The Hong Kong Statement on Practice Research 2017

Contexts and Challenges of the Far East

Timothy Sim, Michael Austin, Fazlin Abdullah, Tak Mau Simon Chan, Martin Chok, Ke Cui,

Irwin Epstein, Mike Fisher, Lynette Joubert, Ilse Julkunen, Rosaleen Ow, Lars Uggerhøj, Samuel

Wang, Martin Webber, Keith Wong & Laura Yliruka

Hong Kong Polytechnic University

University of California, Berkeley

National Council of Social Service, Singapore

Hong Kong Baptist University

Care Corner Singapore Ltd

Sichuan University

City University of New York

University of Bedfordshire

University of Melbourne

University of Helsinki

National University of Singapore

Aalborg University

University of Taipei

University of York

Hong Kong Council of Social Service

Helsinki University Central Hospital

The Hong Kong Statement on Practice Research 2017

Contexts and Challenges of the Far East

Abstract

This statement on social work practice research highlights the contributions of scholars, practitioners, and conference participants in the 4th International Conference on Practice Research (ICPR2017) hosted by Hong Kong Polytechnic University in May, 2017. It focuses on the contexts and the challenges of carrying out practice research in the Far East and beyond as well as raises pertinent questions about the development of practice research. It begins with a brief description of the context of social work practice research in the Far East. The second part explores the organizational and community contexts and challenges of practice research with special attention to the perspectives of practitioners. It concludes with reviewing some of the continuing challenges that will guide the program planning for the 5th International Conference on Practice Research in 2020 in Melbourne, Australia located at the crossroads between East and West.

The Hong Kong Statement on Practice Research 2017

Contexts and Challenges of the Far East

The Contexts of Practice Research in The Far East

The debate and advocacy for practice research in social work have taken place primarily in the West (Europe and the United States, 2008-2017). The fourth International Conference on Practice Research hosted by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University included over 265 people from 33 countries and provided the first international venue to capture the perspectives of the Far East. The dialogue was greatly enhanced by the largest involvement of the practitioner community in comparison with the previous international conferences. The conference also provided a unique opportunity for practitioners, academics and practice researchers from Hong Kong, mainland China, and other Asian countries to exchange with their Western counterparts up close, while charting their own contribution to the ongoing discourse and debate about practice research and its future trajectories in Asia (Sim, 2016).

The Far East shares similar challenges with the West (demonstrating the social impact, value and accountability of social work practice) and it also reflects the influence of the West (theories, interventions, textbooks, educators, etc.). Clearly, practice research in Far East is directly influenced by the state of social work practice in rapidly growing and changing economies. The four Far East locales represented in this overview include: China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan, which are predominantly made up of Chinese communities. Since this statement reflects a description of the unique features of countries located within the region of the conference for the first time, more information is located in Appendix A.

Exploring the Organizational and Community Contexts and Challenges of Practice

Research

Building upon the first international colloquium on practice research in Salisbury (UK) in 2008

with 25 invited researcher mainly from Europe, UK, and USA, the past conferences have

generated more interest among researchers as well as practitioners over time. The Hong Kong

International Conference on Practice Research in 2017 represents considerable growth in

attendance (265 people from 33 countries) and an expanding interest in the development of

social work practice research internationally. Given the tradition of creating a conference

statement (Salisbury Forum Group, 2011; Julkunen et al., 2012; Epstein et al. 2015) that reflects

the issues important in the host country and region, the Far East theme of the Hong Kong

conference was developed with this tradition in mind ("Recognizing diversity, developing

collaborations, and building networks" of social work practitioners, practitioner-researcher,

researchers, and service users) (Sim, 2016). The Hong Kong conference built upon the theme of

the 3rd International Conference ("Building bridges not pipelines: Promoting two-way traffic

between practice and research") by including: (a) renowned scholars in the field of practice

research, (b) international participants to share their knowledge and skills; (c) workshops,

plenaries, social impact discussion forums and poster presentations to enrich the understanding

of participants with different examples of practice research. In its attempt to engage practitioners,

the Hong Kong conference engaged a number of professional associations in the region (e.g.,

China Social Work Academy, Hong Kong Association of Schools of Social Work, Macau Social

Workers' Association, Taiwan Association of Social Workers, Hong Kong Council of Social

Service and the National Council of Social Service of Singapore) to co-organize the Conference.

