There is nothing permanent except change.

Heraclitus (Greek philosopher, c. 535 BCE - c. 475 BCE)

Social Worker and Change, Miss or Opportunity ?

Introduction

The design of a professional identity in the post-modern era is characterized by constant economic, social and cultural changes, as well as extensive and varied information. Therefore, organizations that manage change without considering the impact of the change on the identity of their employees "here and now" may have difficulty in the process. O'Neill and Jabri (2007) conducted a comprehensive review of the reasons for organizations' difficulty in succeeding in change processes. Their review raised a lack of communication, resource allocation, difficulty in creating long-term commitment since, the changes from person to person and environment to environment often create contradictions between or within the professional identity components, and therefore a conflicting sense of unrest may develop among employees.

Conflicts of professional identity are derived from the interaction between person and context (Berzonsky, 2008; Bosma & Kunnen, 2001), which describe a state of incompatibility or even conflict between or within components of identity. The individual who is exposed to major identity conflicts, feels psychological discomfort and even threat. As a result, he avoids considering, choosing, or incorporating alternative identities into a subjective solution, a process that does not occur in a vacuum. People respond to conditions, codes, and cultural and social feedback that they find themselves in (Cote & Bynner, 2008).

Likewise, conflicts have a central power in identity development, they undermine the individual's world and serve as a catalyst for action and change (Damon & Hart, 1988;

Schachter, 2002) and contribute to their coping effectively and adaptively (Chong, Low & Goh, 2011).

The present article seeks to join the approach of O'Neill and Jabri (2007) and draw attention to the developmental conception of "identity" in the context of the "professional identity" of the social worker and the process of organizational change in the Ministry of Welfare. Reforms and changes in the provision of welfare services may create conflicts and crises among social workers. The reforms may have negative consequences for the development of professional identity, the very commitment to the social work profession, professional pride and a sense of inner cohesion (Day, Elliott and Kingington, 2005; Kuzminski, 2011).

The term "professional identity" is proposed here to serve as an arena for discussion about the identity and professional training of the regulator and its integration with the unique characteristics of changes such as regulation. An arena that contains the thoughts and feelings of social workers about their professional choice, their professional efficiency, their sense of mission and their professional reputation.

What is regulation?

Activation in the "regulation" position is mainly attributed to the researcher Majone (1994), who observed the intensification of the mechanisms that formed the envelope for various types of deliberate control action and the attraction of the state or its agencies regarding value activities in the community. The core of the regulation touches on the philosophical foundations for the legitimacy of the state to intervene in the life of the individual, to preserve his rights and to preserve public and social norms.

 The concept revolves around a paradox: on the one hand, in the matter of more mature practice, and the recognition of its importance is only growing. On the other hand, the deeper you go in it, the more detailed it is to define the exact, and the differences of opinion are revealed are between studies in academia and between "people about space". In the Hebrew language, the term regulation appears in many contexts, the options assigned to it express the variety of uses, but for all of them it

means: to guide and regulate private and public activities in the provision of services and supervision. In the broadest sense, it tends to be referred to as "the laws and regulations governing the order of exchange of goods and services" (Arbel-Ganz, 2003).

 More limited definitions usually see the activity of a separate agency whose role is to oversee a specific activity, this activity is motorized or prohibited, various actions of the individual, institutions and organizations, and does so on an ongoing management basis (Goodship et al., 2004). It should be noted that not only does the state exercise regulation, it can also be done on behalf of "non-governmental" organizations, a civil society organization, or an independent regulatory authority empowered by law or even an international organization (Levi-Faur, 2010). In addition, regulatory burden and impact on other public interests should also be considered. On the basis of all these the desired change can be defined through regulation where the starting point for regulatory intervention is defined through accurate identification of the problem, mapping of stakeholders overall and affected and mapping related regulations, as well as international risk review and assessment, as they can help (Government Impact Assessment Guide Prime Minister, Government and Society Division, 2015).

The Australian guide RIA (2009) identifies four possible reasons for regulatory intervention: market failure, unacceptable risk, unequal distribution and regulatory failure.

1. Market failure: Cases in which the allocation of assets and services through the market mechanism leads to an inefficient result. This situation can result, for example, information failures, lack of sophisticated competition and the existence of external influences.

2. Unacceptable risk: Health or safety hazards, for example, when the person who is harmed cannot assess the risk to which he is exposed or when the harming party does not exceed the damage caused.

3. Unequal distribution: Ensuring access for individuals or groups who do not have access to services, goods or information, including regulations for developing a new market, as well as equal opportunities in various areas, the labor market, or receiving needs.

4. Regulatory failure: market distortion unbalanced government involvement. For example, when the government restricts competition is inconsistent with the public good or ineffective regulation.

Although vital regulation opposes the exercise of regulation. These conditions hold the position that the state should intervene as little as possible in the market, since, the involvement of the state is immoral on a philosophical level. The civil rights discourse assumes that the state must protect the individual from the violation of his rights and freedoms, which means reducing as much as possible the degree of intervention of an external party in the election and preferences of the individual as sovereign. On the other hand, the civil rights discourse also includes the justification for providing welfare, health and education services since the individual cannot always take care of himself, especially in situations of uncertainty (Sreedhar, 2010). The justification of the regulation in welfare services, which includes a fruitful cushion for the complex conduct of providing services for all damages, in any and all situations and life relationships.

