

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Ethnic Peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

**Towards Effective Participation  
In  
the Development of Social Policy**

**A Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a  
Masters in Philosophy (Social Policy) at Massey University.**

**Ashish Maharaj**

**2004**

## **Abstract**

The underlying theme of this research is that of participation.

Major objectives of this Thesis are as follows:

- to identify those issues in society which are of concern to ethnic peoples
- to identify barriers which may limit the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policies, which may affect their wellbeing
- to ascertain major avenues through which ethnic peoples may participate in and contribute to the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

In neo liberal democratic societies such as Aotearoa/New Zealand all members ought to enjoy freedoms associated with race, ethnicity, religion or culture. In recent post modern times our differences and uniqueness challenge freedoms curtailed through unwittingly systemic discrimination which occurs when cultural assumptions become embodied in society's established institutions and processes. Post modernism reflects an acceptance of the need to deconstruct realities and construct new ways of measuring and discovering. The detrimental effects of capitalism can be ameliorated through social reforms.

Participation is in itself liberating – only through one's own experience does it become fulfilling. Social wellbeing incorporates being comfortable, integrated and accepted within Aotearoa / New Zealand. It impacts on one's identity and ability to contribute to everyday life. Hence Social Policy making without due participation through appropriate consultation is not only somewhat naive but lends itself to being inherent with real difficulties, often perpetuating even greater injustices and resulting turmoil.

Qualitative research methodology enabled me to interview ten research participants, all of whom being well informed representatives of a cross-section of our ethnic peoples. Each participant is actively engaged in key societal institutions and community organisations that are concerned with safeguarding and promoting our wellbeing and hence, are influential and authorized commentators. All were enthusiastic participants who commented on the timeliness and importance of the research topic.

Social Policy refers to the role of the state in relation to the welfare of its citizens and how state intervention affects the conditions under which people live. Over time experiences with the continued realities of separation and alienation can cause increasingly isolated fragments that can raise undue anxiety, and if not appropriately addressed, create potential powder kegs. Key findings of this research reiterates the importance of participation by suitably

informed ethnic peoples in developing effective social policy that affects their wellbeing.

It is not enough to advocate participation, one must also be participatory. To this effect this thesis invites the reader into worthy consideration of the importance and immediate needs that presents itself. It is argued that while it is important that differing ethnic groupings be accepted by society the emphasis ought to be on bringing them in as players in the political community rather than on simply accepting them as members of the economic, moral and legal community within an environment characterized by the forces of market capitalism, political pluralism and cultural diversity.

## Acknowledgements

There are many who have contributed towards making this journey a reality . My thanks to all of you. Specifically to the research participants for without your deliberations this thesis would not have been possible.

My thesis supervisors, Dr. Jocelyn Quinnell and Dr. Leland Ruwhiu. I have enjoyed our many discourses and am indebted to your insight, guidance and encouragement. Kia Ora.

The administration and staff at Massey University School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work , Turitea Campus, Palmerston North. Your assistance has been invaluable and has made this journey all the more tolerable.

My dear brothers Rocky, Roggy, Noel and Rohit and all who are part of our collective Whare . Thanks for your insights, love, encouragement and support. Jah Love – Positive.

Jordan , Shaquille and Kimberley. Your patience, support, encouragement, understanding & strength in times of adversity is truly inspiring. Your Aroha throughout is ‘ da bomb.’

Sincere thanks to George, Gail & the Jahnke Whanau ; Lydia, Damian, Gabriel, Jane, David & Mark. Thank you all for your interest and encouragement. Special thanks to my gurus over the years, and to June Mackey for your enthusiasm and your nimble fingers.

My many friends here in Aotearoa. The brethren in Wainuiomata. Our lively contemplations long into the wee small hours back in the days was always ‘ one step forward ’. To jah roots back in my hometown of Lami, Fiji - nestled amongst those sunny blue skies , warm rains, green hills and blue waters - soon come : Kia Ora , Vinaka Vaka Levu & Namaskar ‘...come a long way...’

Dedicated to the following very special lives who have passed on through ...

my much loved and inspirational Mum & Dad  
my childhood friends Teapola Ledua ,  
Onny Crocker, William Kutti & Colin Caldwell  
and to the mystical Ganjah.....

‘ always around, can’t stop a good vibration ’  
om shanti

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgement.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
Introduction .....	8
<b>Chapters</b>	
1 Background	
Setting the scene - Introduction.....	12
Historical Determinants.....	12
Conclusion .....	24
2 Literature Review - Introduction.....	26
Theoretical Perspectives .....	33
Marxism	
Critique of Capitalism.....	34
Political economy .....	35
Role of the state .....	36
Role of welfare state.....	36
Fabianism	
Citizenship.....	38
Economic efficiency .....	38
Strategy of equality .....	39
Neo Liberalism	
Major influences .....	40
Neo conservatism .....	41
The New Right .....	42
Pluralism.....	44
Liberal democracy and elitism.....	45
Participatory democracy.....	47
Conclusion .....	48

<b>3</b>	<b>Migration Trends &amp; Statistical Analysis</b>	
	<b>Introduction</b> .....	49
	<b>Historical overview</b> .....	49
	<b>Post WWII Migration</b> .....	53
	<b>Statistical Analysis</b> .....	61
	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	64
<b>4</b>	<b>Exploring Participation</b>	
	<b>Introduction</b> .....	66
	<b>Theoretical orientations</b> .....	66
	<b>Social Capital</b> .....	75
	<b>Rationalisations</b> .....	81
	<b>Public Choice theory</b> .....	85
	<b>Potential of Social Capital</b> .....	88
	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	94
<b>5</b>	<b>Methodology &amp; Ethical Considerations</b>	
	<b>Introduction</b> .....	96
	<b>Rationale for Research Design</b> .....	97
	<b>Research design</b> .....	101
	<b>Ethical considerations</b> .....	106
	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	111
<b>6</b>	<b>Research Findings &amp; Key Themes</b>	
	<b>Introduction</b> .....	112
	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	132
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant Contemporary Initiatives</b>	
	<b>Discussion</b> .....	134
	<b>Treaty of Waitangi</b> .....	147
	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	154
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b> .....	155
	<b>A Positional Statement</b> .....	162
	<b>Appendices</b> .....	164
	<b>Bibliography</b> .....	209
	<b>Glossary</b> .....	214

## Introduction

It is envisaged that this current investigation will

- assist towards the development of effective social policy that will contribute to the enhancement of the wellbeing of ethnic peoples
- empower and encourage ethnic peoples to address issues regarding their wellbeing
- contribute to quality debate in Aotearoa / New Zealand with regard to encouraging effective participation within contemporary neo-liberal democracies

My passion for this research topic is one that has evolved through experiences and insights within our contemporary neo liberal environment which has undergone wholesome economic and public service reform. These reforms have effectively resulted in a greater centralizing of state functions, accompanied by an increasing withdrawal from social services delivery. Within such an environment, ethnic peoples, together with Maori and Pacific Island peoples have, through the forces of assimilation undergone prolonged 'anglo conformity' whilst attempting to address issues that impact upon their wellbeing.

Anglo conformity is when the minority or immigrant is taught the norms, values, and institutions of the majority group are superior and that they should adopt them in order to be accepted. Indeed, encountering such conformity continues to be a reality in neo liberal Aotearoa / New Zealand, as is evident in often largely xenophobic intolerance towards ethnic peoples, in our immigration laws and in contemporary debates regarding the Treaty of Waitangi.

Not surprisingly therefore is my contention that for ethnic peoples wellbeing – that which concerns always ensuring their very unique and special selves, their culture, tradition – in effect that which is their very essence, their wairua – must always be to the fore. The continual socio/political interactions between the dominant Pakeha culture and the tangata whenua, Maori, provides a fascinating insight into the evolving psyche of colonialism and the inherent quest in ensuring one's progression towards attaining the fruits of liberty through democracy. Chief amongst which are one's rights as people towards participation and equality and hence towards ensuring constructive input in social policy processes that impact on these.

Qualitative research methodology has enabled ascertaining ethnic peoples views on issues that comprise and contribute towards their wellbeing. Data emanating from the ten research questions provide a valuable insight into ethnic peoples and their views on pertinent issues that impact upon their wellbeing. Essentially, it is

about the desire to ensure that ethnic peoples perceptions about participation in the development of social policy challenges dominant culture notions of what it is they ought to be involved with and to what extent.

Chapter One provides a background on historical determinants which influence the character of ethnic peoples relations in Aotearoa /New Zealand.

Chapter Two provides an overview of the Literature Review associated with undertaking this thesis. It provides an informed appreciation of the socio – political environment which impacts on the wellbeing of ethnic peoples. Theoretical perspectives including social democracy and neo liberalism are explored. Reforms largely initiated in the 1980s had as their stated goal greater efficiency and an improved democracy which proclaimed increased and more effective participation.

Chapter Three presents an overview of migration trends which have impacted on ethnic peoples wellbeing along with a statistical analysis of the contemporary composition of ethnic peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Chapter Four entails a discussion on Participation. It explores participation and rationalisations towards more effective participation

Chapter Five provides insights into qualitative methodology undertaken in this research and associated ethical considerations.

Chapter Six discusses Research Findings and Key Themes

Chapter Seven discusses contemporary initiatives through which ethnic peoples currently address issues regarding their wellbeing. The Treaty of Waitangi is explored with regards to its relevance in ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy.

Chapter Eight provides concluding comments, and recommendations which may contribute towards enhancing ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing

## Chapter One

### ‘ Setting the Scene ’

#### **Introduction**

This chapter focuses on establishing pertinent historical determinants which have shaped the character of Aotearoa / New Zealand and thus consequently impacts upon the composition and wellbeing of its ethnic peoples. It recognizes historical determinants common in settler societies and provides an in-depth discourse on key developments between Pakeha and Maori under the following subheading - The Phases of Change ( Ihi Consultants, 1987 ). These ‘ phases of change ‘ are referred to as The Age of Experimentation (1780’s to 1840’s), The Age of Domination ( 1850’s – 1890’s), The Era of Reconstruction (1890’s – 1940’s) , The Age of Dislocation (1940’s to 1975) and The Reassertion of Rangatira (The present).

The aim of this discourse is to provide an insight into the nature of the relationship between Pakeha and Maori as it provides an informed knowledge base upon which the corresponding relationship between Pakeha, Maori and Ethnic peoples can be appreciated.

Ethnic peoples consciousness of their identity recognizes unique attributes that distinguish them from others. Such an awareness may be self induced, emerge consciously as a consequence of a group’s treatment by others, or emerge when the group is defined analytically, even though in this latter case the group may not be aware of, or influenced by, such criteria.

#### **Historical Determinants**

Aotearoa /New Zealand is a settler society. Within such societies there are interesting historical determinants of cultural/social policies, which are seen to shape the character of ethnic, and race relations. Such determinants influence the

nature and the extent of the participation of peoples in issues which concern them. Determinants common in colonial settler societies include the following:

- initial and subsequent settlement by the English and control exercised by them and their British government. Power remained for an extended period with the government and settlers. The former usually retained, for an extended period, jurisdiction over native groups and foreign affairs.
- land provided the major inducement for settlement and this brought settlers into conflict with indigenous or other groups who defended or contested control of the land.
- through policies and behavior towards indigenous groups and later, other non-white groups, Anglo – Celtic settlers often found themselves in disagreement with their governing powers. However, when called upon by settlers caught in conflict with indigenous groups, their governing powers usually came to the former's assistance. The balance of power was tipped in the settlers favour, and the settler's thereby became the dominant group in society. The governing powers had little control over settlers and in instances when the two disagreed over policies affecting indigenous groups (despite the fact that the governing powers usually retained control over native affairs), local settler policies generally prevailed.
- English settler and their descendant dominance over indigenous and non-white groups, what ever the techniques or means employed, was aimed at

destroying or curtailing the power resources and, resource mobilization capabilities, of these groups, thereby assuring continued Anglo ( white ) control.

- Aotearoa / New Zealand endured lengthy colonial experiences under British tutelage, and English cultural attitudes of both the homeland and the settlers have shaped the behaviour of the white settler groups towards indigenous and other non white groups.
- even when the government withdrew, divested itself, or was divested of control, English settlers and their descendants still retained control of the major political, economic and social structures. Given that control they were, and still are, able to determine policies for the country.
- power, when exercised by the fragment and Anglo descendent groups was used to control societal structures. Allocation of power, privilege and resources was governed by such criteria as ethnicity, race and culture with those of Anglo descent largely receiving preferential treatment.
- Anglo settlers and their descendants, believed in the superiority of their culture and structured policies (whether as punishment or reward based) to induce non-Anglo groups, white and non-white alike, to discard their own culture and accept the dominant Anglo culture.
- the subsequent influx of other groups, both white and non-white, often precipitated inter group conflict, and this contributed to the intensification of discriminatory policies against other group(s) by the dominant Anglo group.

- Aotearoa / New Zealand continues to retain a considerable degree of British influenced social, political and economic values and institutions.

Given the above determinants it is not surprising then that wherever possible, the dominant Anglo group tried, and increasingly some contend, continue to, encourage assimilation of other groups by forcing the latter towards compromising and/or even at times, discarding their own cultural heritage.

Any constructive inquiry into Ethnic peoples wellbeing must take into due consideration the nature of the relationships between Maori and Pakeha and their key historical and contemporary, developments within the resulting political and economic framework.

It is my belief that there lies a wealth of harmonious solution within all our ethnic peoples, not only those who are participants within the bounds of this research. The following intricacies of the ongoing unique relationship between initial Pakeha colonisers, their contemporaries, and indigenous Maori, presents many positives which ethnic peoples must continue to begin to more earnestly understand and then, insightfully contribute toward all of our wellbeing. At all times however, always giving due consideration to enhancing the true virtues of partnership through inclusive participation and due guidance of the tangata whenua in Tikanga Maori, for this permeates throughout Aotearoa. It is, ultimately, their turangawaewae – their land /their identity and they have long been the true initial guardians of this blessed paradise. All who comprise tauwi

can and should develop a sense of belonging to Aotearoa / New Zealand and are fortunate recipients of their *maanaki*.

This human dimension must be given due consideration when formulating ethnic social policy - this of course being in addition to other consultations involving the dominant driving forces of the day. Being able to cease the initiative is one of the positives of neo liberalism. Done insightfully it ought not to cause undue concern. Rather it is character building to be at the forefront of liberating experiences of progressive responsible social policy. It is therefore both our responsibility and our obligation to positively nurture all of our wellbeing through genuine partnership with and alongside both *tangata whenua* Maori, and *Tauiwi*.

### **The Phases of Change**

The changes that took place in both Pakeha and Maori society imply that the interaction between them varied in its nature from period to period. There is much within this discourse that illustrates the unique relationship between *Tauiwi* Pakeha and *Tangata Whenua*. From the Maori viewpoint, the following periods can be identified.

To assist the reader, a brief chronology is provided at the end of each period.

#### **(a) The Age of Experimentation**

This was to last from the 1780's to the 1840's. In this period Maori people learnt both the desirability and the negative consequences of the impact of Pakeha technology and ideas. They did not however withdraw into conservative isolation

but vigorously experimented to find solutions to the new problems. The adoption of literacy, the acceptance of Christianity, the signing by so many chiefs of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the initial large scale land selling in the 1840's were all part of a Maori desire to come to terms with the changes the Pakeha had brought upon them.

#### **KEY DATES**

- 1769 Cook rediscovers Aotearoa / New Zealand
- 1788 Colony of Sydney founded
- 1790's Potatoe pig and diseases introduced
- 1814 Mission station founded in the Bay of Islands
- 1815 Battle of Waterloo ends Napoleonic Wars
- 1820's Musket Wars
- 1830's Christianity and literacy adopted
- 1840 Treaty of Waitangi

#### **(b) The Age of Domination**

Prior to Waitangi and even arguably the decade afterwards, Maori people were still masters of their own fate. However, from 1850 onwards this position changed. Governor George Grey started the process by refusing to honor the partnership that had been implied in the Maori version of the Treaty of Waitangi. He refused to give the Maori custom the force of law or to give the chiefs a place

in the machinery of Government. The 1852 Constitution that he left as his political legacy made no provision for any form of specifically Maori participation in central or provisional Government though it did provide for the declaration of Native districts – a provision which was studiously ignored by every New Zealand Government.

Grey's attack on the older missionaries were intended to destroy the reputation of the group who still stood for the partnership concept of the Treaty. Maori numbers declined dramatically, Maori were excluded from the Parliamentary process when the white settlers were given self-government in 1854 and the increasingly numerous colonists started to impose their own solutions on the Maori people. This was not done easily and the wars of the 1860's showed Maori determinism to resist unwanted change remained firm.