Another innovation developed for the Hong Kong Conference was the effort to involve a group of conference participants, mostly practitioners, at the close of the conference in identifying future challenges related to conducting practice research as noted below (Chin et al., 2017):

1. Featuring the multiple languages of practice

The change to a more accessible *practice* language has undoubtedly improved the partnership between the researchers and practitioners. The meaning of "practice language" goes beyond the communications between academics and practitioners in English. With a broader international audience being engaged in the conference, culturally and linguistically diverse needs should be addressed because limited proficiency in English can discourage participants from sharing their ideas. In order to enable the participants to use their first language to voice their views and opinions in discussions, simultaneous interpretation and translation services need to be provided.

2. Increasing the capacities of practitioners to conduct practice research

Given the daily demands of social work practice, less time and energy are available for conducting practice research even if the practitioners are able and willing. More guidance at future conferences is needed for: a) learning about the conduct of *empirical* practice research b) gaining knowledge about access, accuracy, reliability and funding resources for data collection and c) exploring different ways of publishing research results.

3. Understanding the unique contributions of different research stakeholders

Different stakeholders (service users; policy makers; government; funders; practitioners; academics) have different purposes in conducting practice research and these differences can make it more difficult for researchers or practitioners to conduct research targeted at specific issues and providing concrete solutions.

4.   Enhancing the coordinating and leadership roles of practitioners

The open dialogue between the academic researchers and practitioners has fostered considerable practice-research collaboration. Practitioners are encouraged to participate in the development of practice-oriented research questions. The increasing involvement of practitioners in assuming leadership roles in promoting practice research in their workplace can be very empowering.

Building on these practitioner observations, the 5th International Conference on Practice Research (Melbourne, Australia, 2020) has indicated its commitment to addressing these themes and issues. The planning for the next conference includes a focus on supporting practitioners (research question selection, definition and clarification) in Academic Practitioner Partnerships that promote practice research through the engagement of both practitioners and service users that can enhance the practice research culture in service organizations.

<div align="center">Emerging Questions to Address As We Move On</div>

The process of identifying critical questions about practice research has been a part of the history of our international conferences. Since the First International Conference on Practice Research (2008) and the creation of the 'Salisbury Statement on Practice Research', the defining and operationalizing of practice research has expanded considerably (Salisbury Forum Group, 2011). The Second International Conference on Practice Research featured the different methodological and theoretical assumptions underpinning practice research, as well as provided opportunities to demonstrate the involvement of service providers and users in the design and implementation of research projects as well as the role of social work research faculty located at local universities (Helsinki Forum Group, 2014). The Third International Conference on Practice Research held in New York City in 2014 reiterated the need for innovative, flexible, and truly collaborative practice research strategies that engage academic researchers and social work practitioners in a

productive dialogue. And the focus of the Fourth International Conference on Practice Research

in 2017 expanded the focus on practice by engaging a broader international audience of current

researchers, practitioners, users, and decision makers in both government and nongovernmental

organizations regarding the role practice research in building social work knowledge.

Old and new questions emerged within the context of the 4th International Conference that

provided expanded perspectives on practice research, especially the ongoing question: What is

practice research? As new conference participants, countries and disciplines engage in

developing the concept of practice research, the question will continue to emerge and benefit

from ongoing refinement, reflecting the strengths of this form of research as well as the value of

ongoing innovations/improvements in various localities. New perspectives and ways of

understanding and evaluating social work practice are also required in different contexts. It is

exactly this unique strength that practice research is able to bring different stakeholders with

diverse backgrounds and different views together. In other words, it is essential for practice

research to pay attention to the different ways that practice research has been employed in

different contexts and settings. It also focuses attention on the change dynamics of social work

practice. For instance, based on the early stage of professional social work development in

mainland China, it is evident that practice research is a new phenomenon and therefore will

reflect an evolving process of practice research that may differ from other parts of the

world. One of the goals of practice research (and the periodic conference statements like this one)

is to highlight a variety of contexts and challenges facing practice research. Practice research

involves negotiating diversity and promoting understanding while also respecting the different

contexts and realities for engaging in practice research. The efforts to further refine the definition

of practice research should continue at the next international conference in Melbourne, Australia

in 2020. Implicit in this search for a meaningful clarification of practice research is the process

of educating students in ways that increase their practice research competence and confidence

(both classroom and fieldwork) and thereby contribute to a practice research culture within their

future workplaces that includes continuing exploration and rigorous examination of practice

research definitions and methodologies.