It should be noted here that an alternative discourse was later developed by thinkers such as Jürgen Habermas (interview in Haaretz, 2012) and Michel Foucault (1975). They questioned the idea of state involvement in civic life, analyzed some of the premises of these traditions and tried to present an alternative in their path. For example, Habermas propose mechanisms of social coordination through litigation in the public sphere as the only way to reach a common language concerning the good of society and government action. Foucault (1975) argues that society today operates like a prison with invisible guards. The paradox, according to Foucault, is expressed in the process by which the Enlightenment discovered freedom but at the same time created a discipline that redefines the freedom of the individual, similar to the freedom of a prisoner in prison.

Current trends in the literature on the regulation of welfare services

The strengthening of outsourcing processes and the integration of non-governmental sectors in the provision of social services have led to the need to strengthen regulatory processes within government, especially in European countries (Seeleib-Kaiser, 2008; Levi-Faur, 2014; Kotkas, 2010; Hood, Scott, James, Jones, & Travers, 1999). However,

the discussion in the regulatory literature of personal welfare services focuses mostly on the regulation of defined areas, such as services for people with developmental, intellectual disabilities, nursing homes, labor market integration, placement of youth in boarding schools, and the like (e.g., Furness, 2009; Forkby & Hojer, 2011; Daly et al., 2016; Lahat & Talit, 2015; Benish, 2008; Shapiro & Frommer, 2010).

In the context of personal welfare services, alongside ensuring a proper level of service, there is another goal which is to ensure the public interest by safeguarding the welfare, living conditions, and proper care of service recipients while protecting them from any harm (Furness, 2009; Daly et al., 2016). McLaughlin (2007), on the other hand, notes that the growing standardization of social work in the UK occurs in a social environment that emphasizes risk, distrust, and fear. As a result, both workers and clients alike are perceived as endangered and dangerous (ibid.). Another professional aspect concerning regulation arises from the growing understanding of the importance of the voice of those applying to welfare services. This understanding is reflected in the possibility of giving space to service recipients and their families to express their opinions regarding the quality of service and in recognizing their contribution to the regulatory process (Kroomer-Nevo, Atias, & Ben-Shamai, 2002).

Based on this review, three principles emerge from the literature regarding the desired nature of regulation of social services (Gunningham & Sinclair, 1998):

Transparent and flexible regulation - A regulation of social services that is flexible, transparent, and adapted to the situation in which it operates. Downe & Martin (2007b) present ten principles for overseeing public services in the UK: 1. The desire to promote improvement; 2. Focusing on results; 3. Adopting the perspective of the service recipient; 4. Adjustment to the degree of risk; 5. Encouraging self-esteem on the part of managers; 6. Use of evidence as much as possible; 7. Disclosure of the criteria used for evaluation and judgment; 8. Disclosure of the processes taken 9. Attention to return concerning the monetary cost of the regulatory system; and 10. Ongoing learning from experience.

The balance between over-regulation and under-regulation - In a comparative study of regulation in nursing homes in Australia, England, and the United States, Braithwaite, Makkai & Braithwaite (2007) point out that the main concern is the formation of a "ritualism" of the regulatory mechanism. Ritualism brings intra-

organizational behaviors that distort regulatory action and impair the way services are provided, making it difficult for supervisors and service providers. Examples include the laconic application of the law that does not promote the spirit of legislation; Over-regulation in unnecessary procedures; Emphasis on paperwork and documents instead of caring for people (Braithwaite et al., 2007; Brown & Calnan, 2011; Lahat & Talit, 2015). Therefore, regulation of social services faces the challenge of balancing over-regulation and lack of regulation (Bilton & Cayton, 2013; Fleming, 2015).

Types of regulation tailored to players and services - The pyramid that is known as the Responsive Regulation, developed by Ayres & Braithwaite (1992), includes a hierarchy of regulatory measures ranging from the "persuasion and dialogue" technologies to the use of "intervention, enforcement, and punishment." The uniqueness of the welfare services arena, and the insights that emerge from the literature review, are aimed at the need to address the multidimensionality of the personal welfare services arena and the regulatory challenge it poses. Braithwaite (2007) argues that "Different causes require different weapons" (Braithwaite et al., 2007, pp. 313).

In the spirit of this statement, Lahat and Zaba (2018) offer a model of three phases of tailored regulation that include **the mapping phase** of the population, its needs and the degree of risk to which it is subjected, **the design phase** of a mix of appropriate regulatory tools and service providers, and **the implementation phase** of clear role definition of the various actors, managing information collected and distributing it to relevant parties such as functionaries in the Ministry of Welfare, service providers and the field personnel involved (Rhodes, 2012). In the opinion of Lahat and Zaba (2018), strengthening the ability of practitioners and ongoing consideration of the needs of service recipients will lead to strengthening the regulatory capacity of the whole system and help provide better services.

Characteristics of the regulator's role in the Ministry of Welfare

Welfare services pose quite complex regulatory challenges. Although similar challenges can be identified in other social services, including health and education services, welfare services seem to be a unique case (Schmid, 2012). Among the many characteristics, I will mention three main focal points relevant to the role of the social worker who is supposed to lead the regulation of these services:

1. **The regulator's loneliness**: In many cases, the responsibility for the quality of the service lies with the regulator because, in some significant parts of the welfare services, it is difficult to get help from other parties regarding the quality of the services. Usually, the regulator cannot rely on market mechanisms and competition between service providers because many providers gain monopolistic status. This is true for government and municipal units that provide direct service to the needy and other providers, public and business. Furthermore, the ability to obtain information from service recipients to monitor the quality of services is also not trivial because of their limitations and dependence on their caregivers and because of the fear that criticism of the services will harm them. Therefore, the Ministry has an additional, and sometimes exclusive, responsibility for the quality of the services and the well-being of their clients (Yadin, 2018).