During this period of domination all government institutions, most notably the Maori Land Court (1865), were intent on breaking down the existing structure of Maori society. The establishment of a system of resident Magistrates (1869), creation of a Maori school system (1867) and the provision of four Maori MP's (1868) were also intended to amalgamate Maori with Pakeha.

The period culminated in the early 1890's in the abolition of the Native Department which, whatever its faults, still had served as a means of communication between Maori and Government.

### **Key Dates:**

- 1845 Grey becomes Governor of New Zealand
- 1852 New Constitution denies Maori any formal representation at central Government level.
- 1853- 61 Struggle between governor and settlers over the control of Maori policy and administration
- 1858 Coronation of Te Wherowhero of Waikato as first Maori King
- 1860 – 61 War in Taranaki
- 1863 Invasion of Waikato
- 1865 Fenton appointed Chief Judge of Maori Land Court
- 1867 Act creates the four Maori seats
- 1881 Occupation of Parihaka
- 1892 Abolition of Native Department

### **(c) The Era of Reconstruction**

This can be broadly considered to cover the period from the mid 1890's to the 1940's. In this time, leaders of genius such as Sir James Carroll of Ngati Kahungunu, Sir Apirana Ngata of Ngati Porou and Wiremu Ratana of Ngati Apa emerged with their own solutions for Maori problems. Carroll and Ngata in particular were masters of the political process and were able to win concessions for Maoridom from the political system.

Existing institutions were shaped to meet Maori needs as well as Pakeha and Ngata was able to establish a range of institutions that took account of Maori values and social organization. Most notable were the incorporations, the tribal Trust Boards and national bodies such as the Maori Purposes Fund Board, which were created to promote Maori social and cultural development.

The end result of the policy of the retention of land and the state funded land development programme that Ngata began and Labour continued to vigorously expand was to create a viable rural Maori society. Ngata in fact gave a new economic base to the Maori tribes and even now this land base represents an enormous potential asset. Because of these programmes Maoridom achieved a moderate standard of living, though this remained significantly less than the Pakeha. Maori communities remained culturally strong and their vitality was shown by a resurgence of building or refurbishing meeting houses.

Ratana, the third great leader of this period, and his followers strongly supported the Labour Government and insisted on sharing fully in the benefits of the Welfare State.

One by-product of these positive policies was a doubling of the Maori population between 1896 and 1945 and it was this population pressure that was an important factor in triggering the next phase.

**Key dates:**

- 1891 Liberals become the Government

- 1892 Kotahitanga meetings begin
- 1900 Maori Councils Act and Maori Land Administration Act provide a measure of Maori local government and control over land
- 1909 Native Land Act lays basis of compromise over title structure, use and alienation of Maori land that has endured until today
- 1929 Fall of the Liberal Government
- 1914 - 1918 First World War
- 1918 High mortality from influenza epidemic inspires Ratana to begin his prophetic mission
- 1920's Gordon Coates discreetly ends Maori land purchase
- 1929 State aided Maori Land Development
- 1935 Labour Government elected
- 1938 Maori given full access to welfare state benefits
- 1940 – 45 The Maori Battalion and Maori War Effort organization represents a high point in the utilization of Maori tribal organization.
- 

#### **(d)The Age of Dislocation**

The preceding period saw a rapid growth in Maori numbers. The Maori population doubled again between 1945 and 1966. This rapid growth meant that Maori had to move to urban areas since the economic base in the tribal areas was insufficient to provide a decent standard of living for so many people. In addition,

many hoped, as a result of the rise in Maori aspirations, to take advantage of the economic and educational opportunities of the urban areas.

From the 1960's the Government actively encouraged this process. The end result was a massive relocation of Maori people away from their tribal areas, until now the majority are living in urban areas. This has proved very costly from the viewpoint of Maori culture because it has separated the young from their cultural base in the tribal areas. As New Zealand's economic growth slowed from the late 1960's onwards, the bright hopes of economic betterment began to fall. Maori people increasingly became resentful at the economic failure, the failure of the educational system and the loss of cultural identity. The emergence of the gangs was one symptom of social break down.

**KEY DATES:**

- 1940's Migration to the cities begins
- 1945 Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act fails to meet Maori aspirations for use of tribal organization for social and economic reconstruction.
- 1947 – 1958 84.5% of all migrants were British, with a smattering of Dutch and lesser numbers of Greeks, Yugoslavs and Italians
- 1949 National becomes Government
- 1950 Migration arrangement between New Zealand and Netherlands concluded
- 1951 – 1956 Pacific island immigrants numbers doubled

- 1960 Hunn Report advocates integration and acceleration of move to cities
- Maori Affairs Amendment Act embitters even conservative Maori opinion by encouraging alienation of Maori land and ignoring Maori values
- 1971 Census shows 70.2 per cent of Maori resident in urban and town areas
- 1974 Matiu Rata repeals much of the 1967 Act
- 1975 Matiu Rata passes the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal Act. It was not retrospective but was intended to cover new breaches of the Treaty.

Maori Land March

### **(e) The Reassertion of Rangatiratanga ( The present )**

The 1975 Maori Land March can be seen as clearly marking a watershed in this period. While in a political sense it was a demand to hold on to the land, symbolically it also represented an assertion of Maori mana over the whole of Te Ika A Maui ( the North Island). Since then, the Maori people have been looking for a way of overcoming the cultural dislocations of the preceding period and finding a way to quit themselves of the welfare dependency and lack of control over their own destiny that their present socio-economic circumstances impose on them.

The solution has been seen in terms of creating regional and Iwi Authorities to deliver appropriate social, economic and educational services. These are under Maori control and responding to Maori priorities.

The other great agenda item is that Pakeha should take seriously the partnership embodied in the Treaty. The Waitangi Tribunal and the court of Appeal give the Treaty a firm place in the judicial and administrative process. The 2004 Hiko protesting against crown ownership of the seabed and foreshore is a contemporary reassertion of Rangatiratanga.

Maori people perforce have to be bicultural. It is to be hoped that Pakeha in significant numbers will also accept the need to become bicultural in the sense that they will gain some knowledge of Maori values, language, social structure and history so that there can be true dialogue.

### **Conclusion**

The abovementioned discourse on developments in the relationship between Maori and Pakeha has simultaneously witnessed an ongoing migration of differing ethnic peoples into Aotearoa / New Zealand. In hindsight I believe it to be rather strange that here in contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand it is Tauriwi Pakeha that the ethnic person must engage with, almost always exclusively. This begs the question – isn't there a contractual legally and internationally recognized partnership which involves Maori? Such an anomaly would, I suggest, not go unnoticed amongst ethnic peoples who are passionate about ensuring an

equitable Aotearoa /New Zealand. It is important that Ethnic peoples need to know the history of Aotearoa /New Zealand.

In today's socio-political environment there is increasing urgency amongst ethnic groups whether in dominant, subordinate or in positions of equality to mobilize their group resources and to strive for influence by their participation in the major political, social and economic structures of society. It is within such structures that most policy decisions which directly impact on ethnic peoples, including the allocation or reallocation of power, privilege and resources, are determined.

Only recently have there been some movements away from Anglo cultural and structural hegemony. This has largely resulted through the effective pursuance by Maori of equity and partnership rights and entitlement as evident in The Treaty of Waitangi. Bureaucratic structures such as The Waitangi Tribunal, Te Puni Kokiri and The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs are now important institutional structures through which issues of wellbeing are addressed. Such societal structures value participation and this is a central theme addressed in the literature review that follows.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature Review**

#### **Introduction**

Our knowledge base about the contemporary experiences in Aotearoa/New Zealand of ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy, which affects their wellbeing, largely remains anecdotal and impressionistic. It would seem that little research has been undertaken with regard to ascertaining ethnic peoples' perspectives of such participation. There is even less which addresses the specific participation or lack thereof of key segments within ethnic peoples communities. These include ethnic women, young people, children and the elderly. This despite participation being touted as one of the enlightenments of neo liberal democracies.

#### **Scope of the Literature Review**

The scope of the literature review was guided by the objectives of this research.

These are as follows:

- to identify those issues in society which are of concern to ethnic peoples
- to identify barriers which may limit the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policies which may affect their well being
- to ascertain those avenues in which ethnic peoples themselves would like to participate in, regarding the development of social policies

- to ascertain major avenues through which ethnic peoples may participate in and contribute to, the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

There exists a range of literature which provides insight into various aspects of ethnic peoples lives and interactions historically within Aotearoa/New Zealand ( Spoonley 1991, 1993a) . However, I was unable to locate any comparable piece of qualitative research that had been undertaken in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand which addresses the research topic from ethnic peoples perspectives .

I believe this research to be unique in that the researcher and all participants are peoples of ethnic origin who do not identify as Pakeha, Maori or Pacific Islander . The quality and validity of the research findings are such that they do represent important and suitably informed reasonings. All research participants are well informed, experienced and influential in contemporary societal institutions which impact significantly on the attainment and maintenance of ethnic peoples wellbeing. Some are key spokespeople and leaders of ethnic communities and within society at large.

In undertaking this research I was mindful that I needed to explore literature which would help me ‘ develop ’ an environment in which I could not only undertake the research, but would be able to do so in a logical informed manner and thus ultimately do justice to the contributions of the research participants, and to the research topic.

One of the central strands of this research was thus woven from gaining an insight into political ideologies conducive to impacting on ethnic peoples rites of passage towards enhancing their participation. This includes acknowledging certain theoretical ideologies which are pertinent to understanding the numerous, varied, complex and interdependent influences that impact upon the ethnic persons encounters, experiences and interactions with contemporary democracy in Aotearoa / New Zealand. Central to this is participation, freedom of expression, equity and the maintenance and progression of ones identity.

Relevant literature includes that which highlights theoretical orientations of Marxism, Fabianism and Neo Liberalism and increasingly importantly, also that which reinforce ethnic and indigenous orientations as espoused by Friere (1972, 1982), Sivanandan (1983, 1992), Ruwhiu (1999) and De'Ath and Michilenko (1980). Such orientations illustrate certain over-riding determinants that shape the character of the ethnic individual and race relations in our settler society. These include insights into relevant aspects of Marxism and his critique of capitalism and social processes as viewed by Englis (1820 - 1895) and Miliband ( 1969 ). A brief disclosure on Fabianism expands on its three social values of citizenship, economic efficiency and equality .

Four major influences on neo liberal thought provides a deeper appreciation of the socio/political environment that ethnic peoples in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand experience, and increasingly need to engage in and with,

to enhance their wellbeing. Of particular importance are the influences of Mill ( 1910 ), Smith( 1937), Hayek ( 1945 ), Friedman ( 1962) and Mclenan (1984).

The important and relevant discourses of ethnic and indigenous orientations are increasingly influential in positively impacting on the inner resolve of ethnic peoples towards more effectively participating in wellbeing issues. Within contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand there needs to be formal recognition that non Pakeha segments of society are able to, and do have legitimate voices. Voices that in essence are an extension of wairua between colonised peoples. Those who have had a taste of the hands of colonialism are better able to feel and relate to wairua that accompanies unjustified losses, and the continual suffering that alienation and non participation imposes through ongoing discriminatory practices of the dominant culture.

The advent of the unique indigenous and bicultural founding traditions of Aotearoa / New Zealand necessitates that ethnic people will need to more readily acknowledge such historical determinants in social policies that impact upon their wellbeing. There is much to be gained between cultural and religious exchanges between tangata whenua and our many vibrant and progressive ethnic peoples.

Our common experience of contemporary and past historical bondages within democratic neo liberal society here in Aotearoa/ New Zealand is a common thread between Maori and ethnic peoples. Ethnic peoples I believe are becoming increasingly adverse to oppressive acts towards tangata whenua. Even moreso

where there is inequality and blatant disregard for the principles of partnership as signified in the Treaty of Waitangi.

Freire (1972) argued that it is absolutely essential that the oppressed participate in the revolutionary process with an interestingly critical awareness of their role as subjects of the transformation. Dialogue with the people is radically necessary to every authentic revolution. Its legitimacy lies in that dialogue.

As Sivanandan (1983) stated:

“... there is nothing wrong with multiracial and multicultural education... it is good to learn about other races ; about other peoples culture, it may even help to modify individual attitudes, correct personal biases...but that tinkers with educational methods and leaves unaltered the whole racist structure...multiculturalism has become the vogue and it exculpates the whites they now know my culture, so they don't have to question their own. Worse they know more about my culture than I do, or think they do and this gives them a new arrogance.”

De'Ath and Michalenko (1980) in Ruwhiu (1999) emphasized that 'deterministic theories' and knowledge, in Western eyes, often discouraged community participation in decision making. Freire (1982) re-emphasises that no pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates.

There have been few distinctly New Zealand approaches to social policy analysis. Instead debates have mirrored and continue to mirror, those occurring within the Pakeha ‘motherland’, a legacy that has far wider implications than social policy. As Jesson (1997:11) argues:

New Zealand’s colonial origins have also meant that thought in this country is derivative. For several generations New Zealand’s educative institutions borrowed their courses from Britain and barely studied their own society at all. During the later 1960’s and early 1970’s social administration became influenced by a range of alternative approaches ( cf. Atkin 1996), particularly the structuralist influences of Marxist and feminist writers. Policy intervention was deemed to have failed, for despite the rhetoric of the welfare state, poverty and inequality remained high.

Theoretical writings sought to give more explanatory focus and move away from pathologising the failure of individuals and groups. These theoretical approaches eschewed piecemeal reform as merely alleviating symptoms without eliminating root causes. Instead, system-level analysis explored structural and institutional sources of disadvantage. This occurred in a range of spheres: class ( Ginsburg, 1979, Gough 1979), gender (Finch and Groves 1983, Pascall 1986), and race (Rex 1973, Cohen et al .1982). These structural analysis (i.e. class, race, gender) had major impacts and social policy analysis developed various mixes of theoretical and empirical analysis, which still encouraged accusations that approaches were either a- theoretical and lacking explanatory power , or absolving responsibility for

dealing with real issues and improving conditions. This (perhaps healthy) tension is maintained in contemporary social policy debates.

Ruwhiu (1999) reinforces that developing paradigms and new theoretical knowledge through research has been an acceptable notion in all cultures through the ages. Moreover, life experiences and conceptual symbols adhered to by indigenous people create contestation points for further development. For instance, in debating the issue of black people reclaiming their right to 'name the world', Sivanandan (1992:72) took up the challenge and emphasized the dangers facing indigenous people lured into the world of the Pakeha.

He stated :

“.. where the individual aspiration is only individual, you cease to be black, you are white. We cannot have the experience and miss the meaning.”

As it is with the indigenous Maori peoples , ethnic peoples here in Aotearoa / New Zealand have contributions to make in the advancement of their own intellectual property ( Ruwhiu, 1999) and ought not to be silent. Their quest towards greater participation in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing is a case in point.

Virtues of participation are a central theme throughout this research. Such an exploration is aided by references to Parry (1992), Rousseau (1986), Pateman (1970) and Plamenatz (1963). Mill and Macpherson (1973) are also referred to as

are Offe and Preuss (1991), Cohen (1996) and Habermas (1995). Putnam (1993) argues the virtues of participation because it can enhance Social Capital.

Schumpeter (1976), cautions on the effects of too much participation on the workings of liberal democratic systems. Burnheim (1985) contends an approach to democracy that abolishes general representative politicians. A brief discourse on liberal theory follows with reference to Kornberg and Clark (1992), Frazer and Lacy (1993), and Rawls, (1971).

Concepts such as democratic right and policy delivery are addressed with particular reference to Innes (1996) and Jacobs (1997). Olsen (1965) and Tullock (1993) comment on aspects of Public Choice theory while Social Capital is explored with reference to Ostrom (1990,1996), Coleman (1988), Putnam (1993), Fox (1996), Chong (1991) Maloney (1988), Ritchey-Vance (1996) , Brown & Ashman (1996), and Lam (1996).

Features of concepts such as the desirability of public participation, developmental approaches, deliberative and participatory democracy are also discussed.

## **Theoretical Perspectives**

### **Marxism**

Karl Marx (1818-1883) is best known for his views on the relationship between life and the nature of society. It is often suggested that Marx was an ‘ economic determinist ’ who espoused that the nature and function of all social institutions,

such as state agencies and the family are determined by the way the economy is owned and organised. Although Marx believed that the character of the economic base of a society (i.e. the relationship between those who own the means of production and those who don't) largely determines its 'superstructure', such as the structure and character of its state institutions and family formations as well as its dominant ideological beliefs. Marx argued that elements of the superstructure could also be relatively autonomous from the economic base and indeed influence societies character.