<div align="center">Questions to Guide The Planning of Future Conferences</div>

1. Practice research methodologies.

What are the different epistemologies and methods relevant to practice research in different parts

of the world, given unique contexts and the development of social work practice? What role does

continuing education play in the development of practice research capacities in different social

work communities? To what extent is practice carried out by students in their field practice a

type of practice research (vis-a-vis a piece of educational output)? Is participatory action

research a part of practice research or the other way around? In the Helsinki Statement it was

concluded that: "The theoretical and methodological framework for practice research calls for

flexible and collaborative structures and organizations. Therefore practice research cannot be

captured by a single philosophy or methodology, but will rather connect itself towards

philosophies and methodologies defining practice-based knowledge and supporting flexible

organizations and understandings" (Helsinki Forum Group, 2014, p8.).

2. Practice research contexts.

It has become increasingly clear, especially at the Hong Kong conference that more attention

needs to be given to the context of practice research around the world given both the diverse

political and cultural contexts and the different stages of social work development as a profession.

Each locale will probably develop a slightly different mix of the ingredients of practice and

research. The changing demands on practice research enterprise also need future consideration.

For example, how does practice research account for the shift in funder interests from output to

outcome research, especially using the new language of impact research designed to address both

policy and community? What attention is being paid to the dissemination and utilization/

implementation of practice research beyond the traditional use of agency reports and peer review

journal articles? While social impact assessment is the process of analyzing and managing the

intended and unintended consequences on the human environment of planned interventions

(policies, programs, plans, projects), social change processes call upon those engaged in practice

research to be equally skilled at articulating the underlying "theory of change" guiding the

provision of services. Future directions in the development of practice research call for increased

attention to articulating "theory-informed practice" in addition to the building of theoretical

frameworks for measurement in the collaborations between practitioners, researchers, and

service users.

3. Role of practitioners in practice research.

The third question that emerged in this process is: What is the role of practitioners in developing

practice research? Based on the experience of the Hong Kong conference, it is clear that

practitioners need to be more actively engaged in the development of practice research (Chin et

al., 2017). Particular attention needs to be given to the language used to describe practice

research in a way that reflects the interests of practitioners. As a result, it is recommended that

more practitioners should be actively involved in the planning and implementation of the

Melbourne conference in 2020 based on the local history of longstanding partnerships between

university researchers and 'practitioners as partners'.

4. Role of service users in practice research.

Another question is gaining increasing interest; namely, what is the role of service users in shaping practice research given unique political and social processes? Some of the questions emerging in the Hong Kong conference included: (a) How and when do we talk about service user involvement in practice research? (b) Are we involving service users as research informants or as active research team members (influencing the design, the research question etcetera)? (c) Is practice research about giving service users a voice through research and are there parallels to involvement and democratic processes? These questions could also guide future conference planning.

Conclusions

This Statement has been jointly compiled by the Conference Organising Committee as well as the presenters and participants attending the Fourth International Conference on Practice Research in Hong Kong. One of the unique contributions of the Hong Kong conference is the need to highlight the "state of social work practice" in relationship to the "state of social work practice research" since they are linked in more complex ways than had been considered in past conferences. It is apparent that practice research is lodged in a context which includes the developmental stages of social work practice as well as the socio-political and economic forces at play. Another contribution of the Hong Kong conference is the growing recognition of the need for more involvement by both practitioners and service users in our continuing efforts to define practice research and contribute to the knowledge development of social work practice.

References

Chin, C.S., Ciro, D., Fisher, M., Ji, C., Begum, R., Rahim, A., Lien, Y., Wu, F.K.Y.
(2017). ICPR 2017 – The Fourth International Conference on Practice Research: overview.
Social Dialogue, 5(17), 47-49.

Epstein, I., Fisher, M., Julkunen, I., Uggerhoj, L., Austin, M. J., & Sim, T. (2015). The
New York statement on the evolving definition of practice research designed for continuing
dialogue: A bulletin from the 3rd International Conference on Practice Research (2014).
Research on Social Work Practice, *25*, 711-714.

Helsinki Forum Group. (2014). Helsinki statement on social work practice research.
Nordic Social Work Research, 4: sup1, 7-13, DOI: 10.1080/2156857X.2014.981426

Salisbury Forum Group. (2011). Salisbury statement on social work practice research.
Social Work and Society, *9*, 4–9.

Sim, T. (2016). International Practice Research Conference (ICPR) Moving East.
Research on Social Work Practice, 26, 730-732.