2. **Regulatory captivity**: Many providers enjoy a monopolistic status, which may make it difficult for the Ministry of Welfare to impose sanctions on providers that do not meet standards because it is feared that there is no other way in the absence of alternative service providers. Moreover, the Ministry of Welfare is a "special type of regulator" (Rolnik and Shapira, 2018). A "regular" regulator exercises external supervision over private activities to prevent harm to public interests. In contrast, in its role as a regulator, the Ministry of Welfare invites the service provider (the supervised) to contact the person in need of the service. This situation may lead the regulator to be less inclined to exercise strict supervision of the franchisee due to their closeness and mutual commitment. This danger also stems from the regulator's close interaction with its supervised service providers, in such a way that they often become their professional reference group and actual colleagues, making it difficult for them to criticize their work in a non-biased manner. Moreover, the Ministry itself operates some of the supervised services alongside external providers, such as boarding homes for people with disabilities. This situation further complicates impartial oversight processes and the ability to impose sanctions.

3. **Specialization and division versus inclusion and expertise**: The organizational structure of the Ministry of Welfare, its division into units that specialize in defined populations known as "services," is reflected in the professional affiliation of the regulators to the headquarters units. These professionals are the main regulatory section of the Ministry, operating on behalf of the Ministry's headquarters units, and

are entrusted with the monitoring and enforcement of the provisions and standards. They are regulators who specialize in areas defined according to the responsibilities of the headquarters units in which they operate. This specialization is ostensibly essential for the regulator to fulfill his or her role with the necessary professionalism, but in some cases, for example, in social services departments, the multiplicity of regulators may burden the supervised organizations and also make it difficult for the regulator to get an overall picture (Zaba, 2010; Schmid, 2012).

Against the background of these characteristics and their challenges, the Ministry has tried several times to redefine the regulatory processes. However, these attempts do not seem to result in a clear and comprehensive concept, and the recommendations of committees that dealt with the issue were usually not implemented (Hovav, 1998; Lahat and Talit, 2012; State Comptroller, 2005, 2015; Ministry of Welfare, 2012; Gal and Ben-Mordechai, 2017). Today, the regulator in the Ministry of Welfare faces structural and professional problems in the field of regulation, such as lack of organizational knowledge of the supervised organizations; Lack of cooperation between central and local government in matters of supervision; Scarcity of resources for supervision; Outdated technologies; Lack of enforcement and lack of sanctions; Diversity of professional expertise; Phenomena of non-acceptance of change; Unadjusted patterns of supervision, as well as lack of investment in learning processes and development of regulation in personal welfare services.

The identity of the social worker - the regulator in a changing organization

Any approach related to change requires the understanding that a change in the organization means a change in the "reality" of the work for the many people who make up the organization. When a change occurs in an organization, the people in the organization are required to adapt to it at different levels: the job definition may change, their power in the organization may decrease or intensify, performance appraisal, communication with colleagues, organizational values, all of these. And other aspects may undergo changes and adjustments. Studies suggest that such changes evoke a wide range of emotions among employees (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Gilmore, Shea, & Useem, 1997). Also, as the changing components of the organization become more significant for the individual, and they feel more at ease

with them, the level of their overall emotional arousal increases. The tendency to support change is related to positive emotions (Massholder, Settoon, Armanakis, & Harris, 2000), while resistance to change is related to the expression of negative emotions (Dirks, Cummings & Pierce, 1996).

The transition from an old state to a new state requires the individuals in the organization to re-evaluate the cognitive agreements they hold that contain a process of interpretation, adjustment and adjustment, as well as the process of interpretation and updating of new cognitive schemas. Created (Bartunek, 1984; Dutton, 1992). Interpretation and updating of cognitive schemas occurs in both managers (Isabella, 1990) and employees (Weber & Manning, 2001). In addition, the set of changes that the individual undergoes has implications and effects on many issues, such as the experienced self-image (Schein, 1996), the intention to leave work and his attitude to work (Massholder et al., 2000).

While the issue of organizational change has gained much research from many perspectives, examining organizational change with respect to the personal identities of organization members is only in its infancy (Jabri, 2004; Ford, 1999; Beech & Johnson, 2005; Anderson, 2005; Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Scheeres & Rhodes, 2006).

The social worker as a regulator, his coping within the process of organizational organizational change All of these have not been examined so far, although he acts as a regulator (Kedushin & Harkness, 2014).

The encounter between the values of the social worker and the regulatory organizational culture in the Ministry of Welfare raises various conflicting and identity aspects in the role of the social worker as a regulator. Conflict management in the arena of change requires social-regulatory workers to consider the framework of their legal and organizational professional values, re-examine them, organize them, and integrate them into a subjective solution (Rogers & Scott, 2008).

What is professional identity?

Identity is an intrapsychic element that produces a certain sense of coherence and continuity in the individual's conscious and unconscious experience (Casey, 1995). The individual maintains and keeps processes of structuring, maintaining, and preserving

the continuity of his or her identity experience vis-a-vis changing circumstances. For example, change in the workplace may affirm or challenge the individual's sense of continuity of the identity because it may contain values and perceptions that may or may not match their identity (Ezzamel & Willmott, 1998). The concept of "identity" is not a fixed attribution but an evolving and changing characterization. In this process, self-identity is the person's perception of her or himself, how he or she interprets himself, what kind of person he or she is and how he or she is identified in a given context and moment (Beijaard, Meijer & Verloop, 2004; Berzonsky, 2008).