It is apparent that the Marxist tradition is open to different interpretations of what Marxism is. However, a common theme found throughout Marxism is its 'critique of Capitalism'.

### **Marxist critique of Capitalism**

Marx's critique of capitalism centred upon the concept of alienation. He considered that society is a product of the social and economic arrangements of a capitalist system. People become alienated in capitalism because of the rules of such a system. The nature of work, as an economic activity, is alien from any human quality or sense of human reality. Capitalism is therefore, dehumanising – valued not as human beings, but by their position, vis a vis the market – professional or unskilled manual worker, capitalist or proletariat, upper class, middle class or working class. There is a reduction to the same level as commodities – workers becoming 'factors of production' which can be bought or laid aside as and when requirements of profitability deem fit. Activities within

capitalist societies are determined by the law of the market rather than by any reference to human needs with the rules of a market economy constituting a set of impersonal mechanisms, which alienate and disguise the reality of exploitation.

### **Marxist Political Economy**

Marx is best known for his work on the relationship between economic life and other social institutions or social structures. Marx's prime interest was the analysis of societies as organized into social classes. The basis of social class was seen to be in the 'modes of production' in the economy – a concept central to Marxist theory. Modes of production determine the constitution of the two main classes: the capitalist class and the proletariat, the working class.

According to Marx, the economic structure of society is the base, the real foundation upon which sit legal, social, cultural, political and ideological superstructures from which corresponding forms of social consciousness emerge. i.e. the mode of production is the main determinant of the character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life.

Engels (1820-1895), while agreeing that the economic system was historically significant, attempted to qualify Marxist theory by emphasising that it was not the only factor in determining social processes. Other structures from the past are also important. This view is also shared by Ralph Miliband (1969) who, in rejecting the 'economic determinism' theory argues, that politics, education and religion, for instance, are also important determinants of the nature of social institutions and of prevailing ideological beliefs. It would seem that Marxist

concepts would today lie somewhere between the two extremes of economic determinism and the 'corporatist view' of society, that is, that a broader range of influences shape social consciousness or ideology.

### **Marxism and the Role of the State**

Marx argued that the modern state (comprised of a parliament, public service, police, and the military.) acted as a committee for managing the common affairs of the bourgeoisie. Government policies served the interests therefore of the capitalist class. The State is seen as a mechanism or tool of class domination. More recently however, some Marxists have questioned this view of the State in modern society, arguing that there are other institutions such as trade unions, pressure groups and the various political alliances which also influence State action. This latter view is known as corporatism.

Consequently, many Marxists today see the State as having relative autonomy – that is, whilst the State might generally serve the interests of the capitalist class, it can also support policies that may be contrary to this class because of pressure from the working class or to legitimate itself and win votes.

### **Marxism and the Role of the Welfare State**

Marxists have attempted to evaluate the Welfare state in three ways: they have tried to explain why social welfare was introduced; they have attempted to analyse the roles and functions of welfare provision; and they have attempted to produce a Marxist model of welfare.

Marxists generally offer either class conflict explanations of the development of social policy and/or explanations of welfare justified in terms of its aim of protecting the interests of the capitalist class (economic growth / legitimacy/social harmony). Marxists are therefore seen to be ambivalent about defending the Welfare State, papering over the cracks of class exploitation.

This however fails to recognise that the working class have derived real gains/benefits from the setting up of the Welfare State to resist wage demands (a main cause of inflation). In order to strengthen the resistance of employers to wage demands, legislation is needed to reduce the power of trade unions. Further, where wage pressures force workers to price themselves out of a job, unemployment will further reduce wage demands. When inflation falls in line with overseas competitors, interest rates can then be reduced to encourage healthy economic growth.

### **Fabianism**

Within a Fabian influenced social democratic tradition there was a collective commitment to the welfare state ; and to the logic that social issues could be easily understood and explained, the needs of the community easily quantified and appropriate policy solutions put in place.

Underpinning Fabian thinking are the three social values of citizenship, economic efficiency and the 'strategy of equality'.

## **1. Citizenship**

Citizenship refers to the belief that individuals in society should be united by a common bond, otherwise society will fragment and fall apart. Social inequality denies people their basic rights to participate fully in society. And therefore a key responsibility of the State should be to address social inequality through intervention in the economy. When social democrats speak of social rights they include not only the right to participate in the political system of society, but also the right to work and the right to welfare services. When the economy fails to supply these basic rights then it is considered that the State must take on this role.

## **2: Economic efficiency**

The economic principles held by social democrats are based on 'Keynesianism'. John Maynard Keynes (1936) a liberal economist argued that public expenditure on welfare programmes was desirable in times of recession to support the economy. Spending on unemployment benefits and government projects was seen as contributing to the maintenance of 'aggregate effective demand' in the economy. The notion underlying this economic growth is encouraged because people will invest in production if they have the money to buy the goods produced. Government spending therefore is considered to act as an effective regulator against downward cycles in the economy. In the view of Social Democrats, the 'perfect' market model does not exist because of the unwillingness of entrepreneurs to supply the right type of goods at the right price. Therefore some needs are unlikely to be met. Such imperfections in the market therefore, must be addressed through social policy.

### 3. Strategy of Equality

Within the social democracy tradition can be found a range of definitions of 'equality'. Many oppose the notion of 'income equality'. Tawney (1931), for example, argued that 'exceptional responsibilities' borne by individuals should be compensated by 'exceptional rewards' in recognition of performance. Crosland (1956), argued against income equality on the grounds that it would inhibit incentive. For Crosland, 'equality' meant equality of opportunity and people having a 'fair' start in life. Townsend (1981), advocated the minimization of income equality through introducing a 'minimum' and 'maximum' wage. He believed that maximum gross earnings (i.e. before tax) should not exceed four times the average male wage.

But generally, the social democratic position on equality is translated into 'equality of opportunity'.

There are four key aims behind this position :

- to maintain social cohesion.
- to encourage social and economic efficiency (inequality seen as a barrier to social mobility which, in turn, means wasted talent and economic inefficiency)
- to achieve 'social justice'
- to allow people to achieve self-realisation and their full potential.

Within the social democratic tradition explanations for the growth of the welfare state vary to some degree. Tawney explained welfare in terms of a 'duality' of conditions which existed in all industrial societies – i.e. industrialisation led to the conditions such as social disorder and health problems requiring welfare provisions and the wealth needed to finance these provisions. Marshall (1963), sees the welfare state as being part of a natural historical progression and reflects the extension of legal and political rights (gained largely in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century) to civil and social rights (gained largely in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century).

### **The Neo Liberals**

There have been four major influences on the development of neo liberal thought 19<sup>th</sup> Century Classical Political Economy advocates such as Thomas Malthus (1890), John Stuart Mill (1910) and Adam Smith (1937), advocated a laissez-faire political economic approach which supports a minimal role for State intervention. Malthus was particularly concerned about subsidies being provided for the poor. He argued that such an approach would allow poor families to breed beyond an acceptable level.

Fredrick von Hayek ( 1945 ) believed in the 'spontaneous' orderliness of market forces rather than the 'man made' order of State intervention. He considered that State action must be limited otherwise it would expand beyond manageable proportions with welfare professionals pursuing their own interests. The growth of welfare organizations and political parties would promise ever increasing welfare provision in order to win votes and would inevitably lead a nation down

the road to socialism, which Hayek equates to ‘ Serfdom ’ or ‘ equality by coercion ’. People will have to accept monopoly services provided by the State rather than seeking alternative choices in the private sector.

Milton Friedman (1962) , contended that inflation is the primary economic evil because it makes products become unprofitable to export and therefore economic growth is constrained. As inflation is caused by an excessive increase in the supply of money in circulation, it needs a four-pronged strategy:

- interest rates must rise which means that individuals and firms will borrow less money
- government spending must be cut because it involves borrowing
- with less money in circulation firms and public authorities will need to resist higher wage demands
- when inflation falls in line with overseas competitors interest rates can be reduced to encourage healthy economic growth.

### **Neo – Conservatism (the Conservative ‘ New Right ’)**

Conservatives view the State as having a role in enabling individuals and families to meet their responsibilities. This differs from the laissez faire perspective of the liberal tradition. However, what unites the liberal and conservative traditions is their common respect for land interests and property rights and their contempt for the trends established by the growth of the public sector and State institutions. Both Liberal and Conservative traditions consider the threat from social

democracy as 'pernicious' given the rise of the welfare bureaucrats (the new 'service class') who had their own agenda which was often in conflict with the capitalist class. The New Right views the Welfare State as a major mistake which has to be reversed. The State, with the emergence of welfarism is considered to have grown too large and to have expanded into areas which led to the undermining of traditional institutions within society, particularly the family.

### **The New Right**

Since the early 1980s New Zealand has largely been transformed through almost addictive adherence to New Right ideologies. Interestingly there has never been a full and thorough appraisal of the effects on the wellbeing of ethnic peoples during this period of prolonged dynamic societal change.

The New Right adhere to the following three articles of faith which grew out of ideas set out in Hayek's book 'The Road to Serfdom' (1945) :

- the first is a horror of inflation and the quest for what is now called
- 'price stability': that is, the elimination of inflation.
- the second is the conviction that State activity in economic affairs is always bad, while the same business in private hands is seen as being invariably good. The faith of an extreme new rightist is as strong as the conviction of a member of an extreme religious sect.

The mass of evidence, almost daily reported in our newspapers and on our TV screens that many businesses, including legal and accounting firms were very

badly and even dishonestly run, is often ignored. This obstinate triumph of faith over fact led to the drive to privatize and in this climate reliable well-run government departments were pushed into corporatization and ultimately privatization at the hands of the Business Round Table and their friends.

- the third article of the New Right faith is closely related to the preceding two - it closes the circle and locks them into place. This is the conviction that every human activity and interest is ultimately economic, and that the free market reigns supreme.

This theory comes into collision awkwardly and destructively with activities such as education, housing, health and employment that ethnic New Zealanders recognise as being central to their well being. To create market forces in these areas New Right ministers were driven to expedients such as bulk funding of schools setting teachers competing against each other, treating public hospitals as commercial businesses run by highly paid executives and with public relations officers and accountants competing for funds from Regional Authorities.

The founding views of the New Right continue to be accommodated with reservations as in the past our views on public affairs have been based on a simpler way of looking at things : common-sense problem solving. As a tiny isolated country we opted for an egalitarian society with well organized public services in the areas of employment, health, housing and education.

Interestingly, the two bursts for our Welfare State came at times when private enterprise had almost clearly failed New Zealanders. After the long dreary depression of the 1880's the liberals fulfilled public hopes by developing many elements of the welfare state. Some forty years later the failure of the business system - a collapse called the Great Depression (the 1920's and early 1930's) was ended by a second burst in the growth of the Welfare State under the Labour government ( 1935- 49) and continued under Labour and National into the 1970's.

The Welfare State came about as a widely supported common sense civilizing response to successive awful failures of economic systems that were all too similar to the ' minimalist State ' that the Business Round Table and the rest of the New Right adherents have today championed. Chief amongst its casualties continue to be pragmatism and common sense.

### **Pluralism**

Pluralism, argues McLennan (1984:47), is a response to the reality of political processes. Pluralism is a response to the historical processes by which the democratic State has developed in capitalist economies.

The pluralist character of the State is fundamental to an analysis of the nature of democracy in New Zealand. Pluralism underpins the commonsense notion that political decision-making is an open process, subject to scrutiny and influence by a range of interest groups. This assumed openness is itself an element in the accountability of the political system, which is derived from the apparent

opportunities for citizens, individually or collectively, to have access to elected decision makers.

With its emphasis on equal competition between interest groups, pluralism implies certain requirements of democracy. Cochrane (in Held and Politt 1994:67- 68) argues that pluralism challenges :

- the notion that the election of a particular party to government even by an absolute majority is the end of the political process, since that continues through the activity of interest groups mobilised on sectional issues;
- the idea that a majority decision is necessarily more democratic than one which allows those minorities most affected by or concerned about a decision to have a greater say than those for whom the issues are fairly marginal. In other words, ' differential preferences intensities ' need to be taken into account and can be if interest groups and political parties are accepted and included in the process.

### **Liberal democracy and elitism**

Elitist theorists effectively assume that ' the masses are asses ' ( Hothschild, in Marcus and Hanson, 1993). It is postulated that it is inappropriate for unqualified people to exercise decision-making power. There are concerns about relying on public opinion in its raw form. Raw public opinion might constitute impulsive and irrational expressions of views which would not lead to good decisions.

These should be refined and enlarged by being processed by the body of elected representatives.

Elitist theorists cite empirical data from surveys of political attitudes and voting behaviour to support their arguments that many citizens have a poor knowledge of politics, are pre-occupied with self-interest, are unwilling to consider the public good, and are inconsistent, conformist and illogical in their voting. Additionally, elite theorists and others who object to participatory democracy emphasise the complexity of public policy and advocate the benefits of restricting public participation. Participation, it is considered, can lead to instability in political systems whereas representation means that political leaders are able to resolve conflicting claims in a rational way and with regard to the interest of the whole group.

Representation also upholds the value of political equality, because participatory mechanisms are open to exploitation by those with vested interests, resources and power. Notwithstanding the public choice objections to interest groups, representative governments with electoral systems based on one person one-vote, on the other hand, are claimed to be egalitarian because every person's opinion has equal weight.

In addition to the issue of the complexity of decision making, there are also concerns about democratic 'overload': in this situation, the vast amount of issues requiring deliberation is seen as threatening freedom and leisure. The sheer amount of time required suggests that participatory democracy is not feasible.

For the elite critics of participatory democracy, as for other theorists of liberal representative democracy, the key democratic activity of citizens is, to select their leaders.

### **Participatory democracy**

Participatory democracy contends that the people do not merely register their views on what is done or proposed by governments and/or representatives; they are also integral to the participatory processes as always. A citizen does more than vote; he/she thinks about and discusses politics and engages in activity that either forms or replaces part of the process of government, for example, becoming a local councilor and helping to run community services.

Participation is seen as being very important indeed – so important that a system of representation is only somewhat regretfully accepted as a necessary modification of direct participation by the people. In these theories participation is not just valued as a means or as an aspect of the means by which people can make political decisions, but is valued for its own sake, or at the very least, for what are seen as its direct effects. The full development of an individual, the education of an individual and the creation or strengthening of bonds between an individual and the community – these are held to be some of the significant and appropriate results of participation.

While Rousseau (1968) is the most important participatory theorist within individualist traditional democratic theory is John Stuart Mill (1910) who most specifically favors participation.

## **Conclusion**

Insights into theoretical perspectives as mentioned above indicate that the notion of inclusiveness through active participation is a carefully crafted path. Contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand continues to produce challenges as it journeys towards a complex increasingly multicultural – multiethnic society built upon its unique bicultural foundations. The advent of the current Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) representation system demonstrates that there is greater participation in the corridors of political power by a wider cross section of the community. This however does not necessarily equate to effective participation by ethnic peoples in the development of social policies that affect their wellbeing. This, I contend, is no doubt due to varying reasons, chief amongst which is a limited appreciation of what participation entails.

The following chapter entertains a discourse of migration trends of ethnic peoples to Aotearoa / New Zealand. Such an insight enables a deeper appreciation of the many nuances of the socio / political environment ethnic peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand encounter.

## Chapter Three

### Migration Trends & Statistical Analysis

#### Introduction

This chapter presents a brief historical overview of migration policies and trends which occurred in Aotearoa/New Zealand prior to World War II and discusses the general nature of post World War II migration to Aotearoa/New Zealand. It presents an historical overview of immigrant settlers in Aotearoa / New Zealand which includes a discourse of key trends that have influenced their migration and a statistical analysis of the contemporary composition of ethnic peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

#### Historical Overview

Early migrants to Aotearoa/New Zealand were whalers, traders, sealers, missionaries and settlers. Colonisation of the new country was a haphazard affair. The first period of extensive European migration was in the period 1839 to 1890. By 1842 the British population of Aotearoa / New Zealand was a little less than 11,000: most had arrived through the efforts of Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the New Zealand Company.

New Zealand changed from being a Crown Colony in 1840 to having internal self-rule through the provincial period of 1854 to 1876. This change had influence on migration. The provinces each sent agents to Britain to promote migration and in 1859 the Central Government also established an agent in London. Provincial governments used land revenues to pay the fares of

immigrants. The screening process was perfunctory and immigrants were not selected but came in random streams.

