with social work in terms of care for their own communities many years prior to colonisation. Formal social work, in its professional Western construct, was, however, quite slow to emerge in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Post-colonisation, many people would become engaged in roles that would soon become known as social work; however, they did not identify them as such. For example, child welfare workers, school teachers and nurses carried on social care functions without identifying them as being unified within the umbrella of social work.

It was not until 1964 that the New Zealand Association of Social Work was formed (which would later become the Aotearoa/New Zealand Association of Social Work in 1998). It became a member of the International Federation of Social Work (IFSW) in the same year (Nash 2001) and is a current member of IASSW as well.

Two issues were significant in the development of social work in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The early development of social work concurred with a widening recognition that the rights of indigenous people had been violated. In 1980, the South African Springboks rugby team was due to tour Aotearoa/New Zealand. A movement developed within the country to halt this tour on the grounds of South Africa’s apartheid regime and the fact that black players were prohibited from playing. This movement concurred with protests that demanded return of Māori lands that had been stolen over the previous generations. Social work was at times seen to be linked with an oppressive state and to represent the interest of
maintaining the status quo. Divisions occurred within the profession. These divisions became linked to the second significant issue in terms of the profession's development: that of the drive towards a more professional identity for social work (Staniforth 2010). Those pushing for increased educational requirements for social work and registration of social work were seen to be separate from those with a more grassroots (often identified as flax roots in Aotearoa/New Zealand) who were seen to be more concerned with professional status than the wants and needs of the people, and more particularly oppressed people. ‘The emphasis on the professionalism of social workers and their academic training was seen as discriminating against people who were often qualified by life and culture to do the work more effectively’ (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1986, 23). While voluntary registration for social workers came into effect in 2003, the debate continues of whether to allow non-qualified social workers into the professional association, and there is a continued push to make registration of social workers mandatory.

Social work's professional and educational identity and development are currently held and maintained by four key stakeholders. These include the Council for Social Work Education of Aotearoa New Zealand (CSWEANZ), the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW, which includes the Takawaenga o Aotearoa (Māori) social work caucus), the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) and the newest member, the Tangata Whenua Social Worker's Association (TWSWA) which was formed and launched in 2009 (personal correspondence, M. Scott, 28/08/2013).

In Australia social work was also initially influenced by the UK and US experiences and scholarship; however, a localised practice model was quick to develop post-World War 1. From the 1880s there were philanthropic endeavours as well as faith-based organisations delivering services and programs to help marginalised people, especially women and children who were destitute, and activists worked tirelessly to create a better and more equitable society. In particular, in New South Wales, it was social activists in the national women's association that influenced the establishment of social work as a beginning profession from as early as the 1800s (Chenoweth and McAuliffe 2012).

In Australia, the period after World War 2 saw the rise of a welfare state and social workers' role in the assessment and provision of welfare services and social, emotional and financial support, designed to help mitigate the effects of changing social conditions. Up until the late 1970s in Australia, the welfare systems were committed to providing universally for their citizens, and services were developed with the prime aim of enhancing the wellbeing of the whole community. However, all from the late 1980s, with increasing concern about the growth in welfare spending and an ideological shift away from supporting the community to encouraging individuals and families to take more responsibility for their care, the influence of neoliberal ideology heralded a decline in publicly funded services, reduction in universal entitlements, and a move towards more scrutiny and accountability of individual welfare provisions and programs (Lavalette 2011). Managerialism, competition and privatisation dominated the welfare discourse. Government funded services diminished, human services programs and provisions were contracted outside of the state and the private-for-profit services were strengthened as a result. This changing landscape has created new tensions for social workers. With the rise in the more conservative neoliberal philosophy determining public policy, social workers, as government employees, are increasingly finding themselves in the middle between enacting polices that support the more conservative elements of the current status quo and ones that advocate
for a shift in power to the least powerful – a key philosophical underpinning of social
work’s commitment to social justice, human rights and an empowered citizenry.