Part of a person's self-identity is also his professional identity, answering the question, "Who am I, or what am I, as a professional?" Therefore, the discussions of self-identity and professional identity are intertwined. Research on professional identity and the stages of professional development throughout life is important because the characteristics of professional identity and the way social workers define their professional identity can affect their self-efficacy (Fisherman & Weiss, 2008), as well as how they will continue to learn and develop professionally, and their attitudes to change and reform.

Professional identity develops and takes shape dynamically and complexly through an intrapersonal and interpersonal process (Rogers & Scott, 2008). This process, which begins during the training and studies period and even earlier, continues to develop throughout the employee's professional life (Hoffman-Kipp, 2008). Researchers distinguish between two key components in constant tension; the *intrapersonal component* refers to how the professional sees himself or herself as a professional, such as attitudes towards the profession and feelings concerning professional skills. The *interpersonal component* refers to an environment where colleagues, clients, managers, and society perceive the person as a professional (Fisherman & Weiss, 2011). Often, the professional has to choose between needs, values, desires, and demands that conflict with the constraints of reality. It is a conflict that affects the cohesion of his or her personal and professional identity (Kozminsky & Claire, 2010; Hoffman-Kipp, 2008), intrapsychic power struggles that may lead to vulnerability, emptiness, missing out, and dysfunction at the professional level.

The power component of the regulator social worker grows out of both professional knowledge and the regulatory role. While social workers are empowered by the power

given to them as caregivers and strengthens their professional status in the assistance profession, the power is given to them as regulators is seen as the antithesis of their vocation and purpose as a social worker. The result of the built-in failure between the field of social care and the field of practice of regulatory work is **the dilemma of the professional identity of the social worker as a regulator** that raises a conflict between the social worker's professional identity and his or her job identity as a regulator. A conflict that describes a state of incompatibility or conflict between the components of his or her identity. Identity conflict is a central power in the development of identity because it undermines the individual's world and serves as a catalyst for action and change (Damon & Hart, 1988; Schachter, 2002). Indeed, organizational change in itself produces a new set of expectations and demands from the employee, and in many cases, the change requires adjustments in a variety of levels and aspects of the employee's identity (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Bosma & Kunnen, 2001).

Professional identity in a changing motion

In the transition from the social role to the regulator role, three major professional aspects affect the identity of the social worker-regulator (Chappell et al., 2003; Jabri, 2004). These are the professional aspect, the legal-values aspect, and the organizational aspect. The separation between the three aspects is didactic. However, in everyday reality, they are intertwined and connected. Here it is necessary to clarify the uniqueness of each aspect individually. The common characteristic of all three aspects, according to Foucault (1979), is the component of power and authority within the role of the regulator-social worker.

The professional aspect - emphasizes the content world of specialization in social work, expertise that represents professional knowledge derived from the worldviews of the aid professions. It represents unique expertise in assisting according to the values of the therapeutic theory. This expertise determines the skills of knowledge, leads, and establishes ways of thinking that produce practices, as well as technologies of therapeutic discourse in the quality of "professional-therapeutic discourse," "risk management discourse," and "rights discourse." Professional knowledge develops institutional logic and a professional language that seeks to find solutions to social problems, among other things, through professional experience and informal practice

derived from reflection (Abott, 1988). The knowledge base is dynamic and depends on the ongoing action of professionalism in interaction and adjustment that describes and clarifies the world and the place in which he or she acts (Payne, 2003). The methods of exercising the therapeutic discourse are based on theories from the field of clinical psychology dealing with the field of mental development, such as Freud (1856-1939), Winnicott (1896-1971), and Kohut (1913-1981), and others. Developmental psychology deals with physical, social, and emotional development from infancy to late adulthood, such as Eric Erickson (1902-1994), Donald Winnicott, Melanie Klein (1882-1960), and others. Social psychology deals mainly with the influence of the social environment, the person's functioning in a group, the formation of attitudes by the individual, and how they change. Cognitive psychology deals with understanding the whole range of mental processes involved in human activity through the scientific paradigm. Modern approaches in cognitive research view the multitude of processes in one sequence. Notable researchers in this field are Leon Festinger (1919-1989), Solomon Ash (1907-1996), Stanley Milgram (1933-1984), and more. Clinical and cognitive theories are also joined by therapeutic approaches from social work, including the power approach that expresses the values of social work with an emphasis on the relationship between the caring social worker and the client. The basic premise of the power approach holds that every person has power that constitutes a major factor that outlines the nature of the therapeutic encounter. Therapeutic intervention is based on the power existing in the client and the professional who accompanies the client. The "therapist," the caring social worker, is part of the treatment process in the way he or she relates to the patient's strengths and not necessarily to his or her difficulties. The wealth of therapeutic professional knowledge from professional fields combined with the knowledge in the field of social work sharpens the values of the social work profession to be "with the patient," and from there, work on his or her power (Rapp & Richard, 2006). The goal of the social worker's relationship with the client is to create a dialogue and shared negotiation within the therapeutic process that empowers the client concerning his or her life so far (Cohen and Buchbinder, 2005).