Gold was discovered in Otago in 1861 and within two years the population of Otago and Southland rose from 12,600 to some 60,000. Sinclair (1969:106). As gold was discovered in Westland, Thames and Coromandel, the population increased from 79,000 in 1860 to 204,000 in 1866. McGill (1981:52) and many of these immigrants stayed to take up land, particularly in the South Island.

The gold rushes brought significant numbers of Chinese to New Zealand. There was a restriction placed on the number of Chinese immigrants but this did not apply to the other groups.

By 1871, a new Immigration Act spoke of 'the selection and conveyance of persons skilled in any description of industry', which could be deemed 'desirable to encourage in New Zealand, together with their families'. Labour and Employment Gazette (1959:24). The selection of immigrants remained largely within the confines of Britain and north West Europe.

Migration to New Zealand diminished in the late 1860's with the greater attraction of developments in North America. The development program instituted by Julius Vogel attracted fresh inflows of migrants through the Immigration and Public Works Act of 1870. This Act also constituted the more formal London Office of the Agent General to manage New Zealand's affairs from Britain. One of the early tasks was to channel immigrants to New Zealand.

Although initially unable to satisfy Vogel's plan demand for migrants, by 1874 quotas were being filled and exceeded. In 1875 growing unemployment in New Zealand caused the Government to restrict assisted passages and by 1880, immigration activities had ceased, only to be briefly revived in the following decade.

Immigration legislation enacted through the 1880's was set in place mainly to control the inflow of Asians – particularly the Chinese, who were regarded as undesirables due largely to their sojourner outlook, their competition to Europeans and for their race. They were labeled “ the Yellow peril ” which threatened the racial purity of a new country which aspired to be “ a Better Britain of the South Seas .”

Recession and discrimination led to the Chinese immigrants Act 1881 which imposed a 25-pound tax on every Chinese person arriving in New Zealand. In 1888 the Immigrants Amendment Act required that no vessel should bring more than one Chinese passenger per 100 tons. In 1896 the Chinese poll tax was raised to 100 pounds, and in 1899 a final piece of legislation to curtail non – white migration, the Immigrants Restriction Act excluded immigrants, apart from those of British (including Irish) birth and parentage, and those who could fill out an application form in a European language. This Act was later to be amended in 1919, to curtail the movement of travelers through New Zealand, with again, special emphasis being placed on hindering the movement of the Chinese. The seeds were sown for a white-only immigration policy and while this was directed

towards Asians it also extended to other non – British migrants, and was to shape New Zealand's attitudes to immigration and immigrants for decades to come.

Population growth from 1890 onwards was less dependent on migration. The nation's population had grown to over 500,000. Net inflows receded and from 1894 to 1900 did not exceed 2,500 people per year. From 1900 to 1913 an average of 8,600 people arrived every year. There were minor inflows in 1914 and 1915, but negligible additions to the population occurred in the remaining war years. McGill (1981).

Immigration fluctuated with economic conditions after 1918. In the period immediately after World War 1 the inflow during this period was predominantly British and the main mode of entry throughout the 1920's was government-assisted migration. This ensued that migrant flows could be easily curtailed in line with prevailing economic conditions. The inflow saw a modest trickle of finances, and also recently arrived settlers spouses joining already established minority groups, and the arrival of some settlers from India. A small number of European refugees fleeing fascism were accepted during the 1930's and in 1944 hundreds of Polish children. The 1930's also witnessed an outflow of population from Aotearoa / New Zealand as a result of the Depression.

Asian immigration was further restricted by legislation. The Immigration Amendment Act 1920 embedded a white New Zealand orientation in legislation. Some elements of legislation were later relaxed and immediate relatives of the Chinese were admitted and in 1934 the poll tax on the Chinese was abolished.

Historically, migration to New Zealand and New Zealand's immigration policies reflect fluctuating economic standards and the continuing desire to maintain a racial homogenous society of white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

### **Post World War II Migration**

Following World War II, the New Zealand government again decided to encourage settlement from overseas. Industries demanded labour and there was strong demand for farm workers and domestics. The government found that, in order to obtain the sort of people it most wanted, it 'could not rely wholly on immigrants paying their way to New Zealand but would have to take positive action to encourage those with skills that were in short supply into this country'. New Zealand Labour and Employment Gazette (1964:8).

It was decided therefore to start an assisted immigration scheme.

Immigrants were to be selected on their occupational skills, in relation to the vacancies and accommodation available for such workers in New Zealand. Those selected would have their expenses either partly or wholly paid by the New Zealand Government. Immigrants arriving under the scheme had to remain in the occupations for which they were selected for a minimum of two years after their arrival. Failure to do so would mean that the government contribution to their fares was recoverable from the immigrant.

Initially, the assistance scheme sought only single people from the United Kingdom between the ages of 25 and 35, in selected occupational groups. Only

single people were sought because of housing shortages: it was felt that married people with families could not be adequately accommodated.

By 1950, the categories were broadened ; the upper age limit was raised to 45 years and married applicants with no more than two children could be selected in cases where suitable accommodation and employment were available. Dutch migrants were later included in this scheme to meet particular needs in domestic and farm work

Until 1950 immigrant selection had been culturally biased towards the British on the premise that these people would more readily assimilate in New Zealand. New Zealand would then remain a white Anglo-Saxon dominated country. Labour shortages forced horizons to be broadened, with the changing policy being expressed in terms such as this: ‘ We are, however, also alive to the fact that complete homogeneity is neither possible nor desirable. Nor are we so small minded as to dislike talent in other people. We therefore welcome a number of other migrants. ’ New Zealand Labour and Employment Gazette (1964:47).

The Dutch closely resembled that which would fulfill New Zealand’s needs, both in terms of numbers of available migrants, their skills, as well as the compatibility of a European background, not too dissimilar to the cultural norms of Aotearoa /New Zealand.

The migration agreement between the New Zealand and Netherlands governments was concluded on 16 October 1950. In terms of this agreement, up

to 2,000 persons could be accepted as new settlers in any one year : 1200 men and 800 women. To be eligible , prospective migrants had to be single and between 18 and 35 years of age at the time of application. The number and type of person settled included the following : building tradesman, carpenters, painters, plasterers , farm workers, unskilled workers for laboring jobs; engineering tradesmen, timber workers, bushmen, sawmill hands and dairy factory workers. Women were selected for work as domestic, factory workers and fully trained qualified nurses.

This assistance scheme had at various times throughout the 1950s and 1960s included small numbers of migrants from Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Belgium and Greece.

By 1953 the Netherlands government was putting pressure on the New Zealand Government to accept more migrants than the set quotas allowed. A report in the Dominion of 6 July 1953 observed that ‘ The prime minister learned that over population is one of the Netherlands’ main problems, and that with a yearly increase of births over deaths of some 140,000 the Dutch Government hoped that 50,000 people could find a home in overseas counties every year ’.

The motivation or reasons for Dutch migration were a combination of political, social and religious factors, formed in a society which had its social fabric seriously disrupted by World War II.

Thompson (1970) observed that a background much more comparable to the New Zealand norm than that of either peasants from Southern Europe and Polynesia or intellectuals from Berlin or a displaced persons camp, makes adjustment much easier.

At the time of the Dutch migration to New Zealand there were also greater numbers of British migrants. Between 1947 and 1958, 84.5% of all migrants were British while Dutch migrants accounted for seven per cent of all migrants. There were also lesser numbers of Greeks, Yugoslavs and Italians, together with other north – west Europeans, such as Danes, Swiss and Austrians. This period of migration also saw the arrival of displaced Polish and Hungarian refugees in the 1950's.

Of particular long term significance was the growth in migration from the South Pacific Islands, beginning in the 1950's. Between the 1951 and 1956 census the Pacific Islands' Polynesian population more than doubled (from 3,624 to 8,103) and had the fastest average annual growth rate (17%). A Western Samoan quota was established in the 1960's, providing residence for up to 1100 Western Samoan citizens each year subject to a guarantee of employment (no skill or labour market requirements), age (18-45 yrs) and health and character requirements.

Intakes of refugees also continued during these decades, including more than 1000 Hungarians between 1956 and 1958, refugees from China including Russian Christians in 1956 and in the late 1960s, Czechs. In 1959, New Zealand also

became a pioneer in the resettlement of 'handicapped' refugees (medically, physically or socially disabled or disadvantaged) and by 1963 more than 200 refugee families with handicapped members had arrived.

New legislation, the Immigration Act 1964, consolidated the mechanisms of permits, visas, exemptions, prohibitions and deportations. Discretionary power was vested in the Minister of Immigration rather than Customs, and the Act provided the legal framework within which Government could effectively exclude, restrict or facilitate migrants.

### **The 1970s**

The 1970s were a turbulent time for immigration. The decade is particularly remembered for the controversial 'dawn raids' on Pacific Island over-stayers. Unrestricted entry for British migrants also ended.

The decade began with the government freeing up the United Kingdom subsidised immigration scheme in response to an acute labor shortage. Later in the year the scheme was extended to Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, West Germany and the United States. A publicity programme was mounted and at its peak there was 70,000 permanent and long term arrivals. The resulting pressures on housing, schools and other services produced a rapid turnaround in public and political attitudes to immigration.

This manifested itself in guidelines for immigration policy regarding permanent entry being introduced in 1974. Assisted passage schemes were abolished in

1975, and the Dutch assisted migrant scheme was suspended in May 1976. Entry was then largely limited to migrants with skills and qualifications in fields where there was high demand, those people with close family ties and on humanitarian grounds.

In 1976 occupational immigration was opened to migrants from other than so called 'traditional source' countries (Britain, Ireland, Western Europe, Australia and North America), provided that their skills were not in demand in their home country. A Business Entrepreneur scheme was also set up in the mid 1970s for migrants who had specific business proposals. At the same time, there was marked increase in the proportion of migrants approved on the basis of family relationships and a decrease in people arriving for employment.

Refugee intake continued through the 1970s, including Ugandan Asians, Chileans, Soviet Jews, Europeans, Iranian Baha'is, Assyrian Christians, and from the mid 1970s a growing commitment to Indo-Chinese refugees (Cambodian, Vietnamese, Laotian ) in the aftermath of the Vietnam War.

### **The 1980s**

The mid 1980s saw an explicitly non discriminatory immigration policy of settling immigrants on individual merit rather than on ' traditional ' sources which had largely shaped Aotearoa / New Zealand's migrant flows.

In a 1986 there was a review of immigration policy by the then Labour government for reasons of national , economic and social security. This was a

significant departure from the bias in favor of considerations, controls over immigration needed to be retained. While maintaining the broad structure of immigration arrangements, broad policy objectives and principles resulted in significant changes. There was acknowledgement of the increasing role of immigration in the evolving multicultural social fabric of Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Against the background of wide restructuring and deregulation undertaken by the Government, the main thrust of new business immigration was to encourage people with good business ideas, initiative, demonstrated ability and English language skills. They were expected to become genuine residents contributing fully to the community.

Approximately 500 such applications from 20 different countries were approved in the first 18 months, with particular interest from Fiji, Malaysia, Hong Kong and Taiwan. There was also change to 'social' immigration. The stringent guidelines applicable to reunion with family in New Zealand of close relatives overseas were made more flexible. Policy provided for the spouse or partner of a New Zealand citizen or resident to be granted residence, while dependent children, parents and siblings were eligible to be reunited with their adult children in some circumstances. A new avenue for migration was also established which provided New Zealand residents with the opportunity to sponsor a close relative who had a 'worthwhile' skill, a job offer and English language skills. Relatives

who did not meet the usual criteria could also be considered on humanitarian grounds.

The 1986 review endorsed Aotearoa / New Zealand's commitment to the resettlement of refugees in New Zealand, and reaffirmed the special relationship with Australia and provision for Australian citizens and residents to freely enter and live in New Zealand indefinitely. The Immigration Act 1987 sought to establish a balance between effective enforcement of immigration law and protection of individual rights.

### **The 1990s**

Significant changes to immigration policy in the 1990's have seen continual heated debate about the role of immigration for New Zealand. In the 1990s there has been an increasing emphasis on considering applicants who would make the highest contribution to employment and income and a trend towards maximising gain in productive human capital while maintaining provision for migrants to enter New Zealand for social humanitarian reasons.

### **Current trends**

The most significant overhaul of immigration policy in a decade occurred in 2003. The 'general skills category' was scrapped and the current system is one in which there is a strong requirement that migrants not only have jobs but must also prove that they will be able to settle and contribute to society. Interestingly, some of these changes were due to the unwillingness of employers to hire workers from a different ethnic or cultural background.

Scraping the general skills category for migrants means that most migration will now be ‘invitation’ only. The New Zealand Immigration Service will prioritize applicants and its decisions cannot be appealed.

These changes are viewed as useful in addressing skill shortages and more skilled tradespeople are more likely to be able to come to Aotearoa / New Zealand .

Obviously immigration will always pose challenges for social cohesion. However it is my belief that there is an increasing recognition that a sensible immigration policy is essential if economic growth targets and a higher standard of living are to be achieved.

### Statistical Analysis

‘ A valid measure is one which measures what it is intended to measure...’ (De Vaus, 1985:55)

Ethnic communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand have become increasingly diverse and dynamic. The following table indicates that the population of Aotearoa/New Zealand has grown steadily both in size and complexity.

### Ethnic Composition of New Zealand Resident Population

Grouped Total Responses to Ethnicity Question in Census	Census Year			Percentage of Total People Census Year		
	1991	1996	2001	1991	1996	2001
Ethnic Groups						
European*	2,783,028	2,879,085	2,868,009*	82.5	79.6	76.9*
Māori	434,847	523,374	526,281	12.9	14.5	14.1
Pacific	167,070	202,233	231,801	5.0	5.6	6.2
Asian	99,759	173,502	237,459	3.0	4.8	6.4
Latin American, Middle Eastern or African	6,693	16,422	24,924	0.2	0.5	0.7
People Stating an Ethnic Group	3,345,813	3,466,590	3,586,734	99.2	95.9	96.2

Ethnic Group Not Stated	28,113	149,052	143,598	0.8	4.1	3.8
Total People Resident	3,373,929	3,615,639	3,730,332	100.0	100.0	100.0

Census 2001 data shows that 10% of the resident population of Aotearoa/New Zealand belong to a minority ethnic group, which is neither European nor Maori nor Pacific Island New Zealander.

- 6.4% of all Census respondents identified an Asian ethnicity
- 2.6% identified a Continental European ethnicity
- 0.7% recorded an ethnicity from Africa, Latin America or Middle East.

The following table shows the 50 largest ethnic groups based on total responses recorded by New Zealand residents in 2001 Census. This confirms trends identified from immigration statistics and the 1996 Census.

### Census 2001 Top 50 Ethnicity Categories

2001 Categories				Percentage of Change		
	1991	1996	2001	1991-	1996-	1991-
New Zealand European	2,618,445	2,496,552	2,696,724	-4.7	8.0	3.0
Māori	434,847	523,374	526,281	20.4	0.6	21.0
Samoan	85,743	101,757	115,017	18.7	13.0	34.1
Chinese nfd	44,136	78,663	100,680	78.2	28.0	128.1
Indian nfd	29,820	40,404	60,210	35.5	29.7	75.7
Cook Island Māori nfd	37,233	46,092	51,486	23.8	11.7	38.3
Tongan	23,175	31,392	40,719	35.5	29.7	75.7
English	53,325	281,895	35,082	428.6	-87.6	-34.2
Dutch/Netherlands	24,732	47,571	27,504	92.3	-42.2	11.2
European nfd and European nec)						
Australian	23,967	53,625	20,784	123.7	-61.2	-13.3
Niuean	14,427	18,474	20,148	28.1	9.1	39.7
Korean	930	12,753	19,026	1271.3	49.2	1945.8
British nfd	16,659	729	16,572	-95.6	2173.3	-0.5
South African	2,007	6,762	14,913	236.9	120.5	643.0
Scottish (Scots)	14,094	107,007	13,785	659.2	-87.1	-2.2
Irish	7,392	73,047	11,706	888.2	-84.0	58.4
Filipino	4,917	8,190	11,091	66.6	35.4	125.6
Japanese	2,970	7,458	10,023	151.1	34.4	237.5
German	4,611	13,410	9,057	190.8	-32.5	96.4
American (US)	6,663	7,977	8,472	19.7	6.3	27.2
Fijian (except Fiji Indian/Indo-Fijian)	5,100	7,695	7,041	50.9	-8.5	38.1

Tokelauan	4,146	4,917	6,204	18.6	26.2	49.6
Sri Lankan nfd	2,406	4,077	6,042	69.5	48.2	151.1
Khmer/Kampuchean/Cambodian	4,320	4,407	5,268	2.0	19.5	21.9
Thai/Tai/Siamese	1,047	2,838	4,554	171.1	60.4	335.0
Canadian	4,239	4,932	4,392	16.3	-11.0	3.6
Asian nfd	495	1,998	3,930	303.6	96.8	693.7
Taiwanese Chinese		2,721	3,768		38.6	
French	1,400	5,886	3,516	308.8	-40.3	144.1
Vietnamese	2,673	2,886	3,462	8.0	20.0	29.5
Welsh	2,781	9,963	3,414	258.3	-65.8	22.7
Russian	480	2,190	3,141	356.3	43.6	554.6
Italian	1,542	4,914	2,955	218.7	-39.9	91.6
Arab	177	1,725	2,859	874.6	65.6	1514.1
Groat/Croatian	171	3,897	2,505	2178.9	-35.7	1366.1
Swiss	1,671	3,747	2,346	124.2	-37.3	40.5
Greek (incl Greek Cypriot)	2,100	3,564	2,283	69.7	-36.0	8.6
Iranian/Persian	984	1,650	2,160	67.7	30.9	119.5
Iraqi	246	966	2,145	292.7	122.4	772.4
Indonesian (incl Javanese/Sundanese/Sumatran)	861	1,662	2,073	93.0	24.9	140.9
Malay	1,383	2,937	2,052	112.4	-30.1	48.4
African nfd	429	741	2,013	72.7	172.0	369.2
Danish	1,404	3,507	1,995	149.8	-43.1	42.1
Fijian Indian/Indo-Fijian	783	2,970	1,983	279.3	-33.2	153.3
Somali						
Tuvalu Islander/Ellice Islander	429	879	1,965	104.9	123.7	358.3
Polish	1,671	3,756	1,956	124.8	-48.0	17.0
Other African nec	273	1,689	1,902	518.7	12.5	597.1
Spanish	543	2,772	1,731	410.5	-37.5	218.8

Notes nec = not elsewhere classified; nfd = not further defined

The above table gives an illustration of the diversity within the ethnic sector.