Appendix A:

The Status of Practice Research in China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan

China -- Social work is at an early stage of professional development in China (Yuen-Tsang & Wang, 2008). After decades of civil wars and the Cultural Revolution, it was re-introduced by the Chinese government to universities in 1986 with the hope that graduates with a professional background of social work could contribute to alleviating the acute social problems caused by the drastic socio-economic changes after its economy grew at a break-neck speed (Yuen-Tsang & Wang, 2008). In 2006 the Chinese government formally acknowledged the importance of "building up a strong team of social workers to help in the development of the harmonious society" with "education as priority" in its social work development model in China (Shi, 2012:17). It is believed that professional autonomy of social work needs to be strengthened for it to become an independent discipline, combining specialization and localization, theory and practice in China (Peng, 2017). Practice research has the potential to speed up this process of strengthening the professional autonomy of social work (Sim & Lau, 2017). With a total of 206 practice research publications between 1999 and 2014, Sim and Lau (2017) reported that practice research is still fledgling in China.

In a context where practice research is just beginning, challenges are expected. First, there is a lack of coherence and clear definition of practice research concepts such as "practice research", "intervention research", "action research" and the like. Social workers in China are apparently unclear about the different yet apparently related concepts and question what is the difference between intervention research and practice research? Is action research part of practice research or the other way around? This confusion and obscurity has led to an alternate use between action research and practice research in current Chinese social work literature (Sim &

Lau, 2017). Finally, inadequate institutional support undermines the development of practice research in the long-run. Currently, there are few training courses and textbooks on practice research for social work students, social work educators are also lacking adequate training in practice research and in academic writing, compounded by the fact many of the university teachers have little practice experience.

Hong Kong -- Social work arrived in Hong Kong as a direct consequence of colonization but the colonial government did not take any major initiative regarding social work until 1960s (Lam & Blyth, 2014). In 1997 Hong Kong was returned to the Chinese sovereignty after 100 years of British colonial rule. By then, it has a well-developed social service system with a myriad of programmes and services to respond to the emerging psychosocial needs of its seven million inhabitants (Leung, 2007). The development of practice research matches the different stages of social work advancement in Hong Kong (Wang, 2004), as journal articles on practice steadily increased between 1966 and 2016 (a total of 1261 articles as noted by Chan & Sim, under review). However, these publications featuring practice research initiatives had been mostly academic-led.

Since practice research operates at the crossroads between practice and research, there is a need for joint efforts from both parties and negotiation between them (Drisko, 2014). Hong Kong is in the process of benefiting from overseas models of collaboration (Joubert & Hocking, 2015; Julkunen, Karvinen-Niinikoski, Marthinsen, Rasmussen, & Uggerhøj, 2012). As with its western counterparts, the research funding by the government and the community is impacted by globalization and its socio-economic circumstances. In 2001, the Hong Kong Government implemented a new funding system ("Lump Sum Grant"), which shifted the focus of service monitoring from "input" to "output" to delivery of quality service, which is not dissimilar to

other western countries where neo-Conservative welfare regime prevails and the "small

government" is heralded (Chui, Tsang & Mok, 2010). This move to reduce costs and funding is

believed to have long-term adverse effects on the quality and stability of social services in Hong

Kong (Chui, Tsang & Mok, 2010; Leung, 2002). By 2019, all universities are expected to

account for the social impact of their research, as a result of adopting the Research Excellent

Framework used in the United Kingdom since 2004. These challenges, faced by both academics

and practitioners, include the quest for effective practices (Lam & Blyth, 2014), need to

demonstrate social impact, the managerialism and accountability associated with grants (Yan,

Cheung, Tsui, & Chu, 2017), and the complicated and uncertain nature of funding (Lam & Blyth,

2014). But there is also a huge opportunity for Hong Kong to share its experience in developing

social work practice and research with China (Chui, Tsang & Mok, 2010) and probably its

neighboring counterparts including Taiwan (Wang, 2004) and Singapore.

Singapore -- Like Hong Kong, Singapore is an island state with a population of about five

million, has a colonial legacy, including for its social service and social work education. Since

the social work discipline debuted with the set-up of the Department of Social Work at the

National University of Singapore (NUS) in 1953, the social work sector has been evolving into

one that not only focuses on delivering good practice, but also examines closely the other three

critical components of social work: formulation of policies, advocating for social causes and

research. The Singapore government adopts the "Many Helping Hands (MHH)" approach in its

social service provision, where assistance is provided by various stakeholders including the

government, community organisations, voluntary groups, concerned citizens and family

members (Lim, 2007). The importance of cultivating practitioner-researcher collaborations to

widen the sources of social work knowledge production has been acknowledged by different

ministry divisions (Sutjipto, 2017). The government is keen to promote practice research. As an example of this, the National Council of Social Service (NCSS), a statutory board of the Singaporean government with over 460 member social service organisations under its wing, has been actively working with a coalition of local practice research enthusiasts to resource and plan engagement efforts among social work practitioners to promote awareness in practice research, and to document key issues and challenges faced in conducting practice research in the social and health sector.