As social work progressed over the decades a number of unsuccessful attempts have
been made to achieve registration in Australia and these continue. Registration is seen by
the Australian Association for Social Workers (AASW) as an important process to ensure
the ongoing legitimacy of social work as a profession in the human services industry and to
shore up practitioners’ rights to practice independently, claim government financial sup-
port and protect consumers from harm as well as holding social work more accountable
for this work (Chenoweth and McAuliffe 2012). The debate continues.

In 1972 the then Australian federal labour government adopted the policy of self-
determination for indigenous communities to decide on the pace and nature of their
future development. Aboriginal specific services were established such as the Department
of Aboriginal Affairs, Aboriginal Legal Aid medical services and housing and welfare
schemes (Green and Baldry 2012). In 1997, land rights legislation was passed and the
Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody was established in 1987. In 1990,
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) was legislatively established
while Eddie Mabo successfully challenged the terra nullius notion in 1992, thus recog-
nising that indigenous peoples were the first inhabitants of the country. The Native Title
Act (1993) followed and many other initiatives to improve cultural relations and undo the
long-term cultural harm suffered by the indigenous peoples were established. In 1997 and
then in 2007 the issues of the stolen children and child sexual abuse were addressed, and
in 2007 the Australian Government gave the indigenous peoples a national apology, which
gave all Australians some hope for a different future. These developments have had an
important influence on the development of an indigenous approach to social work educa-
tion and recognition by the profession to acknowledge this history and social work’s past
and ongoing obligation to Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islander Australians (Green and
Baldry 2012).

Evolution of social work education in Australia and New Zealand

Australia

In Australia the first social work training was offered by institutes that were separate from
the universities as early as the 1920s. These institutes offered specific training in particular
areas of practice and the formalisation of university-based qualifications came in the 1940s
when universities in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide began offering specific social work
training. By 1976 there were 11 schools of social work across Australia offering bachelor
degrees and today there are 29 Universities offering programs in both undergraduate and
postgraduate professional qualifications as well as postgraduate research, MSWs, DSWs
and PhD programs. This growth is linked to the expansion of the tertiary sector and the
growth in demand for social and human services workers. When social work moved from
the institutes to the universities, a more generic curriculum was developed, with employ-
ers and academics exerting their influence on what should be included in the programs,
with the professional association having the final say (Chenoweth and McAuliffe 2012).

The Australian Association for Social Workers (AASW), established in 1946, regulates
the training of practitioners through its role in the national accreditation of programs and
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hence the graduates that enter the profession. It also disciplines members who have been found to have acted unethically and will withdraw accreditation of courses if standards, resources, governance and curricula fall below its nationally set criteria. Current curricula guidelines encourage a more radically informed approach to practice by including a structural analysis in the theory and practice strands and more latterly the new Australian Social Work Educational Accreditation Standards (ASWEAS 2012) encourage full incorporation of alternative cultural knowledge into the educational curricula with important flow-ons into practice, policy and research. Further, Australian social work academics have led the epistemological challenge to the more conservative and individual (case work and case management) approach to include broader critical social analysis both nationally and internationally. For example, the consideration of a multi-cultural practice which promotes the acceptance of diversity and difference in both theory and practice, in order to reflect the concerns of the multifaceted nature of the community in which it is located, is a required aspect of curricula. So too is the need to internationalise the curricula by including more international literature, exploration of other countries’ culture and context of practice, and encouraging the link with international issues and local practices. A strong commitment to social justice, human rights, gender and minority groups’ democracy is reflected in its ontological foundations. A key core curricula consideration is the inclusion of Aboriginal and Torres Straits knowledge and practice across the programs as well as in stand-alone units of study (where possible).

The baseline qualification is a four year undergraduate program but a two-year postgraduate Master of Social Work (Qualifying) (MSW[Q]) has more recently emerged for people with under-graduate qualification in cognate areas in the human services. The usual social science knowledge (social systems, psychology, political economy, law, sociology, philosophy) and social work theory and methods, and practice competencies and extensive field education make up the curricula. Programs can be offered on or off campus or online as long as students are on campus for five days each academic year. The issue of field placements continues to pose difficulties in both countries as the length of time (1000 hours) and availability of agencies willing to take students are a constant concern.