There are four broad groupings:

- Continental European - includes all European groups except those from Great Britain and Ireland.
- South East Asian - Includes Filipino, Cambodian, Vietnamese and 'other' South East Asian.
- Asian - includes Chinese, Indian, Korean, Japanese, Sri Lankan and other Asian.

The Middle East, Africa and Latin America

It is important to realize that ethnicity is not the same as culture, race or identity. It often involves these characteristics but not necessarily. The ethnicity of particular groups has little to do with culture or individual personal identity. Ethnicity increasingly involves a political dimension. Ethnic phenomenon is relational : that is the construction of differences and similarities are always in relation to others. They are political due to the relation of ethnic groupings with the distribution of resources and also exclusionary as the boundaries of ethnic phenomenon are based on the practice of inclusion and exclusion as well as categorising people into a sense of belongingness or otherwise.

### **Conclusion**

It is clearly evident that regardless of the rate of future migration, people from different ethnic backgrounds and their descendants will continue to represent a significant proportion of the population of Aotearoa /New Zealand and that this phenomenon will continually pose challenges for those concerned with social policy and wellbeing. There is, and will be, continual demand for the provision of culturally appropriate social services and the recognition of the importance of ethnic peoples contributions to the social and political life of Aotearoa/ New Zealand.

Mainstream services will need to become more attuned to the cultural needs of an increasingly divergent and complex ethnic sector. This will also include being adequately responsive to the wellbeing of separate ethnic populations.

An increasingly diverse and complex ethnic population in Aotearoa / New Zealand necessitates the need to ensure that ethnic peoples are able to participate towards ensuring their wellbeing in a neo liberal democracy. The associated complexities that constitute Participation is now examined.

## **Chapter Four**

### **Exploring Participation**

#### **Introduction**

This chapter entails a discussion on key themes which are critical to understanding the concept of Participation. This includes exploration of concepts such as educative participation and deliberative democracy. An indepth critique on liberalism and democracy leads into considerations of democratic rights and policy delivery in pursuit of more effective participation. Fundamental obstacles to effective participation are considered in discussions on public choice theory and the potential of social capital is explored.

#### **Theoretical orientations**

In theory our elected political representatives, whether at national, regional or local levels are accountable to the voters. As 'ordinary' citizens, we have input into the government through our votes, our ability to lobby and pressure our representatives and our access to various means of political communication. It can be argued that our link with our representatives is the crucial element in the workings of a liberal democracy.

Public participation can be defined as 'taking part in the processes of formulation, passage and implementation of public policies' (Parry et al., 1992). Encouraging ethnic peoples to participate in the development of social policy will no doubt be dependent upon the normative values and mechanism's involved in the promotion of participation.

Rousseau (1968) argued that participation was desirable because no one person is fully able to adequately express the views of another. He contended that people should come together in an assembly to decide the laws that would cement and govern society. Those laws should be based on the 'general will', which would differ from the 'will of all'. Just how Rousseau believed the 'general will' would be achieved is not clear. It appears that people would reach the general will through their own efforts, by thinking in terms of what might be termed the 'common good'. Pateman (1970), drawing on the work of Plamenatz (1963), argued that the main reason why Rousseau supported participation is because of its psychological impact.

### **Educative participation**

For Rousseau, participation was desirable because he saw it educated people. Through participation individuals learn that they are part of a society and develop a sense of justice. Pateman views Rousseau advocating that as a result of participating in decision-making the individual is educated to distinguish between his own impulses and desires and he learns to be a public as well as a private citizen. Further, that Rousseau also believes that through such a process the individual will eventually come to feel little or no conflict between the demands of the public and private sphere.

It can be argued that Rousseau supports participation in decision making for two reasons:

- because it largely produces desirable outcomes

- because it helps people develop as individuals in socially desirable ways.

He considers the educative effect of participation as the more important of the two benefits which come from participation. The two however are closely related.

The argument that public participation should be supported because of its ability to educate individuals is one that is adopted by a number of other writers such as John Stuart Mill. Mill's approach is in some respects, ambiguous. In *Representative Government*, he supported the ideas of plural voting. The number of votes allocated to individuals should depend upon their level of formal education (Mill, 1910). However, Mill (1873) & Williams (1976) also argued that it was through participation in public affairs, locally and in the workplace that individuals learnt how to participate. Mill argued that through participation in decision-making at 'low levels', individuals developed their capacity to participate responsibly in decision making at 'higher levels'. For Macpherson (1973), Mill's approach represented a 'developmental' approach to democracy.

Supporters of public participation for its educative consequences would view participative mechanisms that are purely consultative with suspicion. The aim, for those who adopt positions close to that of Mill, is for individuals to be educated through participation, so that they can eventually participate at the highest level of decision-making. Forms of participation which do not promote the opportunity for individual development are therefore considered flawed.

Giving people the right to vote in referendums especially if the referendums were purely consultative, would be treated with suspicion unless it could be shown that individuals were gaining the ability to engage in decision-making.

Supporters of what might be termed 'educative democracy' might however react more favourably to referendums, which were binding. Even in these cases however, referendums might be seen as a limited way of increasing people's capacities to engage in public decision making. They are 'one-off' events, concerned with only a limited range of issues.

Citizens' juries, while in most cases consultative, might be viewed as 'developmental' in that they involve citizens in the detailed discussions of issues and therefore might increase their ability to engage in democratic debate. However, in as much as the juries are single events and do not lead to opportunities to participate in decision making in public affairs, they would probably be seen as inadequate. Where decision making powers, even if only to a limited extent, are devolved to bodies such as neighbourhood councils, such mechanisms are likely to gain some support from supporters of Mill.

### **Deliberative democracy**

Within a deliberative democracy, public participation is desirable in as much as it is tied into the development of deliberative mechanisms. It is the quality of the participation that is stressed in this approach. Offe and Preuss (1991) argue that the important factor in strengthening democracy in liberal capitalist societies in the current period is that people should have to defend their opinions against

those of others and, that people's opinions should be open to challenge. In that way the quality of democracy will be enhanced, as people come to question their own assumptions and positions. The argument that deliberation will produce better decisions is one that is supported by Cohen (1996).

However, Habermas (1995) argues that if all opinions are given a voice and the only factor that influences the outcome is the force of the best argument, then a position will be reached in which no one will feel that his or her interests have been ignored or overrun. As a consequence, justice will result. The exact outcomes of decisions is less important in this approach than the emphasis on the processes involved.

Habermas's approach to communication and discourse has its critics. Deliberation is not necessarily a good way to make decisions for it is rarely, if ever, that the best argument wins through, in the way envisaged by Habermas.

Both Adam Przeworski (1998) and Susan Stokes (1998) argue that deliberation can result in people supporting beliefs that do not represent their best interest. Przeworski observes that people can be ideologically dominated in deliberative processes.

Przeworski's position is based on the types of areas in which deliberation generally takes place. He argues that most deliberation that involves the public is about means rather than ends. In such situations, if people change their beliefs it is largely on technical matters, concerning the relationship between means and

ends or what he refers to as 'equilibrium beliefs' which concern 'the political efficacy of alternative directions of collective action' (Przeworski, 1998).

In such situations, Przeworski argues that people are easily open to manipulation by the powerful, the organised and the articulate. With regard to this approach, Przeworski would seem to view any deliberative mechanism, which is not concerned with the aims rather than simply with means, with suspicion.

However, against such arguments advanced by Przeworski (1988), Habermas (1998) distinguishes between instrumental and strategic rationality and communicative rationality. Instrumental or strategic rationality occurs where people try to convince others to support their aims and goals. Communicative rationality on the other hand exists where people are trying to reach the truth or the best position, and are willing to be persuaded by strong arguments and evidence. In the latter case, the chances of manipulation are much lower than they are in the former .

It is only where participants enter dialogue in the spirit of communicative rationality that the type of 'discourse ethics', and the achievement of decisions based on justice, stand any chance of being achieved.

Some criticise Habermas for either producing a false dichotomy between instrumental and strategic rationality on the one hand or communicative rationality on the other, or for inadequately distinguishing between strategic rationality and communicative action (Johnson, 1998).

Elster (1998) argues that the motives of participants are not that important as deliberative mechanisms can have an impact on decisions irrespective of people's motivations. His main argument is that a deliberative setting can shape outcomes independently of the motives of the participants. There are powerful norms operating against naked appeals to interest and prejudice so speakers have to justify their proposals by the public interest. Because there are powerful norms against the use of threats, they have to disguise them as warnings. (Elster, 1998).

In other words, Elster is arguing that having to defend one's position in public forces one to take a less self-interested, more communal approach. This is not because of any specific commitment to 'communicative rationality' but because expressing oneself in terms of simple self-interest is not likely to succeed. One is more likely to achieve ones aims by demonstrating that those aims are in line with the general public interest. Moreover, threats are unlikely to succeed in public debate.

The logic of public debates leads people to present the consequences of not making a particular decision in terms of a warning, rather than a threat. In this approach, public deliberation is a good thing because the structures of deliberation lead people to act in certain ways. As such, this position is different from the Habermasian support for discourse. It does have similarities with the approach of Offe and Preuss.

Joshua Cohen (1998) adopts a similar position. In a series of workshops supporting deliberative democracy, Cohen (Cohen, 1989,1996,1998, Cohen and

Rodgers, 1995) argued that deliberative participation is not only desirable because of the procedures on which it is based but also because it produces acceptable outcomes. That this is so is because deliberative conception requires that the interests of all be given equal consideration in finding collective decisions. It further requires that we find politically acceptable reasons – reasons acceptable to others, given a background of reasonable differences of conscientious conviction. This is the principle of inclusion (Cohen, 1998).

However, against such a broad approach, one might consider the work of Jane Mansbridge (1983) re the New England town meetings in the USA. Such meetings are open to the members of the public. Mansbridge found that attendance at town meetings was not popular with some citizens because of the demands it made upon them. The element of disagreement involved in participation in the meetings worried some inhabitants, who were not happy having to disagree and argue with neighbors.

However open and encompassing meetings may be, it can still be a daunting task to put forward one's point of view in a public forum, particularly if there exists ingrained ideological barriers within the dominating culture. There is always the chance that deliberative processes, however they are set up, will be dominated by the articulate, the self confident, those with more formal education and who enjoy taking part in debate, as well as by those with greater social power.

Moreover, engaging in deliberation can be very time and emotion consuming. However a number of mechanisms, such as Planning Cells in Germany, help

people to participate by paying them and in other ways which mean they can participate. For these and other reasons, some argue that the best way to extend public participation is not through the development of deliberative mechanisms which may, even if unwittingly, discriminate in favour of some against others.

The Italian political and legal theorist Norberto Bobbio (1987) has argued that the battle facing democracy is to extend participation through voting by increasing the spheres in which people are able to vote. In the future, Bobbio argues, it should become as commonplace to collectively elect one's boss at work, as it is to elect one's member of parliament. Representatives could be elected according to the groups and organisations to which they belong. Held, (1995), views this as a way of moving towards Cosmopolitan democracy. Electing representatives of course tackles the problems associated with the time demands associated with participation. It can also give everyone an equal right to participate, even if that participation is formally limited to the act of voting.

However, any participation in decision-making is indirect and raises its own problems of how representatives are to be held accountable to those whom they represent. Developments in voting, on their own, would not meet the aims of those who support public participation for its educative role or who support it for its promotion of deliberation and justice and for the benefits associated with social capital.

## **Social Capital**

Putnam (1993) argues that participation is desirable because it can enhance social capital. Participation can bring together people from groups which might otherwise be excluded and provide them with an opportunity to have input into public policy. It can also help to increase trust between citizens and those who run government and public sector bodies (Putnam 1993). Putnam also contends that a 'living public sphere' within civil society can help to lessen problems of social exclusion and alienation as well as a number of associated social problems. For these reasons public participation, in its broadest forms, can help to produce a more inclusive society and a greater sense of community and community self-confidence. It can also help prevent a large gap emerging between the 'governed' and the 'governors.'

All the above justifications are based on arguments that public participation is either good for individuals, and/or improves the equality of decision making, which is more likely to reflect the public interest. However, public participation can be approached from other perspectives. If one considers public participation from the perspective of the managers of public services or those who manage public organisations, the approach to public participation may well be very different from the positions discussed above.

It is not always clear why managers in public organisations support public participation. Current central government is calling on lower levels of government to increase their consultation with, and the participation of their communities. It

is also encouraging local authorities and other public bodies to work in collaboration with other organizations such as private business, not-for-profit organisations, and community groups in the delivery of services and other activities.

There would also seem to be little doubt that there is in Aotearoa / New Zealand need to continually develop participation initiatives throughout local and central government. Public bodies will increasingly be required to improve participation in order to satisfy externally imposed demands.(eg. ascertaining barriers to employment for ethnic doctors). There would also seem to be no doubt that in some cases the process of public participation is being driven by the desire to ensure that support is maximised or opposition is minimized, for the policies pursued by public bodies, especially in sensitive areas. Additionally, issues evolving around participation are being limited by the need to be fiscally prudent.

For some, too much participation is seen as a threat. Schumpeter (1976) argued that the roles of voters and their representatives should not be confused. The task of electors was to periodically elect their representatives, who should then be allowed to get on with the task of governing. If citizens tried to hold their representatives to constant account or became more directly involved in the process of governing, the benefits of representative democracy would be lost. This view was taken up and extended by Sartori (1962) who developed the idea of 'competitive elitism'. He viewed the task of the electorate as simply deciding periodically which set of competing elites they wanted to govern them.

One does not have to accept the approaches of Schumpeter, Sartori or Burke, who stressed that members of parliament are representatives, not delegates (Macpherson, 1980), to acknowledge that not all forms of public participation may fit neatly with representative democracy, as it has been applied in liberal democracies. It may be possible for all citizens at most levels of government in the modern world, given the scope of the problem, if for no other reason, to directly participate in the formulation, making or implementation of public policy, except through referendums.

It can be argued therefore that participatory mechanisms that delegate powers of decision making away from representatives to bodies that are not directly elected on grounds of universal suffrage in some sense, marking a move away from formal political inequality. Does that mean, therefore, that greater participation by ethnic peoples, other than in referenda and similar mechanisms should be limited to consultation and advice? Can ethnic people's participation in policy and general decision-making be extended without undermining the formal political equality of liberal representative democracy?

Burnheim (1985) contends that the liberal representative approach should be replaced by an approach to democracy that abolishes generally representative politicians. People supporting such an approach argue either that the different areas of society should be run by people who have a particular interest in that area or that 'governing positions' should rotate between citizens. However there are also those who have a belief that a more direct form of democracy is not only

desirable but also feasible, given the ever-increasing developments in the use of computerised technology. There is no reason why, given the scope of computer and other forms of technology, that citizens should not be able to vote on issues, which are currently decided on by our elected political representatives. Support for such an idea was proposed by Wolff (1970) as early as the 1970s.