Practice research in Singapore has been employed as a means to strengthen service quality, account to service-users and donors and build public confidence and for the continuous learning of social work practitioners. While governmental and academic institutions have been active in promoting practice research (Tan, 2017), bottom-up practice research projects are limited and concentrated in a few social service organisations. While funding opportunities are available, there can be more support for practice research in terms of time given for the practice research to be conducted, and the technical support given to the practitioners. Efforts have already started recently. For example, the Social Service Research (SSR) Centre, based in Department of Social Work at the National University of Singapore, work closely with NGOs in designing a project, writing a grant and applying for ethical approval, and more access to up-to-date research databases to carry out literature reviews in recent years. Today there are two grants in Singapore which aim to support practice research: (i) the Mrs Lee Choon Guan Endowed Research Fund was established in 2016 to motivate scholars to pro-actively engage practitioners to conduct practice research to be adapted into training materials to transfer knowledge to students and other professionals (National University of Singapore, 2017), and ii) the NCSS-administered VWOs-Charities Capability Fund (VCF) which supports practice research projects

undertaken by social service organisations and incentivises collaborative research. However there is still a need for an active centralised sharing platform to allow inter-organisational collaboration for the dissemination of findings with one another. However, a quick review from the Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development, published four times a year by the Department of Social Work of the National University of Singapore, in collaboration with the Asian and Pacific Association for Social Work Education since 1991, yielded few articles on practice research by both the academics and practitioners in Singapore. A quick search on practice research published in international journals by social workers related to Singapore is not more promising (Sim, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c; Sim & Ng, 2008), when compared to Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Taiwan -- The modern social work profession began to take shape in Taiwan in 1949 and reflects two developmental pathways; namely, governmental social administration and 'American-style' social work education and practice (Cheng, 2007). As a result, the social work profession in Taiwan reflects a dependence on the party-state institutions to achieve its legitimacy in the society and features of the American education and knowledge production system (e.g., Epstein, 2010). The nature of social work practice has also evolved from rigid governmental social control to a flexible form of individualizing services. While practitioners support the importance of social work research, only one third of them found existing academic research useful in meeting their needs in practice (Zhao, 1992; Zhang, 2006).

Practice research efforts are mostly led and undertaken by academics in Taiwan. Zhang (2006) examined the articles between 1994 and 2004 in social work related journals, only 40 of them are related to the study or evaluation of social work practice. Government-funded programmes increasingly emphasize the importance of involving both practitioners and academic

researchers in service projects (Zhang & Hsu, 2004). Both academic researchers and practitioners are urged to consider research as a tool for practice, rather than consider practice as object of research (Epstein, 1995). Social workers are encouraged to be the user and producer of knowledge to inform and evaluate their practices and contribute to knowledge development, especially in medical settings that feature evidence-based practices (EBP). There is a general lack of organizational support, resources, funding and facilitators to motivate and guide research-minded practitioners. Given the history of the two development pathways related to government-support social services and university-supported social work education, it has been difficult to narrow the gap between practice and research in Taiwan.

Consolidating the Challenges in Practice Research of the Far East

Practice research is a new enterprise in the Far East, particularly China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan due to the relatively brief history of social work that has been imported from the West with limited efforts to tailor to local needs with services and university education heavily subsidized by government. As a result, practice research is mainly led by academics with a minimal role played by practitioners and the role of the service users in practice research is almost non-existent. Given the many common social, economic and cultural characteristics of the countries and regions in the Far East, the international conference provided a platform for a process of continuing exchange in the region with regard to the development of practice research (Lam & Blyth, 2014; Chui, Tsang & Mok, 2010; Wang, 2004).

References

Chan, T. M. S., & Sim, T. (Under review). East meets West: Practice research in the city of Hong Kong for six decades. *Research on Social Work Practice.*

Cheng, Y. S., (2007). Historical analysis of social work development in Taiwan between 1949-1963: a dual vision of "Social work in social welfare department" and "American style social work profession". *Social Policy & Social Work*, *11*: 153-197. In Chinese

Chui, E., Tsang, S., & Mok, J. (2010). After the Handover in 1997: Development and challenges for social welfare and social work in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development, 20*(1), 52-64.