Aotearoa/New Zealand

The history of social work education in Aotearoa/New Zealand has been written in detail by Nash in her 1998 doctoral thesis. In this she indicates that professional social work education emerged relatively late in Aotearoa/New Zealand. While, like in Australia, there was a system of social security in place that was meant to serve its population from cradle to grave (The Social Security Act 1938), the government at the time saw the expressed need for social work as an indictment on its much lauded welfare state. As a result, the first social work education program (first intake 1950), located at Victoria University in Wellington (the nation’s capital), was not permitted to call itself such, with the qualification being named the Diploma in Social Sciences. This was a two-year postgraduate diploma that produced a very limited number of graduates, not nearly enough to meet the need for qualified social workers at that time. It would be approximately another 25 years before undergraduate social work programs would be established with Massey University on the North Island and University of Canterbury on the South Island. The two-year Diploma of Social Work followed in 1980, situated in the Auckland Teacher’s College (now the University of Auckland). From the mid-1980s onward, numerous social work diplomas,
certificate and degree programs were developed. These were situated mainly in universities, polytechnic institutes and in wānangas (tertiary education providers that provide programs from a Māori cultural perspective).

The Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW) initially provided accreditation for social work education programs. With the advent of the Social Workers Registration Act 2003, this task was assumed by the Social Workers Registration Board, which currently provides accreditation to programs, which enables graduates from those programs to achieve provisional registration upon graduation (SWRB 2013b). There are currently 17 institutions in the country that provide either a qualifying bachelor's degree (three or four years) or master's degree in 'social work' (SWRB 2013a). The SWRB has signalled to institutes that the minimum requirement will shift from a three-year undergraduate qualification to a four-year qualification, which will take effect from 2017 (SWRB 2013b). This is a development that has been praised by some as it brings Aotearoa/New Zealand into line with many other countries, and decried by others as it has the potential to make the qualification less accessible to groups such as Māori due to increased costs and longer time away from the family or the workforce that will be required.

**Contribution indigeneity has made to social work education**

We have discussed that both countries began their education programs through importing ideas from overseas, and we note the reflexive nature of globalisation as both countries have borrowed from, and contributed to, international discourses surrounding social work education and practice. Part of this contribution has been made through the knowledge, skills and values of our countries' indigenous peoples, and other people native to the Pacific whose knowledge, educational processes and ideas form part of the 'local' of each country, and have much to offer the global. We have chosen to explore two aspects of how indigenous process and knowledge have contributed to social work education. From Australia we discuss some of the ways that indigeneity is embedded in the curricula, while from Aotearoa/New Zealand we focus more specifically on theory.

**Australia**

The Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (2012) specifically deem that all Australian social work courses cover ATSI attitudes, values, knowledge and skills as core curricula. Further, the preamble for both the AASW Code of Ethics (2010) and the AASW newly formed Practice Standards (2013) note great advances in developing a collaborative and integrated social work response to issues ATSI peoples face. Each of these documents begins by stating:

1. Social work acknowledges the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the First Australians, whose lands, winds and waters we all now share, and pay respect to the unique values, and their continuing and enduring cultures which deepen and enrich the life of our nation and communities.
2. Social workers commit to acknowledge and understand the historical and contemporary disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the implication of this for practice.
3. Social workers are responsible for ensuring that their practice is culturally competent, safe and sensitive. (Briskman 2007; Zubrzycki and Crawford 2013; Green and Baldry 2012)