Whether such a development would be desirable is, however, another matter. There exists a long tradition among theorists who contend that citizens are simply not capable of making responsible decisions on issues of public concern. Plato (1974) argued that specialists were needed to govern, just as they were needed to captain a ship. Countering this position however is the contention that people learn to govern from participating in government, the stance of Mill (1910). How far 'the people', however defined, are capable of self-government in a direct and active sense remains a perennial debate in political theory.

Hirst (1990) observes that there is no 'democracy in the singular, rather there are a variety of doctrines of democracy and a variety of political mechanisms and decision procedures which are claimed to be democratic.

The wide terrain of literature on democracy is mapped out by examining key dimensions of liberal representative democracy and then highlighting major critiques of liberal democracy. This approach is adopted primarily because liberal democracy is the form found in Aotearoa / New Zealand. In addition, despite having obvious flaws in its practical implementation, liberal democracy enjoys

substantial popular support, as well as extensive dominance in both the realms of theoretical formulation and the domain of practical manifestation.

Central to liberal theory is the exercise and advancement of individual freedom. The freely given consent of citizens underpins the legitimacy of representative democracy (Kornberg and Clark, 1992). It needs to be stressed, however, that liberalism is not a unitary theory and in fact it is more accurate to recognise that a number of different liberalisms have been articulated reflecting the different historical and cultural contexts in which liberal ideas have taken root.

Frazer and Lacey (1993) contend that a particular version of liberalism has dominated political theory since the early 1970s – a version reflected in Rawls's 'A Theory of Justice (Rawls, 1971)'. This form of liberalism is deontological, that is, grounded in the Kantian view of the rights bearing, autonomous individual. It is, they observe, a version, which privileges certain themes in liberal thinking and excludes others. In particular, it de-emphasises themes in Rousseau's work such as the notion of equal political liberties and the idea that society has a status over and above that of the individuals who comprise it.

Frazer and Lacey (1993:43) assert that the belief in the possibility of a rationally and scientifically organised society, which has been an important motif of much welfare liberalism of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, tends to be marginalized as the value of individual liberty is given a central place, ruling out too much State intervention.

When the two traditions of liberalism and democracy are compared, it is clear that there are conflicting views and internal paradoxes in liberal democracy. For example, within liberalism some, like Rousseau, regard people as not truly free if they do not govern themselves, while others see participatory democracy as encroaching on individual freedom. Another paradox, which emerges from the emphasis on the rule of law and individual equality is the tendency towards homogeneity – which conflicts with the principle of liberal individualism (which affirms individual uniqueness and difference).

Liberal democratic theory is agnostic about notions of the good and of the ultimate human purpose. Society is made up of individuals freely associating with other individuals, engaging in spontaneous, autonomous and freely chosen collective action.

The individualism of liberal democracy excludes consideration of social structure. Social structures are patterned social relations and institutions, which have a more or less determinate shape and autonomous existence and which exert an influence on the individual's social identity and experience.

### **Rationalisation – In pursuit of more effective participation**

The following section is a discussion on how to approach more effective participant interaction. It is my belief that there is much within this discussion that ought to be considered when seriously contemplating effective participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policy in Aotearoa / New Zealand. There are two distinct approaches towards greater participation by ethnic peoples. These concern the notions of democratic right and policy delivery.

#### **Democratic Right**

One rationalization focuses on the democratic right to be involved in the policy process and the importance of all barriers to such involvement being reduced or withdrawn. The emphasis here is on :

- enabling access to the policy process,
- encouraging the take up of such access, and
- of ensuring that such participation when it does occur is capable of making a difference in policy outcomes.

The policy process is the locus for the articulation of values and preferences associated with policy options, and ethnic peoples participation is a means of bringing the pattern of values and preferences represented within the policy process closer to that existing within society as a whole. The non-inclusion/selective consultation of ethnic peoples lends weight to considerable doubts about various other methodologies, their inherent biases and assumptions,

and the scope for professional manipulation and therefore cannot bridge the gap between values and policy.

Ethnic peoples participation ought to be viewed as the right to have input into developing social policy that directly impacts upon their wellbeing and not just as a means towards an end. Ethnic peoples participation is a measure of the overall legitimacy of the policy process as a policy which has involved informed due consultation is assumed to operate with a greater level of consent, and this is, by definition, more desirable.

Such an approach is representative of associated trends towards consensus building (Innes, 1996). In consensus building the aim is to work towards a common vision of what can be achieved, before working out the details of how to achieve it. Policy becomes a continuous negotiation between policy makers, and the category of 'policy-maker' is drawn broadly to include many outside groups within civil society. Allied to this are recent developments in the area of 'deliberative democracy', which uses techniques such as 'focus groups' and citizens' juries to expand the role of public involvement. (Jacobs, 1997).

### **Policy delivery**

The second rationalization focuses on the effectiveness of policy delivery and considers how participation can assist in producing 'better' policy outcomes. Of course, 'better' could mean more in tune with society's values and preferences but there are also other important considerations in policy delivery, such as the following :

- does the policy achieve its stated goals?
- are there unintended and /or undesired consequences
- are the resource costs of implementation appropriate to the benefits of meeting policy goals?

This approach tends to view policy formulation and implementation as being integrally related, hence it is insufficient to limit the discussion of participation to reflect societal values in policy statement ; its role of putting these statements into practice also needs to be addressed.

A primary argument in favor of more participation suggests that the involvement of ethnic peoples, whether generally through consultation and surveys, or through representative groups, provides information to the policy process. This information may relate to ethnic people's preferences but may also be more specific and relate to local knowledge. The generation of such locally specific information, which may not be available to professional agencies, may help avoid inappropriate initiatives which are often associated with centralized schemes. This goes beyond the incorporation of the general public's preferences into policy goals and suggests that ethnic peoples hold key resources of knowledge that policy actors require in order to achieve policy goals.

Another significant argument is that appropriate participation by ethnic peoples may help avoid conflict during the policy process. Involving more parties and avoiding conflict is a test of the policy process's overall legitimacy. Incorporating relevant views and taking fuller account of the potential for conflict can prevent

delays and breakdowns in the policy process. Furthermore, continuing participation aids the smooth implementation of policy through to implementation, stressing the need for the continuing involvement of relevant sectors of the public throughout the policy process.

The distinction between a 'rights' approach to ethnic peoples participation and a 'policy delivery' approach is not always considered. This is particularly evident where the commitment to both legitimate and effective policy implies the transference of power within the policy process from professionals towards ethnic communities. Ethnic peoples participation should be in all stages of the policy development process, from setting the agenda, through the formulation of strategies and plans to detailed implementation and evaluation.

However, a problem which strikes at the heart of arguments for gaining greater ethnic peoples involvement, continues to be the apparent difficulty of actually achieving effective participation by all sectors of ethnic peoples. This often results in selective participation by vocal and well organized interest groups in negotiation with the professional bureaucracy. The costs of policy failure however impacts upon the entire community, perhaps more adversely on non participating sectors of the community.

Orthodox accounts have often assumed that non-participation reflects either a lack of interest in the policies under discussion or is indicative of frustrations encountered within political and professional structures. There is an assumption, sometimes implicit, that policy-makers do not positively encourage the

participation of ethnic peoples. This can however be changed by professionals altering their values, institutional norms and working practices. If, when and where there exists a perception of ethnic groups being potential threats to professional practice then such notions need to be challenged so that all affected can become involved and work constructively together. Powerful sectional interests can be better controlled by establishing and expanding appropriate channels for participation and ensuring equality of voice within the policy process.

There ought to be serious consideration towards initiatives which represent movement away from purely instrumental approach to public participation, where the ethnic communities are simply consulted on how to best implement policies and decisions, which have already been pre-empted

Some of the fundamental obstacles to effective participation are inherent in its very nature as a social process. There can be an over-emphasis of the demand for such opportunities.

Obstacles to effective participation arising from such demands are a central focus of institutional public choice theory.

### **Public choice theory**

The characteristic focus of public choice theory is on the incentives for participation within the political process and on the obstacles to effective participation. Within this context, public participation is conceptualised as a

collective action problem, where non-cooperative behavior (such as shirking and free-riding) may impact on the effectiveness of the process.

Following the seminal work of Olson (1965) regarding public choice, he argues that political activism for public policies which benefit large numbers of individuals is unlikely to be forthcoming. A single individual's participation is unlikely to have a sufficient impact on the political process to make up for the costs of engagement. As the results of the participation are non – excludable and indivisible (that is, they are a collective good), it is rational for individuals to free ride on the particular efforts of others, reaping the benefits without incurring the costs.

According to public choice theory, the exceptions to this logic of public non-participation tend to occur in small group situations where potential participants know each other. There is the prospect of strategic bargaining in an interactive social context. In these circumstances the increased possibility of monitoring and punishing free riding behavior may make participation more likely. The existence of ongoing social ties and the desire to maintain progressive relationships within their community can encourage ethnic peoples towards relatively high degrees of participation.

Alternatively, participation may be stimulated by the possibility of private selective incentives – benefits that may be enjoyed only by those who agree to co-operate. These may be of a material or non-material nature. For instance, individuals may obtain consumable goods, as a benefit of participation or the prospect of meeting

friends who share similar values and beliefs. The enjoyment of collective effort with these people may also be sufficient incentive to participate.

From a public choice perspective the underlying problems of wavering commitment and inactive participation in the policy process often results in the frequent capture of participation efforts by special interest groups. A special interest issue is defined as one which generates substantial personal benefits for a limited number of constituents, whilst imposing a small individual cost on a large number of other members of the public.

A final obstacle to effective participation identified by public choice theory is the phenomenon of rational ignorance ( Tullock, 1993 ). The point here is that collecting and processing information takes time, effort and resources ; it has a cost. Therefore, actors have to ensure that it is worthwhile expending these resources in terms of the likely benefits.

Public choice theory identifies a number of factors which influence the scale and nature of ethnic peoples participation on an issue. These include the following:

- costs of participation
- direct benefits of participation
- costs of non-participation
- expected likelihood of participation influencing policy outcome
- expected distribution of costs and benefits associated with the policy outcome

- level of knowledge of the policy issue and the policy process.

### **The Potential of Social Capital**

Social capital relates to the characterization of a society in terms of its democratic traits, central amongst which is the notion of participation.

Social capital constitutes the pre-existing elements of social structures which social actors can use to obtain their objectives. Coleman (1988) asserts that the existence of social capital facilities contributes towards the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible

Social capital encompasses the following :

- the extent of networks between individuals and group
- the density of relationships within those networks
- knowledge of relationships within networks
- the existence of obligations and expectations regarding these relationships  
i.e. promoting reciprocity
- other forms of local knowledge
- the level of trust between individuals and groups
- norms of routine behavior
- the existence and use of effective sanctions.

Identification of factors that underpin the collective action problem prompts identification of strategies to modify these factors and , thereby, alter the incentive structure for participation by ethnic peoples in the development of social policy.

Among such strategies are the following :

- reduction of the costs of participation eg. paying for child care, keeping meetings short.
- increasing direct benefits e.g. creating an opportunity for socializing
- making the impact of non participation in the policy decisions more explicit e.g. careful ‘ marketing ’ of policies
- reiterating the positives of policy outcomes.

A central issue concerns how to embed coercive participatory tactics that will foster more effective participation over the longer term. The sooner such initiatives can be pursued the greater the benefits that will accrue.

One of the failings of conventional public choice analysis, and especially collective action theory, has been the neglect of the ability of individuals and groups to actively change the structure of the incentives they face.

Ostrom (1990, 1996) demonstrated the capacity of local communities to supply their own mechanisms to overcome collective action problems in a dynamic process of institution building. Social networks which emphasize the value of information relationships and trust, can successfully overcome collective action problems. Such networks, I suggest, are increasingly abundant amongst ethnic

communities and ought to be better utilized to encourage greater participation overall in the development of social policy.

Repeated interaction and communication in small group settings allows individuals and groups to monitor one another and to exact sanctions with regards to non-cooperative behaviour. In these circumstances it is possible for people to develop a reputation, to learn what effects their actions will have on the achievement of their goals and to discover how to organise themselves in order to gain benefits and to avoid harms. Such 'social capital' can then assist solve problems on a longer term basis.

The claims made for social capital vary greatly. Putnam (1993) has claimed that the economic wealth of nations depends on its existence. Historical record strongly suggests that the successful communities became rich because they were civic, not the other way around .

Fox (1996) has examined the role of social capital in the strengthening of civil society in rural Mexico while Chong (1991), in a study of the US civil rights movement, has highlighted the importance of community solidarity and, in particular, the importance of the social rewards and sanctions that may be mobilised at the local scale. Building on this analysis, Chong has shown how incentive which cemented the congregations of local black churches, also provided the social building blocks for the mobilization of a much larger mass movement campaigning for the civil rights of African Americans.

Maloney et.al. (1988) have suggested the significance of social capital at the city level for explaining the degree of association and the activism of local voluntary sector groups.

Following Ostrom's (1990,1996) claims about the potential for social capital to embed participation practices, Ritchey-Vance (1996) also argue that building social capital can be a mechanism for maintaining community involvement over time. Brown & Ashman (1966) point to the role of social capital in fostering future problem solving, 'which will generate more social capital.' Others have argued that the existence of social capital contributes to the effectiveness of projects towards achieving their specific objectives. Building social capital may be important as an implementation tool.

Brown & Ashman (1963) found that participatory decision-making was more essential for grass roots based co-operation where the building of local organizations and networks was the most important form of social capital. For non-government organizations mediating cooperation, there was a greater emphasis on promoting inter-sectoral contacts across individual entities. In these circumstances, local champions or policy entrepreneurs could be very significant in determining outcomes and it further demonstrates that constrained or managed participation may be more effective in terms of appropriate policy delivery.

It is important to recognize that social capital theorists do not claim that all institutions and elements of social capital are necessarily positive. On the contrary, many political institutions contribute to perpetuating forms of negative

social capital. Interest groups and beauracratc may build on these to insulate themselves from political scrutiny and thus thwart the ability of other segments within the community to overcome social policy problems.

The outcome of building social capital is clearly dependent on the particular form of institutional design that is adopted.

Social capital emphasizes the importance of institutional design in shaping incentive structures and determining the nature of outcomes. By implication, it suggests the importance of institutions redesigning these structures and changing the nature of collective action. ‘ Institutional redesign ’ refers to a package of measures which will shape the ways in which actors within a community will interact over the medium to long term. This includes organization matters, such as the :

- nature of arenas for interaction
- role of actors within interactions
- assignment of rights and duties to actors
- rules of interaction, including monitoring and enforcement and the norms and routine practices of interaction such as :
  - language of interaction
  - handling of conflicts
  - building of agreement, compromises and trade-offs
  - presentation and self-presentation of actors and the interaction process.

Lam (1996) suggests that various important features of institutions are necessary for the creation, and maintenance of social capital. These include

- multiple arenas at different levels for working out conflict
- various domains of autonomy for actors to exercise their problem solving capacities
- carefully defined public participation to reduce the costs of participation by limiting its scope at different points
- ensuring that higher levels support the problem solving of lower levels
- rules to enhance the complementarity of interests between actors
- establishing symbiotic relationships
- norms, with emphasis on mutual dependence
- group-oriented incentives
- use of authority to enhance co-ordination and reduce the transaction costs of co-operation
- aligning authority with responsibility
- constraints on asymmetries in and the abuse of power, which hinder communication and social learning, and dampen the incentives of those in subordinate positions: for example, the rotation of leadership.

The adoption of such abovementioned features would, I believe, encourage ethnic peoples to actively engage in pursuing the benefits of social capital. The level and rate of participation will vary across ethnic groups dependent largely

upon the ability to mobilize their memberships and resources, and the seriousness of concerns being addressed.

### **Conclusion**

What then does one make of the varying contentions regarding participation, and more specifically the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policy which impact upon their wellbeing? Whether one encourages participation and the type of participation one supports, will, in many instances be discriminatory. One's approach will depend upon what one thinks is desirable either for individuals or for society at large.

Attitudes towards ethnic peoples participation will also relate to how well their potential and capabilities are appreciated, understood and articulated.

Increasingly leaders of industry and enterprise, and those in key policy positions, within the public sector particularly, will be challenged to successfully engage participation by ethnic peoples in developing social policy that impacts upon their well being. Pertinent questions that will require in -depth deliberations will include the following:

- how effective are efforts by political leaders and local and central government managers to appease ethnic peoples concerns and in so doing improve the legitimacy of their actions within ethnic communities?