Compared to the professional expertise in social work, the field of regulatory practice is not recognized as a profession. Regulators do not have a unique course of study and training. Regulatory discourse is directed to types of governance and the use of force, emphasizing the use of covert force versus overt force. Regulation is a generic policy

tool in regulating the overall life system in the country in terms of the behavior of corporations and organizations that provide services and products to citizens. It determines the state authorities' degree of involvement in the actions of private entities, all to protect the economic and social interests of the state. The operating methods of the regulator are management and control through actions and procedures to reduce deficiencies and disparities that damage the "public interest" (CEO procedure, 2019). Regulatory work is supposed to represent "safeguarding the public interest" by the logic of control technologies, supervision, judgment, discipline, and normalization of the behavior of the various social service providers and the welfare services departments operating in local authorities. Lahat & Zaba (2018) argue that a social worker who moves from a content world of care and social work to the world of regulation and control is "threatened" by new discourse forms, technologies, practice, and professional language.

The encounter between the therapeutic and clinical expertise that shapes the social worker's professional identity and his or her encounter with regulatory technologies of control, discipline, and normalization in his or her role as guardian of the public interest raises the potential for imbalance and cognitive professional conflict as an antithesis to the purpose of his or her occupation as a social worker.

The legal-value aspect: The discussion of the legal-value aspect of the regulator's role takes place in the context of the social role of law and justice. Critical approaches view law and judgment as a cultural creation, an instrument that educates and sets norms for the concepts of "normalcy" and "deviation" (Donnelly, 1986). Social workers in the Ministry of Welfare derive the source of their therapeutic and legal authority from the "Relief Services Law 1958," which briefly states that the Minister in charge of welfare services in the government shall appoint supervisors to oversee the activities of the welfare services departments (Yanai, 2006). Over the years, additional laws were enacted, such as the Dormitory Supervision Law 1966; Youth Care and Supervision Law 1960; Patron Protection Law 1960; The Sheltered Housing Supervision Law 2011, which describe the social worker's role as being responsible for the implementation of the law in these areas. The purpose of the legislation in these areas was to add to the social worker, in addition to his or her professional expertise, legislative and legal tools for assistance in situations of clients' risk or danger. Modern law involves and is integrated with the therapeutic professions with which it forms new ways of

intervention. The intervention and control of modern law are found in all spheres of life and establish arrangements with other professions, including social work. The law is perceived as defining what is allowed and forbidden and as resolving disputes, but, due to its combination with other professions, it also educates values, influences a person's ways of thinking, and disciplines and normalizes them. This practice of discipline and enforcement collides with the regulator-social worker's professional and therapeutic values. The combination of the various powers of the social worker as a regulator illuminates the possibility of developing a value dialectic in the social worker-regulator concerning the concepts of "power by virtue of values and ideologies" of education and training shaping the social worker's identity during his or her studies and training, and "power by virtue of enforcement authority." Yadin (2018) claims a built-in failure in the regulatory powers of lack of regulatory deterrence due to the scarcity of providers who can provide essential welfare services. The poor variety of regulatory enforcement tools creates a poor structure of the enforcement pyramid. In this context, the question arises as to what value lies in such an enforcement structure when the regulator adopts a perception that considers the service provider "too important to fail or be closed," actually leading to the avoidance of effective enforcement that weakens the regulator's power (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992).

Lack of detailed powers and laws that give broader powers lead the regulator-social worker to resort to the field of technologies in social work, technologies of negotiation, and the formation of agreements between him or her and the supervised, which force the regulator to compromise with the supervised. Under these circumstances, he or she develops a low sense of self-worth in the experience of his or her role and the methods of action he or she can employ as a regulator. Furthermore, the social worker-regulators' feeling of discrepancy in their relevance to the role of regulator may increase their sense of insecurity in their ability to cope with the occupation as regulators and even lead to a state of helplessness and a sense of failure in their role as regulators.

The organizational-institutional aspect: The discussion of the regulator's role in the organizational-institutional aspect takes place in an organization-based occupation that reflects a form of discourse (Weick, 1995). The power of social workers is achieved, in addition to the professional aspect and the value-law aspect, by being members of a governmental bureaucratic organization. Human services organizations have been designed to meet people's needs, set policies, and implement them by supplying

financial, professional, and organizational resources (Limor, 2005). The organization and its employees are given rational authority based on the belief in the legality of normative laws and their right to coercion. This authority is presented as a normative force. Scott (1985) emphasizes the world of bureaucratic content that the social worker represents in his or her role as regulator. An organization where its employees are granted authority as a legitimate regulatory force that relies on enforcing normative laws (Yadin, 2018). The regulatory social workers operate at the core of the conflictual experience created between them and the social workers in the local government welfare departments and between them and the service providers who are contractually bound with the Ministry of Welfare. They experience a regulatory failure that expresses opposition, rejection, and non-acceptance of their role as regulatory social workers on the part of their supervisees (Limor, 2005). The regulating social workers accept the evolving antagonism between the supervised and the supervisors with mixed emotions.

On the one hand, social workers skilled in therapy have tools to deal with resistance and rejection, to address the sources of resistance of the supervised and their removal. On the other hand, from the same therapeutic aspect, they are built to develop identification and understanding with the supervised and act to please them. The element of rejection thrives against the background of a crisis in the regulatory legitimacy of the social workers-regulators. This element develops in the context of the supervisory work and enforcement regulation by the social workers-regulators and the service providers who claim that the social workers are professionally incapable of managing regulation in business and economic organizations based on a free market economy (Lahat and Talit, 2012). The field workers in the welfare services departments are also wondering about the alleged choice of the regulatory social workers to engage in controlling and supervising processes in the welfare departments instead of engaging in the real challenges, which are the achievements of the social workers in caring or promoting the various welfare departments in the workforce, resources, and more.