Further, each of these commitments requires curricula that support its implementation. In summary, this is done in several ways. The first is incorporating an indigenous world view – ‘ways of knowing’ – as well as ‘ways of being’ and finally ‘ways of doing’ (see Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards 2012, section 3.3.4; 20–24). The second is to show respect for ATSI peoples and for non-white peoples to challenge racism and oppression in practice and educational processes, and work to address their consequences. The third is to review how the history of social work has been influenced by colonisation and how as a consequence ‘white politics’ and ‘whiteness’ dominate its epistemology and pedagogy and to work at decolonising its impact. Fourth is to link social justice and human rights in developing an anti-racist practice that informs the development as well as research and policy changes. The fifth is to acknowledge the resilience of ATSI peoples, and their strengths and survivorship in the face of extensive racism, oppression and the trauma of dispossession from their land and the legacy of the Stolen Generations. Sixth is to acknowledge the importance of working communally rather than individually. Seventh is to work in true and real collaboration in both the classroom and the workplace in the development of an Indigenous social work. In essence to open up dialogue by inviting yarning, learning and listening to indigenous peoples as they talk and act from their lived experiences and provide them in the curricula. Finally (although not exclusively) to incorporate a critically reflective aspect to education and supervision in order to begin the work outlined above.

We, along with others (Zubrzycki and Crawford 2013; Green and Baldry 2012) would argue that an important contribution that this scholarship offers social work education more generally is of ‘turning the lens’ on whiteness within educational content and processes and actively redressing the fact that indigenous peoples are at the bottom of the communities’ race-aligned hierarchies. The constant question and challenge for social work education is how to continue to address this situation in the curricula, the classroom, practice and the profession more broadly. The contribution of ATSI scholars in defining ways of including indigienity in the social work curricula as outlined above is an important way forward. Aotearoa/New Zealand has also made some strides forward in these regards.

Aotearoa/New Zealand

Aotearoa/New Zealand is a relatively small country sitting in the middle of the South Pacific region. It has evolved a unique identity based on its Māori heritage and pioneer spirit. A reflexive relationship has also existed with the many Pacific Islands that surround it. All these influences have played a part in how social work education has evolved and is currently delivered.

One of the distinguishing features of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s colonisation was the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) between the British Crown and some of the chiefs of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The key points of the treaty were that Māori chiefs gave the Queen governance over the land, that Māori chiefs were given exercise of chieftainship over their lands, villages, and property or treasures, and that Māori would have the same protection and rights accorded to British subjects (State Services Commis-
sion 2005, 15). Controversy surrounded the treaty, however, as more than one version was signed (three in English and one in Māori). Key terms were confused in the translation, which would cause significant misunderstandings and conflict in the years to come (Ruwhiu 2013). Regardless of these controversies, the Treaty established the foundation of biculturalism within the country and entrenched the rights of Māori people as Tangata Whenua. As described earlier, formal social work education was just establishing a ‘critical mass’ at a time when the social fabric of the country was shifting from being a relatively conservative agriculturally-based country to a country that would become known for speaking out against human rights abuses, including the ones occurring on its own soil. Social work’s identity was closely aligned with these developments.

In 1986 the government commissioned a report into practices within the Department of Social Welfare that found extensive evidence of institutional racism in the provision of service and the department itself. The report, known as Puao te Ata tu, would become a seminal document in social work education and practice (Hollis-English 2012). The family group conference, which entrenches the rights of whānau (extended family) and is used in child welfare decision-making and young offender restorative justice programs, emerged from this report. These approaches have been deemed to be more in line with Māori cultural world views and practices.

In 1993 the social work association, ANZASW, developed a code of ethics and bicultural code of practice. A bilingual (Māori and English) version was adopted in 2007. This code of ethics, as well as the code of conduct developed by the SWRB, form the basis on which schools of social work base their teaching and curricula around ethics and practice.

During the course of the evolution of social work education, there has been a parallel development of programs developed and delivered by Māori academics for Māori students, often delivered through wanangas (which have also had a number of non-Māori students) as well as recognition that students in ‘mainstream’ programs needed to become more aware of the Māori world (te ao Māori) and to gain competence in being able to work with Māori clients. The ANZASW lists one of its practice principles as ‘The social worker demonstrates a commitment to practicing social work in accordance with the Code of Ethics (2007) and an understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Articles 1, 2, 3 and 4′ (ANZASW 2007) while the SWRB requires that social workers demonstrate the competence to practise social work with Māori (SWRB 2010a).