- is the aim to genuinely improve policy and decision-making and to give members of the ethnic communities real participation in policy and decision-making?
- are ethnic peoples, because of their experience, knowledge, positions in society better placed to determine and progress their well being?

Informed responses to these and other equally important related questions impact upon approaches to participation. Qualitative research methodology empowers ethnic participants towards participating and thus provides informed responses to issues affecting their wellbeing. A discussion of qualitative research methodology undertaken in this research follows in the next chapter.

## Chapter Five

### Methodology & Ethical Considerations

#### Introduction

Knowledge is seen as being actively created rather than as fixed 'stock' dispensed by experts to passive ill-informed recipients. Often by 'experts' far removed from the life experiences being encountered. Qualitative research methodology involves more than merely acquiring facts. Qualitative research develops people's potential for creativity and provides for societies disadvantaged and marginalized sectors, such as its' ethnic peoples, to actively participate towards enhancing their wellbeing.

From the outset I realized that the research I was undertaking was an area about which I knew very little about and would be exploratory in nature. I aimed to learn as much as I could from a cross section of information sources within a specified time and in a managed fashion.

I became aware that participant's knowledge, skills and life experiences were related to themes. Themes emerge when there is discovery of relationships and when personal experiences are matched to broader trends in society. Links are discovered between, for example, local and national dimensions, or between cultural, social, economic and religious orientations.

Qualitative research methodology undertaken in this research discusses

- The rationale for the choice of Research Design
- Ethical considerations
- Details of fieldwork

### **Rationale for the Research Design**

The primary objectives of this research are as follows:

- to identify those issues in society which are of concern to ethnic peoples.
- to identify barriers which limit the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policies, which may affect them
- to ascertain opportunities where ethnic peoples can contribute to the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Qualitative research assumes that there are multiple realities and that social facts are understood through interaction, perception and interpretation. The intention of the researcher going into the field was to document and understand rather than to discover, measure or predict. The researcher seeks to explore the roles and perceptions of key actors. During this process however I was also able to discover through careful listening and analytical ability additional dimensions of inquiry which contributed to enriching my research through new sources of knowledge and insights.

The techniques involved assist the researcher in learning about the participant's own frameworks and understanding of a situation. (Lofland, 1971). Qualitative research methods in the form of interviews and documentary analysis are used in this thesis.

A characteristic of qualitative research is that it does not generalise the experiences of a whole population but rather it provides a description of people's experiences at a given time or location. Primarily, qualitative research is concerned with understanding how people make sense of their lives, experiences and structures of the world. It is concerned with processes rather than products and is inductive in its methods, building concepts, hypothesis and theories from details. (Crosswell, 1994)

In discussing qualitative research methods Patton (1990), provides several key points. He states that ' the researcher is the instrument '. Open-mindedness, honesty and rigour of the researcher are especially critical issues when using methodologies which rely on interpretive processes.

Qualitative inquiry typically focuses on detail with relatively small samples, providing a wealth of data.

Drawing on the work of Lofland (1971), Patton (1990) outlines the following people oriented mandates in collecting qualitative data:

- the qualitative methodologist must get close enough to the people and situation being studied so as to be able to understand in depth the details of what the situation presents
- the qualitative methodologist aims to capture what actually takes place and what people actually say.
- qualitative data includes a great deal of descriptive material re peoples, activities, interactions, and settings.
- qualitative data must include direct quotations from people, both oral and written.

Lofland (1971) emphasises that in qualitative research the researcher is learning about a situation through the participants' understanding of what is happening in that situation. Therefore the researcher must seek to understand the participant's own frameworks and terms for understanding a situation.

Patton (1990:14) claims that qualitative research inquiry is particularly suited to process studies, documenting development over time, implementation, evaluations and legislative monitoring. Relevant to this research project are the following important features of qualitative inquiry:

- that the inquiry is naturalistic in that actual situations are encountered as they unfold
- that systems are viewed as dynamic and that change is assumed to be ongoing

- that research findings are understood within their specific social, historical and temporal context, and
- that the research design is flexible and able to be modified to meet changing situations and to gain understanding of the processes involved.

While interviews and observations are often regarded as separate activities, Patton (1990:32) emphasises that in reality they are interconnected. Interviewing requires good observational skills. In the course of observing social phenomenon , especially if one is a participant observer, one is likely to have opportunities to question other participants in the field.

The findings of a research study are more likely to be more convincing, accurate and valid where the data has been drawn from different credible sources rather than from one approach. (Patton, 1990). Triangulation strategies are incorporated into this research design. Triangulation is a procedure for establishing validity in qualitative research and involves the use of data from several sources so that a range of evidence may substantiate the conclusions (Elsner, 1991). This is evident in the emergent themes of this research.

### **Conclusion**

If people are to be enabled to have an effective involvement in social transformation, they need to gain a critical understanding both of the society in which they live and to be able to contribute to, and appreciate alternative visions which people share. Such understanding must be conveyed without malice and with the aim being for the wellbeing of the Common Good. Qualitative research

methodology has enabled me to undertake this research in a professional , dignified manner . This involved being able to establish a very good professional rapport with all research participants, supervisors and associated staff members.

## **Research Design**

### **Fieldwork**

#### **Qualitative Data**

Qualitative approaches to data collection usually involves direct interaction with individuals on a one to one basis. Data collection methods are time consuming and consequently data is often collected from small numbers such as the ten participants in this research. The benefits which accrue include the richness of data and deeper insights gained into the phenomena under study.

The data from this qualitative research is derived from face to face interviews.

#### **The Interview(s)**

I undertook structured interviews and I used a structured schedule of questions.(Appendix 3) The open ended nature of the questions defined the topic under investigation but also provided both myself as the interviewer and the interviewee (s) opportunities to discuss some topics in more detail. Where the interviewee had difficulty answering a question or provided only a brief response, I was able to utilise cues or prompts to encourage the interviewee to consider the question further.

As I was able to decide the nature and scope of the questions in advance I endeavored to remain open and receptive to unexpected information shared by the interviewee. I endeavored to undertake the interviews within the stipulated timeframe without compromising the interviewee's response.

The interviews were conducted in a professional, considered manner with the aim being to ensure that the interviewees were relaxed and felt comfortable participating in the process which was akin to conversing / discussing rather than responding in a question and answer situation. This also recognized and acknowledged interviewees varying ethnic and cultural norms that prefer dissemination of information through appropriate informed dialogue.

It quickly became apparent that good quality qualitative interviews are the result of rigorous preparation. The development of the interview schedule, progressing the interview and analysis of the interview data all required careful consideration and preparation.

I undertook to tape record the interviews as this allowed me to concentrate on listening and responding to the interviewee without distraction. I found that this enabled discussions to flow as I did not have to write down the response to one question before moving on the next. I was aware that in note taking there is an increased risk of interviewer bias because one is likely to make notes of the comments which make immediate sense, or which are perceived as being directly relevant or particularly interesting. Tape recording helps to ensure that the whole of the data from an interview is captured. Cues which may have been missed can

be picked up when listening to the recording. Interviewees may also feel inhibited if the interviewer suddenly starts to take notes and they may wonder why what they have just said was of particular interest.

I used a small unobtrusive good quality tape recorder with an in built microphone. I felt this made the participants less self-conscious. The auto reverse facility meant that the tape could automatically 'turn itself over' where there was limited recording time available on one side of the tape. While consent for the use of the tape recorder was established in the earlier stages, I reaffirmed this at the commencement of the interviews. The flow of the interview was largely dictated by the research participant.

### **Transcribing Qualitative Data**

I transcribed each of the ten interviews. These were full 'scripts' of the interview and while transcribing I attempted to note key points. Tone and inflection provided me with an indication of the interviewees' certainty, enthusiasm and concern about issues being discussed.

Each transcript was then sent out to the respondent. This was in keeping with the mutually agreed research ethics protocol and allowed each participant to edit their transcripts as they saw fit and to comment on or clarify their responses

### **Data Analysis**

Data analysis involves summarising the mass of data collected and presenting the results in a way that communicates the most important features. I was interested

in discovering the big picture through using the data to describe understand and articulate phenomena.

As I read through the transcripts, I noted key points. I used a content analysis process to identify and label items of data. In this way all items of data in one interview could be compared to that collected in the other interviews.

### **Content Analysis**

Content analysis is a procedure which provides for the categorising of verbal or behavioural data for the purposes of classification, summarisation and tabulation. Content may be analysed on two levels. The basic level of analysis presents outlines of the data as it was received. Interpretation of that data is the next level and is concerned with what is meant by the response , and what is inferred and/or implied.

Content analysis involves coding and classifying data. It may also be referred to as categorising or indexing. The basic idea is to identify from the transcripts the extracts of data that are informative and key messages which emerge from the content of each interview and then to identify any emerging themes which are common across the interviews.

To do this the following steps were undertaken:

- drawing up a grid that had the list of interview questions down one side and the ten participants identified in code along the top of the page.

- reading through each transcript thoroughly and noting the information provided in its appropriate column. Any recurring themes were highlighted in different colours. This made recognition of data much easier when reviewing the transcripts at a later stage.
- on completion I had a list of items gathered from each of the ten transcripts as well as a good indication of recurring themes which then enabled me to examine and identify each response and any possible 'links' across the categories.
- I then referred back to the original transcripts and re-examined the contents for any information, which may have been incorrectly categorised or inadvertently left out. This enabled me to further identify themes, including minor and major categories.

By this process I sought to ensure that the content analysis resulted in categorising data in such a way that the resulting themes and categories used to summarise and describe the findings were an accurate reflection of the data.

### **Findings**

Once I had identified themes including minor and major categories, I was then in a position to utilise these to further discuss the outcomes of the interviews. These include a discussion on the main themes of the research findings.

Further 'evidence' to support the findings is provided by using direct quotations from the respondents. Where applicable, key quotations are selected to illustrate the meaning of the data. Quotations are used because they are good examples of

what people have said about the issue being discussed. They illustrate features such as: the strength of opinion or belief; similarities between respondents; differences between respondents and the breadth of ideas.

Many of the quotations will 'speak for themselves' as they are examples of the manifest level of analysis – what people actually said. However some analysis of data is carried out at the latent or interpretive level, which involves extracting the meaning of what was said. Quotations also demonstrate the reliability and validity of the data analysis and further re-emphasises the strength of belief and conviction that research participants felt in the responses they gave. '...he who feels it, knows it ..' (Marley , 1945 –1981).

### **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical Considerations central to undertaking this qualitative research, included confidentiality, informed consent, trust, cross cultural research and instrumentation.

#### **Confidentiality**

Confidentiality was a vital aspect of this research. Research participants all willingly participated in this research and expressed their opinions and views knowing that their personal anonymity was assured. (Appendix 1).

#### **Informed consent**

Informed consent was gained from all research participants and again sought prior to undertaking the interviews and, on occasions, at different stages

throughout the research. This I felt was important, as both researcher and prospective participant often do not have full knowledge of the types of events that may unfold during the research process. (Appendix 2)

### **Trust**

The building of trust is a developmental task. Trust is not something that suddenly appears after certain matters have been accomplished, but is something to be carefully considered and to be mindful of each day. Trust is not established once and for all; it is fragile, and even trust that has been a long time building can be destroyed overnight in the face of an ill-advised or ill considered action.

Establishing and maintaining trust between research participants, my supervisors and myself was a process which commenced at the very outset. This entailed establishing clear, effective avenues of communication and the ability to engage in constructive analytical discussions as dictated by the progress of the thesis. This ethical consideration was further reinforced in considerations expressed in the Information Sheet (Appendix 1) and Consent Form (Appendix 2). In my role as researcher I always ensured that all details of appointments / engagements were mutually arranged and that all participants were kept fully informed as to the various developmental stages of the thesis.

### **Cross Cultural Research**

An ethical dilemma presented itself in undertaking this research. This related to studying multi-ethnic perspectives different from my own. Often such perspectives are targets of social researchers who use them for their own research

purposes without acknowledging their own powerful position or without giving anything back to the group.

Research on non Pakeha ethnic peoples, for example continues, in the main, to be undertaken by Pakeha researchers and academics, often with very little awareness of finer cultural intricacies needed to fully engage participants. While academic careers have advanced, the participants themselves have gained very little from it. Unless there are aims and objectives in the research, which are directed towards change and the advancement of these peoples, research is pointless. Adopting the traditional academic stance of the detached observer (or even the participant observer in many cases) who takes no responsibility for the consequences of what is borne out of the research are insufficient.

Interacting and engaging participants from diverse ethnic backgrounds must involve the recognition of the researcher's own cultural conditioning and bias and how this can influence the research process. It is not possible to observe other cultures and claim a neutral value free stance. Our cultural conditioning influences our choice of topics, who the research participants will be, how the questions will be phrased and how the information will be interpreted.

Acknowledging this bias and the unequal nature of the relationship between the participant and the researcher is a more honest way of proceeding than those researchers who use traditional research methods which ignore this power imbalance and which claim to be value free.

Throughout the undertaking of the research there is an underlying commitment towards ensuring that the entire process is undertaken ethically as stipulated in the respective institutional and professional codes of both the researcher and that of the respective research participants.

A range of key individuals active within the ethnic community were approached and informal discussions about the nature and extent of the research project were undertaken. From these, key participants were identified.

I chose not to be selective within specific ethnic groupings to prevent personal bias and to ensure a more equitable representation of a cross section of ethnic peoples and to ensure that there was mixed gender representation. The final list of research participants were also selected after I had undertaken much fruitful discussions with my supervisors.

I then arranged and undertook initial discussions with prospective research participants. Upon clarification of their commitment, research participants were each given information sheets (Appendix 2) that clarified the aims and objectives of the research, key ethical considerations and research supervisory details. Ethical considerations include the right of withdrawal from the research at any time, and participant confidentiality. (Appendix 1)

In the intervening period prior to undertaking the research interviews, I developed and maintained positive dialogue with each of the research participants and informed of them of developments as required. I found all the research

participants to be very enthusiastic and supportive throughout the process. I sensed that they, much like myself, believed strongly in the merits of the research topic and hence were naturally enthused about the research. There is no doubt in my mind that being an ethnic person with some insight into the intricacies of the research topic, together with my life experiences, provided me with constructive pathways towards being able to engage research participants for this research undertaking.

The research participants posed no limitations concerning the use of the English language. There were however limitations that presented themselves whilst conducting the interviews specifically where research participants responses took into account their loyalty to their office and/or of their official status.

### **Instrumentation**

I used structured interviewing as my primary method of gathering data. This was complimented with reference to publicly accessible documentation.

The kind of information I was seeking demanded that the interviewer allowed for the free expression of attitudes, perceptions and experiences. Additionally, I was aware that I needed some kind of structure to the interview to be able to order and analyze the data. I therefore chose the technique of the 'structure interview' because it allowed for the flexibility needed to access the necessary information through carefully focused questions which were centered around a central theme, that of ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy. The interview questions were carefully phrased to ensure that they were relevant and

centered on the objectives of the research topic. The questions were structured individually and topically to be both interesting, contemporary and challenging. This was commented on by participants who provided positive feedback as to the relevance, importance, timeliness and scope of the interview topic and associated questions.

### **Conclusion**

Qualitative research methodology enabled ethnic research participants to provide in-depth considered responses during the interview process. This contributed towards the objectives of the research being addressed. Research participants were enthusiastic as indicated by their dialogue and appreciative that they were able to express their thoughts and concerns about issues concerning their wellbeing.

Qualitative interview methodology generates a large quantity of data. Key themes emanating out of the research data are explored in the following chapter

## Chapter Six

### Research Findings & Key Themes

#### Introduction

This chapter focuses on exploring major themes emanating from the research data. The themes complement the following research objectives :

- to identify those issues in society which are of concern to ethnic peoples
- to identify barriers which limit the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policies which may affect their wellbeing.
- to ascertain major avenues through which ethnic peoples may participate in and contribute to the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

#### Key Themes

Key themes reflect the common elements which emerged in the interviews. A list of the research interview questions is attached as Appendix 3.

Research participants identified the following **key** areas as being of importance when deliberating more effective participation in social policy processes :

- Wellbeing
- Language
- Employment
- Discrimination

- Political Representation
- Treaty of Waitangi
- Infrastructure
- Barriers to Participation

( Appendix 6 presents a summary of Research participants responses to interview questions).

I will now discuss each of the above subheadings in turn. At the end of each discussion I have included appropriate direct quotes from research participants and these further emphasize to the reader that qualitative research methodology enables raw data to be presented in a balanced fashion which reflects the research participants reality.