Summary

Major tensions between the perspective of social work and the regulatory perspective (Power, 1997; Stuart, 2011; Shapiro & Frumer, 2012) produce a complex organizational change in which the attempt to create and preserve identities

necessitates maneuvering between conflicting laws, emotions, interpretations, self-presentations (Garrety et al., 2003). In the process of change, the organization provides a new scale for evaluating the employee's internal and external being and at the same time seeks to remove certain elements and assimilate others into the individual's being, perceptions and thoughts.

According to Foucault's (1979) approach, the subject is not autonomous, free and independent of the social context in which he exists. On the contrary, the subject's conscious sense of self is created and maintained by involvement in power systems that enable him to produce and preserve the sense of identity.

Different motives relate to the different ways in which people manage their professional identity. Professional and managerial processes will inherently obscure the ability of the social worker in the organization to remain true to his professional values and take care of needy populations. His refusal to join the wave of change and criticism of regulatory change stems in large part from his deep identification with the "old organizational entity" and its values, which, as long as it does not change, will not lose its professional identity in the flood of impending regulation. On the other hand, the individual is not passive in the face of the organization's efforts to produce a change in its identity (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002).

The proposed changes to the reform represent new components such as new values, goals and practices. These elements can match or contradict the existing professional identity even on the emotional level. Thus, in order for the change to be accepted, there must be a conscious connection between the components of professional identity and the components of the proposed change.

Such a dialogue can raise awareness for three types of insights:

1. There are no contradictions, and the social worker will adopt the proposed changes.

2. There are contradictions, but they involve the components in the periphery of the professional identity and small changes so that the social worker can restore his professional identity, accept the change and even promote it.

3.The great contradictions and gaps identified do not allow the social worker to accept the changes. Dialogue with change initiators and decision makers may identify contradictions and find ways to bridge them. Such mediation may lead to a change in the professional identity of the social worker but also bring about a change in the change itself.

Changes in organizations and life are inevitable and sometimes of varying intensities. Some of the changes occur mainly on the surface, and some of the changes shake the foundations of the organization. It can be said that the more organizational change occurs at the deeper and more substantial organizational levels, the more it resonates with the individual.

A critical discussion of the professional identity of the social worker and the role of social workers in creating change both as individuals and as a leading group towards "achieving identity" according to the terms of Marcia & Fraser (2008). Whereas Kohut (1981) argues that one's investment in oneself and in another violates one another, whereas focusing on the centrality of one's relationship with the "other" disrupts one's experience of oneself. According to Kohut, the concept of 'self' is a concept of integration and personal experience that requires experiences of 'self-object'. The interactions with objects that respond accordingly and in relation to the inner feelings of the evolving individual, through the internalization and inclusion of the other-self's functions make the individual's self more stable, and more flexible. The subjective and the objective in a productive and creative way. Awareness of these psychological processes seems to me also true of interactive coping processes in the space between the social worker and the representation of one change or another.

Kohut e. (1981). Glorification and other-self of culture. Psychology of the self and the study of the human spirit. book Worm. Pp. 241-249

Bibliography

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*, 619-644.

Anderson, D. L. (2005). "What you'll say is…": Represented voice in organizational change discourse. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*, 63-77.

Arbel-Ganz, A. (2003). Regulation - The Supervisory Authority, *Position Paper 37. Jerusalem:* The Israel Democracy Institute.

Ayres, I., & Braithwaite, J. (1992). *Responsive regulation.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bagley, T. M. & Czajka, J. M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 552-556.

Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012*). Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bartunek, J. M. (1984). Changing interpretive schemes and organizational restructuring: The example of a religious order. *Administrative Science Quarterly. 29*, 355-372.

Beech, N. & Johnson, P. (2005). Discourses of disrupted identities in the practice of strategic change: The mayor, the street-fighter and the insider-out. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*, 31-47.

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P.C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20,* 107-128.

Benish, a. (2008). Accumulation and its limits: privatization of spacious work plans and the problem of supervision failures. *Laws, 283, Part C*, 293-310.

Berzonsky, M. D. (2008). Identity formation: The role of identity processing style and cognitive processes. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,*645-655.

Bilton, D., & Cayton, H. (2013). Finding the right touch: Extending the right-touch regulation approach to the accreditation of voluntary registers. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 41*, 14-23. doi: 10.1080/03069885.2012.750273

Bosma, H. A., & Kunnen, E. S. (2001). Determinants and mechanisms in ego identity development: A review and synthesis. *Developmental Review, 21*,39-66

Braithwaite, J., Makkai, T., & Braithwaite V. (2007). *Regulating aged care.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Brown, P. R., & Calnan, M. (2011). The civilizing process of trust: Developing quality mechanisms which are local, professional-led and thus legitimate. *Social Policy & Administration, 45*, 19-34. doi: 10.1111/j.14679515. 2010.00751

Burke, P. J (2004). Identities and social structure. The 2003 Cooley-Mead award address. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67,* 5-15.

Casey, C. (1995). *Work, self and society: After industrialism*. London: Routledge.

Chappell, C., Rhodes, C., Solomon, N., Tennant, M. & Yates, L. (2003*). Reconstructing the lifelong learner: Pedagogy and identity in individual, organizational, and social change.* London, UK: Routledge Falmer

Chong, S., Low, E., & Goh, K. (2011). Emerging professional teacher identity of preservice teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(8),50-64.