Drisko, J. (2014). Split or synthesis: The odd relationship between clinical practice and research in social work and in social work education. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *42*, 182-192.

Epstein, I. (1995). Promoting reflective social work practice: Research strategies and consulting principles. In P. Hess & E. Mullens (eds.). *Practitioner researcher partnerships: Building knowledge from, in, and for practice* (pp. 83-102). Washington D. C: NASW Press.

Epstein, I. (2010). *Clinical data-mining: Integrating practice and research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Helsinki Forum Group. (2014). Helsinki statement on social work practice research. *Nordic Social Work Research, 4*:sup1, 7-13, DOI: 10.1080/2156857X.2014.981426

Joubert, L., & Hocking, A. (2015). Academic practitioner partnerships: A model for collaborative practice research in social work. *Australian Social Work*, *68*, 352-363.

Lam, C. W., & Blyth, E. (2014). Re-engagement and negotiation in a changing political and economic context: Social work in Hong Kong. *British Journal of Social Work*, *44*, 44-62.

Leung, J. (2002). The advent of managerialism in social welfare: The case of Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Journal of Social Work, 36*(1–2), 61–81.

Leung, J. C. B. (2007). Debate: An international definition of social work for China. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *16*, 391–397.

Lim, X. H. (2007). Security with Self-Reliance: The Argument for the Singapore Model. Ethos: *Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, 3, 35-39.

National University of Singapore. (2017). NUS establishes Mrs Lee Choon Guan Endowed Research Fund to expand social service research. Retrieved 6 July 2017, from http://giving.nus.edu.sg/nus-establishes-mrs-lee-choon-guan-endowed-research-fund-to-expand-social-service-research/

Peng, H.M. (2017). Social work discipline in China: Centennial growth and autonomy in research. *Social Sciences*, *7*, 66-73. In Chinese.

Shi, B.N. (2012). How to fill in the weaknesses of social work education? *China Social Work* (30), 18-19. In Chinese.

Sim, T. (2011a). Working with ex-offenders' family in an Asian context – Part I: The impossible task of engaging the family. *Journal of Community Corrections, 20*(2), 7-10, 18-19.

Sim, T. (2011b). Working with ex-offenders' family in an Asian context – Part II: The tools and traps of assessment and intervention. *Journal of Community Corrections, 20*(3), 7-8, 13-15, 20-21.

Sim, T. (2011c). Collaborating or colluding: A practice research project with ex-offenders and their family in Singapore. *Social Work and Society, 9*. 1-14http://www.socwork.net/2011/1/sim

Sim, T., & Ng, G. T. (2008). Black cat, white cat: A pragmatic and collaborative approach to evidence-based social work in China. *China Journal of Social Work, 1*, 50-62.

Sim, T. & Lau, V. (2017). The emergence of social work practice research in the peoples' republic of china: a literature review. *Research on Social Work Practice*,27, 8-18.

Sutjipto, P. (2017, August 10). Personal interview.

Tan, C.C. (2017). *Opening Address at Official Launch of Mrs Lee Choon Guan Endowed Research Fund*. Speech Delivered at the Shaw Foundation Alumni House Auditorium, Singapore, 10 April 2017.

Wang, C. S. (2004). A comparative analysis of the professional development of social work in Taiwan and Hong Kong. *National University of Taiwan Social Work Review, 9*, 137-182. (in Chinese).

Yan, M. C., Cheung, J. C. S., Tsui, M. S., & Chu, C. K. (2017). Examining the neoliberal discourse of accountability: The case of Hong Kong's social service sector. *International Social Work*, *60*, 976-989.

Yuen-Tsang, A.W.K., & Wang, S. B. (2008). Revitalization of social work in China: The significance of human agency in institutional transformation and structural change. *China Journal of Social Work, 1*, 5–22.

Zhang, Y. C. (2006). Mind the Gap: the integration of research and practice. *Social Policy & Social Work*, *10*, 87-116. In Chinese

Zhang, Y. Z., & Hsu, Y.H. (2004). Evaluation of outreach service for children and adolescence in risky single family. *Annual report of Ministry of Interior.* Taiwan, Taipei. In Chinese.

Zhao, S. R., (1992). *The utilization of researches for social work practitioners*, M.A. thesis, Institute of Social Work, Tunghai University. In Chinese