Some training programs have specific papers or courses devoted to working with Tangata Whenua, while others embed the whole of their programs within this context. While much of the content taught in social work programs in Aotearoa/New Zealand still resonates with Western theories and models, Māori models of wellbeing have also been embedded within social work curriculum. Duri’e’s (1985) Māori model of wellbeing, Te Whare Tapa Wha, uses a metaphor of the walls of the meeting house, which need to be in balance to hold up the house. These walls are hinengaro (thoughts and emotions), wairua (spirituality), whānau (family) and tinana (physical). They are also held up by a strong foundation of relationship to the whenua or the land. Māori ceremonies and processes, such as that of the powhiri, have also been adopted within social work practice. These include the use of karakia (prayer), waiata (song) and the joining together over kai (food) (Munford and Sanders 2010; Webber-Dreadon 1999).

While concepts such as ‘evidence-based practice’ or ‘practice-based evidence’ have influenced what is taught, in New Zealand this has often been filtered through a critical lens in terms of what constitutes evidence, and a growing recognition about the impor-
tance of the inclusion of Tangata Whenua and other groups’ voices in determining what works in practice. Ruwhiu notes that all social work in New Zealand should be familiar with the history of Tangata Whenua/Tauiwi (people who have come from elsewhere) relations and the importance of the narrative in the formation of identity and concepts of wellbeing (2013).

While discussion around the how social work is conceptualised and taught within the various Pacific Islands is beyond the scope of this paper, we acknowledge the influence and contribution that Pacific Island peoples have made upon social work education and practice. Pasifika models of wellbeing have also been included in ‘mainstream’ social work education.

The most well-known of the Pacific Island models is the Samoan Fonofale Model (Polutu-Endemann 2001). Developed by Polutu-Endemann, this model has similarity to the previously discussed Whare Tapa Wha Model. In this model, the fale (meeting house) is held up by different posts (pou-tu). These posts are representative of the spiritual (fa’aleaagaga), mental (mafaufau), physical (fa’aletino) and ‘other’ realms of wellbeing, such as gender, age, sexuality and socioeconomic status, which sit on a foundation of the extended family (aiga). These are held in place by culture, or the roof of the fale, and sit within context, time and environment (Mafile’o 2013).

As Ruwhiu (2013) espouses three important considerations in becoming competent to work with Māori, Faleolo provides guidelines (2009) for achieving cultural validity in social work education. These include establishing a social work curriculum where cultural content is ‘strong, authoritative and equitable’ (153); incorporating assessments that utilise cultural knowledge and practices, and acknowledging parables as culturally valid knowledge (153).

While social work in Aotearoa/New Zealand is deemed to occur within a bicultural context, the country itself has become increasingly multicultural in terms of its makeup. The ANZASW has particular interest groups for African, Chinese, Filipino, Indian, and
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Pasifika social workers (ANZASW 2013). These groups serve to provide a mutual connection for social workers from various minority ethnic groups and can also act as consultants in relation to policy, research and practice. The core competencies of the SWRB indicate that social workers must demonstrate ‘competence to practice social work with different ethnic and cultural groups in Aotearoa/New Zealand’ (SWRB 2010b).

Conclusions

Like many places in the world, the tensions between the global and the local are felt within the Australian, New Zealand and South Pacific contexts. The contribution of Aotearoa/New Zealand's bicultural status on the development of social work and Australia's attempt to include indigeneity into the social work curricula are making some progress in breaking down the institutional barriers that decades of white privilege has created. This also has implications for the promotion of effective cross-cultural practice and enables social workers to work not only with indigenous communities but other ethnicities characteristic of Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand's multicultural populations. While links with international and global contexts are important, it is in the local that significant changes can occur.

Just as the proposed new definition of social work, which is emerging from extensive cross-cultural and cross-national collaboration and consultation, needs to hold the balance of global and local, so does social work’s educational curriculum. Schools of social work will need to be proactive in ensuring that their students are adequately prepared for both
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the local and the global contexts. We hope that some of the examples put forward in this chapter are helpful in providing ideas on ways forward within these dialectical tensions as both our countries move towards celebrating the incorporation of indigenous histories, voices and learning in their social work programs.

The authors would like to acknowledge the images created by Dr Simon Nash.
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