Cote, J. E., & Bynner, J. (2008). Changes in the transition to adulthood in the UK and Canada: The role of structure and agency in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Youth Studies, 11*, 251- 268.

Cohen, B., & Buchbinder, A. (2005*). From power to action.* Tel Aviv - Ramot, Tel Aviv University.

Damon, W., & Hart, D. (1988). *Self-understanding in childhood and adolescence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daly, T., Struthers, J., Müller, B., Taylor, D., Goldmann, M., Doupe, M., & Jacobsen, F. F. (2016). Prescriptive or interpretive regulation at the frontlines of care work in the "three worlds" of Canada, Germany and Norway. *Labour/Le Travail, 77*, 37-71. doi: 10.1353/llt.2016.0029

Day, C., Elliot, B. & Kington, A. (2005). Reform, standards and teacher identity: Challenges of sustaining commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 5*,563- 567

Dirks, K.T., Cummings, L.L., & Pierce, J.L. (1996). Psychological ownership in organizations: Conditions under which individuals promote and resist change. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 9*, 1-23.

Donnelly, M. (1986*). Foucault's genealogy of the human sciences*. In: Gane, M (Ed*). Towards a critique of Foucaul*t. London: Routledge &Kagan Paul.

Dutton, J. E. (1992). The making of organizational opportunities: An interpretative pathway to organizational change. *Research in Organization Behavior, 15*, 195-226.

Downe, J., & Martin, S. (2007b). Regulation inside government: processes and impacts of inspection of local public services. *Policy & Politics, 35*, 215-232. doi: 10.1332/030557307780712997

Ezzamel, M. & Willmott, H. (1998). Accounting for team work: A critical study of group-based systems of organizational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43*, 358-396.

Fisherman, S. Weiss, J. (2011). Professional identity of teachers: the concept and its measurement. *Pages, 51* 39-56.

Fleming, S. (2015). New development: A game of responsibility? The regulation of health and social care professionals. *Public Money & Management, 35*, 169-171. doi: 10.1080/09540962.2015.1007716

Ford, J. D. (1999). Organizational change as shifting conversations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12,* 480-500.

Forkby, T., & Höjer, S. (2011). Navigations between regulations and gut instinct: The unveiling of collective memory in decision-making processes where teenagers are placed in residential care. *Child & Family Social Work, 16*, 159-168. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2206.2010. 00724.x

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Alan Sheridan, New York: Random House.

Furness, S. (2009). A hindrance or a help? The contribution of inspection to the quality of care in homes for older people. *British Journal of Social Work, 39*, 488-505. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcm146

Gal, H., & Ben-Mordechai, P. (2017). The Ministry of Welfare sets a standard: provides services to the regulator. Regulatory methods in the field of out-of-home placements. Final thesis in the course "*Final Project - The Cadet Program*". The Federman School, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Garrety, K., Badham, R., Morrigan, V., Rifkin, W., & Zanko, M. (2003). The use of personality typing in organizational change: Discourse, emotions & the reflexive subject. *Human Relations, 56*, 211- 235.

Gilmore, T., Shea, G., & Useem, M. (1997). Side effects of corporate cultural transformation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33*, 174-189.

Goodship, J., Jacks, K., Gummerson, M., Lathlean, J., & Cope, S. (2004). Modernising regulation or regulating modernisation? The public, private and voluntary interface in adult social care. *Public Policy and Administration, 19* (2), 13-27. doi: 10.1177/095207670401900204

Government Guide to RIA Impact Assessment, Prime Minister's Office, *Government and Society Division, 2015*

Gunningham, N., & Sinclair, D. (1998). Designing smart regulation. In *Economic Aspects of Environmental Compliance Assurance. OECD Global Forum on Sustainable Development.* Retrieved from
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/18/39/33947759.pdf

Habermas, J. (10.8.2012). Inside the Haaretz newspaper. Interview with Jürgen Habermas - The Last of the Great Philosophers Calls tame the Capitalism. https://www.haaretz.co.il/magazine/1.1797148

Hoffman-Kipp, P. (2008). Actualizing democracy: The praxis of teacher identity construction. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(3), 151-164.

Hood, C., Scott, C., James, O., Jones, G., & Travers, T. (1999*). Regulation inside government: Waste-watcher, quality police and sleaze-busters*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hovav, m. (1998). *The Supervision of Welfare Services in Israel*. Tel Aviv: Cherikover.

Isabella, L.A. (1990). Evolving interpretation as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 7-41.

Jabri, M. (2004). Change as shifting identities: A dialogic perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17,* 566-577.

Kadushin, A., & Harkness, D. (2014). *Supervision in social work.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Kohut, E. (1981*). Glorification and Other-Self of culture. Psychology of the Self and the study of the Hhuman Spirit*. Book Worm. pp. 241-249.

Kotkas, T. (2010). Governing health and social security in the twenty-first century: Active citizenship through the right to participate. *Law and Critique, 21*, 163-182. doi: 10.1007/s10978-010-9071-0

Kozminsky, L. & Claire, R. (2010). Building the Identity of teachers and teacher teachers in reality variable. *Pages, 49*, 11-42.

Kozminsky, L. (2011). Professional identity of teachers and teacher educators in a changing reality. In I. Žogla, & L. Rutka (Eds.), *Teachers' Life-cycle from Initial Teacher Education to Experienced Professional*. Proceedings of the ATEE 36th Annual Conference (12-19), Riga.

Kroomer-Nevo, M., Atias, P., & Ben-Shamai, A. (2002). Routine of work with families in deep distress in the welfare services: basic guidelines for professional discussion. *Society and Welfare, 22,* 221-199.

Lahat, L., & Tallit, G. (2012). Regulatory Challenges in the Field of Personal Welfare Services. Social Security, 90, 120-81

Lahat, L., & Talit, G. (2015). Regulation of personal social services: The Israeli experience. *Social Policy & Administration, 49,* 335-355. doi: 10.1111/spol.12076

Lahat, L., & Zaba, J. (2018). Characteristics in the processes of implementing the regulation in social services*, Society and Welfare, 18*, 149-174.

Levi-Faur, D. (2010). The Regulatory Deficit of the Age of Privatization - Towards Regulatory Reform in Israel*", was written as part of the Van Leer Institute's privatization project.*

Levi-Faur, D. (2014). The welfare state: A regulatory perspective. *Public Administration, 92*, 599-614. doi: 10.1111/padm.12063

Limor, N. (2005) - Regulation and supervision of third sector organizations. *Social Security*, *70*, 159-187

Majone, G. (1994). The rise of the regulatory state in Europe. *West European Politics, 17*(3), 77-101. doi: 10.1080/01402389408425031

Massholder, K.W., Settoon, R.P., Armanakis, A.A. & Harris, S.G. (2000). Emotion during organizational transformations. *Group & Organization Management, 25*, 220-243.

McLaughlin, K. (2007). Regulation and risk in social work: The general social care council and the social care register in context. *British Journal of Social Work, 37*, 1263-1277. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcl079

Ministry of Welfare and Social Services, (2012). *Supervisor as the generator of regulation in the Ministry of Welfare and Social Services: Formulation of a concept and proposals for implementation.* Summary of the work of the steering committee headed by Menachem Vagshal.

Mills, S. (2005*). Michel Foucault*. Translated by Ohad Zehavi Tel Aviv, Wrestling Publishing.

OECD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, tool for policy coherence (2009).67 sitting Australian Government, Best Practice Regulation. *Hand book OBPR Canberra 58*.

O'Neil, A. & Jabri, M. (2007). Legitimation and group conversational practices: Implications for managing change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 28*, 571-588.

Payne, M. (2003). *What is professional social work?* British Association of Social Workers.

Ponnert, L., & Svensson, K. (2016). Standardization: The end of professional discretion? *European Journal of Social Work, 19,* 584-599. doi: 10.1080/13691457.2015.1074551

Power, M. (1997). *The adult society: Rituals of verification*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Rapp, C. & Richard, G. (2006). *The Strengths Model –Case management with people with psychiatric disabilities,* Oxford University Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2012). Waves of governance. In D. Levi-Faur(Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of governance* (pp. 33-48). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Rodgers, C. R. & Scott, K. H. (2008). The development of the personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith & S. Feiman-Nemser (Eds.,) *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.,* 732-755). New York: Routledge.

Rolnik, G. & Shapira, R. (2018*). Dynamics of regulatory captivity*: Israeli case research, *Shmuel Ne'eman Institute for Public Policy Research*, Technion Campus, Haifa.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Levin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems Practice, 9*, 27-47.

Schmid, H. (2012). Management patterns in welfare organizations. In: M. Hovav, A. Leventel & Y. Katan (eds.) *Social work in Israel*. pp. 334-309. Tel Aviv: Red Line and United Kibbutz Publishing.

Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New-Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Scheeres, H. & Rhodes, C. (2006). Between cultures: Values, training and identity in a manufacturing firm. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 19*, 223-234.

Shapiro, S., & Frumer, D. (2010). Quality Control in the Age of Privatization. *Social Security, 84*, pp. 128-105

Shapiro, S., and Frumer, D. (2012). "Quality Control in the Age of Privatization*".* *Social Security Journal 84*: 105–128.

Schachter, E. P. (2002). Identity constraints: The perceived structural requirements of a "good" identity. *Human Development, 45*(6), 416-433.

Seeleib-Kaiser, M. (Ed.). (2008*). Welfare state transformations: Comparative perspectives*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sreedhar, S. (2010*). Hobbes on Opposition: Defying the Leviathan,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

State Comptroller (2005*). Annual Report 55B for 2004 and Accounts for the Financial Year 2003*. Catalog Number. 955-2005

State Comptroller (2015). *Ministry of Welfare and Social Services - Physical Aspects of Out-of-Home Welfare Frameworks*. Annual Report 65C for 2014 and Accounts for the 2013 fiscal year.

Stuart, P.H. (2011*). Social work profession: History*. In: Mizrahi &L. E. Davis (Eds.), the encyclopedia of social work (20th ed., pp.156-164). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press

The role of the District Supervisor, Director General Procedure, January 2019

Weber, P. S. & Manning, P. R. (2001). Cause maps, sense making, and planned organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37*, 227-251.

Weick, K. E. (1995*). Sense making in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yadin, Sh. (2018). New Regulation*: Revolution in Public Law*. Nevo Publishing, Tel Aviv.

Yanai, A. (2006). *The Relief Services Law, 1958: Is there a basis and a guarantee for the common good? Position Paper.* Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, School of Social Work and Welfare, Paul Brawald.

Zaba, Y. (2010*). Report of the Committee for the Drafting of a Proposal for a Reform in Local Welfare Services.* Welfare and Social Services,