### **Wellbeing**

It appears that to date there has been very little research undertaken which has specifically addressed ethnic peoples mental health issues. There appears to be a prevailing attitude that most ethnic peoples are well adjusted , as reflected in their low rates of crime and divorce as well as their generally high educational and occupational attainment.

There are vital aspects to well-being and preconditions without which it cannot be achieved or sustained and these relate to the freedom to participate, freedom

to be, freedom to develop innate, acquired and new capacities, freedom as a right to exercise and to be seen as capable of exercising that right.

The term wellbeing encompasses issues of identity, the ability to contribute, being able to practice one's culture without being made to feel apologetic, being able to contribute through appropriate consultation, opportunity to access appropriate timely information, being helped to feel comfortable within Aotearoa / New Zealand society through positive integration, acceptance and participation, being able to pursue positive Human Rights.(Appendix 5).

Mental wellbeing is an area of increasing concern. Often the burden of just being able to cope with ordinary everyday issues presents obstacles which impact upon the ability of ethnic peoples to participate in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing.

Research participants expressed that at the coalface, ethnic peoples are increasingly having to address issues such as:

- racial and cultural prejudice
- coping with the fallout of being labeled a 'minority'
- undesirable stereotypical attitudes
- the difficulty of preserving cultural identity and traditions whilst juggling everyday issues
- the ever present possibility of alienation.

Research participants were of the opinion that ethnic peoples' mental health continues to be significantly affected by adaptational problems which is further compounded by their inability to utilize mental health services, specifically their access to such services. Collectively these factors have a negative effect on social interaction and integration and often result in depression, stress, and low self esteem.

Often they find that they have to negotiate complex and copious wads of written, oral and technological information to be able to successfully interact with organizational officials who often, do not adequately appreciate the issues that ethnic peoples often present.

Despite such obstacles towards successful integration it is acknowledged, that here in Aotearoa / New Zealand society in general is supportive, tolerant and encouraging towards ethnic peoples. This, it is felt, is indicative of the Kiwi tradition of being given 'a fair go.'

It is considered that participation in the various stages of development of social policy that affects wellbeing is desirable and at times, crucial. Decision makers and social policy analysts need to enable and enhance ethnic people's involvement in participation at the individual, organizational and societal level.

Without constructive dialogue and participation, resulting social policy is less likely to be effective both in its assessment of ethnic peoples needs and in its implementation. Accountable Central and Local government agencies must be

accountable with regards to providing the impetus towards ensuring ethnic peoples wellbeing needs are being constructively addressed. Attaining any measure of progress within organizations in today's liberal democratic socio / political environment entails being able to communicate effectively.

**Research participants responses:**

‘ wellbeing probably means something like being able to feel included and accepted in New Zealand society so not only being able to participate but being able to practice ones own culture and religion, dress appropriately or conduct ones own lives according to your own cultural needs or world view but still being an accepted system. ’

‘ I believe it is important that ethnic peoples are well established – that they have jobs, equal access to schools and welfare and other facilities like any other New Zealander, that they can practice their culture, their religion without the fear of persecution and discrimination...’

‘ we are talking about ethnic people who are in a minority whose wellbeing means integration into the community in a way that they feel valued, they feel at home, they feel they can contribute to society and they feel they are not discriminated against, they can actually go about their local business like anyone else..’

‘ Two things – one is social and the other is mental wellbeing. Social wellbeing refers to being able to act freely with out any prejudice, with society at large, and

the other is mental wellbeing. There are a lot of issues that impact on wellbeing – migrants come from countries with very different systems, not understanding the systems in New Zealand can put them on the back foot with regard to income, not accessing services, emergency and health services. – this is most likely to introduce stress to the family – there is also a huge reliance on each other in that context – this is when the stress builds up quite significantly and ultimately affecting mental health.’

### **Language**

Language clearly emerged as the major theme impacting on ethnic peoples wellbeing and ability to participate in social policy processes. Varying levels of English language proficiency critically affect the ability of ethnic peoples to articulate their many concerns regarding their wellbeing.

The inability to communicate effectively with / within the dominant culture / host population has been identified as an important factor influencing the psychological well being of ethnic peoples, more so those who are new immigrants, refugees and student sojourners. A lack of language proficiency affects all aspects of ethnic peoples’ lives and exacerbates virtually every problem encountered.

Research participants expressed that within their own communities it was often the older persons, women, young children and recently arrived refugees who were most severely disadvantaged. In such instances the burden then fell upon their older children or younger extended family or friends to act as translators.

While this is at times effective, there are also inherent communication problems /misunderstandings as often younger persons are not able to advocate adequately for their older folk or their families.

Research findings indicate that ethnic peoples continue to be subjected to discrimination and stereotypical attitudes by members of the host community because of their limited English language proficiency, differing accents and speaking habits . There continue to be further problems when ethnic children leave home as often their elderly folk are left to deal with isolation , due not only to their lack of proficiency in the English language but with the added associated problems of being left without much needed family support and, transport.

Interestingly it was also felt that there is now a growing need being expressed by ethnic peoples towards being able to become proficient in their own mother tongues . It would seem that this is emerging as a need for those who have been using and encountering the English language in their everyday life over a prolonged period and, consequently have become 'rusty' in the use of their own mother tongues.

Many ethnic peoples continue their language maintenance through voluntary communal initiatives such as language nests held at their community centers. An increasing number of initiatives through appropriate ethnic peoples orientated programmes on radio and television is viewed as being vital in assisting them develop more adequate consultation processes.

Inadequate English language skills are often major barriers that have a direct and real impact economically. Every single ethnic person who is capable, able and willing but yet unable to secure adequate employment which allows them to participate, and make a real contribution economically is a huge slight on our economy. There is more than a hint of truth in that there are many highly motivated ethnic peoples who are often left frustrated and consequently become a burden economically and socially as they refrain from participating due to feeling demoralised and stigmatized.

**Research participants responses:**

‘ there is a constant barrage of issues pertaining to language. This is a significant barrier – I question that because many migrants are already tested for their language skills before they come here..’

‘ the system itself is a barrier, it is non complex system which is some-what structured and somewhat fragmented as well, many migrants are used to very structured systems with the right way of doing things’

‘ these barriers can be overcome with consultation with the ethnic community, inform them of the perceived barriers, ask them if there are more barriers and once barriers are identified, ask them how they are going to work on it – then interpret it in a very culturally sensitive way and make recommendations on how to overcome this and make sure it is embraced by public sector agencies that are entrusted to developing social policy. ’

‘ one of the things is that information has to be available in a form that people can relate to- there are often going to be language uses, where English is a second language, and particularly for people who learn English late in life – it is very difficult to deal with complex issues in a language.’

### **Employment**

Many ethnic persons continue to have difficulty finding suitable or adequate employment and this despite often being able to overcome the language barrier and / or being suitably qualified, willing and able.

Often it is viewed as insulting and / or condescending when employment initiatives are negated through lame everyday excuses couched in unnecessary, often unfounded fears. These tend to reflect unfair discriminatory attitudes on the part of employers. Education in the benefits of a good employer ought to be made mandatory and initiatives towards attaining these ought to be a given consideration by both the State and private sector. The trickle-down benefits arising from this would be enormous and beneficial for all sectors. There is also much to be said with regards to better educating local communities about the need to break out of their comfort zones, both psychologically and in their everyday actions, in order to better appreciate those ethnic peoples who want nothing more than to contribute towards a better society.

Research participants were adamant that often ethnic peoples were unfairly discriminated against when seeking employment due to their qualifications not being recognized, lack of workplace experience or due to their specific gender

and ethnicity. Additionally, some research participants felt that often employers perceived certain ethnic peoples as being ‘ threats’ due to their enterprising natures.

Research findings indicate that there seems to be little recognition by key organizational decision makers, that for decades members of the dominant culture have benefited by having little competition with regard to school admissions, jobs and having access to government programs. Such resources have assisted propel many non ethnic peoples and their descendents into the middle and upper classes while ‘others ’ continue to be left behind , forgotten and invisible. There exists a need for affirmative action program’s to assist ethnic peoples into gainful employment and hence increase their ability to participate and to contribute.

Assertions that ethnic peoples displace other sectors of the population with regard to employment and thus contributing to job losses is unfortunate. Other contributing factors such de-industrialization , migration , downsizing , corporate layoffs , early retirement , technological innovation and computer automation are often overlooked.

**Research participant responses:**

‘ racist , gender bias employers who are seemingly increasingly xenophobic’

‘ language barriers- in sufficient written or oral skills

‘religious and cultural barriers ’

‘insufficient appropriate opportunities’ ‘

‘institutional biases’

### **Discrimination**

Research participants readily acknowledge that discrimination in its many forms with regard to ethnic peoples is unfortunately, ‘alive and well’ in today’s socio / political environment. However it becomes more than just an unnecessary irritant when there is inherent institutional discrimination within key societal organizations or where it is perpetuated by influential decision makers. This is viewed as disturbing as often such short-sightedness has the potential of having detrimental long-lasting effects particularly in the development of appropriate social policy, and also on ethnic peoples themselves.

Generalized suspicions and stereotypes towards entire groupings of peoples are unjust and wasteful of talent and skills.

Research participants were of the view that there must also be recognition of the diversity and complexity of needs within each differing ethnic community. This complexity is often overlooked by policy analysts, many of whom are often unable to adequately interact with ethnic peoples for a whole host of reasons which include personal limitations such as being monolingual, religious and personal beliefs and, at times, blind adherence to organizational and party political ideologies.

Within each ethnic peoples community there exist differences in terms of traditions, age, educational attainment, income, languages spoken and ability to communicate in the English language. This highlights the need for policy analysts to ensure that their consultations / deliberations are undertaken with due considerations and are indeed true indications of the situation at hand and not merely accepted as being such when in reality they are the views of a selected few. Often these 'selected few' are amongst the more influential ethnic peoples. Often the views of these 'selected few' are readily mistakenly accepted as being a fair representation of ethnic peoples.

**Research participants responses:**

'institutional, cultural ,and language barriers '

'qualifications not recognized by employers '

' I think one is ignorance, a suitable degree of awareness needs to be developed within government and local government agencies about the existence , the extent and the needs and the aspirations of ethnic peoples in New Zealand. So the first thing is to move from ignorance to knowledge, moving to a 'us & us' situation rather than a 'them' and 'us.' '

**Political Representation**

It is anticipated that as the population of ethnic peoples grows there will be greater representation within the political arena at both the central and local government levels. The advent of MMP has seen a greater number of ethnic

peoples enter the political arena. Ethnic peoples participation and their acceptance by their peers has altered the constitution of parliament and the ways by which groups can have access to political representation and decision making. In terms of ethnicity this change has been dramatic and it is felt that there will be even more diversity of representation at a parliamentary level. This, I feel, is long overdue. It not only demonstrates a more inclusive democracy but, more importantly, it allows ethnic peoples to become more participatory and in so doing, enabling responsibility for their wellbeing.

**Research participants responses:**

‘ I think MMP is definitely a movement in the direction in terms of increased participation as it provides the possibility for people who are not part of the mainstream or dominant culture but who are a significant minority to get representation on their own terms.’

‘ I think that we should always be looking to encourage – the government has to have a positive policy of looking to increase participation within government because the kind of culture that exists within government departments is usually driven by the dominant Pakeha culture but also by the peculiar government department culture which is itself exclusionary and quite often elitist so the only way to address those things is that you have to bring fresh ways of thinking - trying to encourage increased diversity within government staff, in key locations as well.’

### **Treaty of Waitangi**

Research participants were unanimous in their view that The Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of our nation of Aotearoa / New Zealand. Some view it as perhaps the first significant social policy document in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Despite this recognition it is felt by research participants that ethnic peoples generally do not understand the significance nor the potential impact of the Treaty of Waitangi on their wellbeing.

Reference was made particularly to Article the Third of the Treaty which concerns the rights of citizenship and concerns all ' New Zealanders ' . However it is also felt that that social policy makers must be mindful of Article Two issues which need to be addressed in relation to disparities, deprivation and inequities affecting Maori people.

Ethnic peoples however, in general, need to better appreciate that within the partnership dealings between Maori and the Crown there has been fundamental damage done to collective and individual mana, mauri and rangatiratanga concerning Maori peoples . Such an appreciation is , I suggest, in the very least, a considered moral recognition by many ethnic peoples for whom matters philosophical and ideological are similar to those of the tangata whenua. Ultimately due respect must be given to those who are the indigenous peoples of this land.

Social policy initiatives that affect wellbeing ought to be undertaken with sensitivity so that there is no further damage. Ethnic peoples must be strong enough to add value to the process and not be seen to be party to divisiveness. This is in keeping with the spirit of citizenship vested upon them and importantly contributes to maintaining one's mana.

When engaged in Treaty of Waitangi considerations there needs to be appreciation of the fact that many Maori do not subscribe to being identified as being 'New Zealander' first and then Maori, but rather the reverse. Identity with their tribal links are held first and foremost. This is similar to the position for many ethnic peoples themselves who identify with their particular ethnicity first, then as being New Zealander.

It ought to be appreciated that such a distinction however does not demean being a New Zealander. It is not any less significant to being identified as an Indian, Irish or Japanese New Zealander. It merely gives due recognition to one's true identity. It also empowers one to be able to feel pride and to be confident in the knowledge that within today's liberal democratic environment there is no need to undermine one's culture or true identity. This is fundamentally different to being assimilated to become like one of the dominant culture as such illusive goals are often pursued but never attained.

There is significant contemporary debate between Pakeha and Maori about the Treaty of Waitangi. To date in this debate there has been little consideration given to the citizenship status of ethnic people or what impact such contemporary debates could have on the wellbeing of ethnic peoples.

The resultant fallout of contemporary debates on the relevance/ status of the Treaty of Waitangi has the potential to sour relationships if not engaged in with due thought towards benefiting our common good. I suggest that it ought to be a matter of concern to ethnic peoples that there exists the potential that their silence on important contemporary debates could lend itself to unfavourable misinterpretations. One needs to ask why is there a limited response, if at all, from representative ethnic peoples organizations on such important contemporary socio / political debates. It ought to be remembered that participating is far more productive than seeking to participate or conveniently sitting on the fence.

Research participants expressed the view that there ought to be affirmative action taken towards educating ethnic peoples more fully about the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi. Significantly not one of the research participants were dismissive of the Treaty of Waitangi nor of the importance of the partnership between Maori and the Crown.

Questions have also been raised about the extent of commitment by ethnic peoples towards better understanding the actual Articles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Three versions of the Treaty of Waitangi are attached as Appendix 4.

These provide the reader with an overview of the contents of the Treaty of Waitangi and ought to assist towards attaining a deeper understanding of the significance of what is essentially an increasingly significant first social policy document.

### **Research participants responses:**

‘ The Treaty of Waitangi is a constitutional arrangement between the crown and tangata whenua. It is a very crucial document – it’s a world leader in terms of relationship’s between migrants and the indigenous people ..’

‘ how does it impact on people – the relationship in terms of land use, in terms of protocols in organizations, in terms of their own cultural sensitivities there are quite significant implications on a day to day basis.’

‘ in terms of immigrants people I think that the Treaty of Waitangi should be a basic part of peoples orientation – people should understand what it is when they come here – it is also seems to me that in terms of the issues of inequality and exclusion that Maori people face in Aotearoa in a sense people who are of a non European descent are natural allies in that struggle because for example, if you come from India , you know what its like to be colonized by the English

‘ all peoples who come here as Taiwi need to recognize that the Treaty of Waitangi is what gives us the right to be here.’

### **Infrastructure**

It is apparent that ethnic peoples are often unnecessarily adversely affected by / through their frustrating dealings with numerous societal organizational infrastructures. Included in these are numerous bureaucratic organizations both at central and local government level that ethnic peoples encounter.

Negative encounters impact on wellbeing due to the resultant anxiety and associated stress. It is felt by research participants that there ought to be improvement in the nature of involvement and the quality of consultation engaged in by officials. This can be achieved by making organizations more accountable, through employing appropriate staff who are skilled enough to be able to achieve organizational goals and by ensuring that there is adequate representation and wider consultation when addressing ethnic peoples issues.

Organizational bureaucratic staff ought to be given appropriate training aimed at dealing with ethnic peoples. Employing informed ethnic peoples would also assist towards alleviating anxieties when dealing with bureaucracy.

Clearly ethnic peoples experiences within the maze which constitutes government and officialdoms infrastructure continues to present difficulties. While the Office of Ethnic Affairs is seen as a positive development within the State infrastructure, satisfaction is often dictated by the quality of the official one encounters within bureaucracy.

### **Research participants responses:**

‘ if people aren’t able to participate then it will lead to increased exclusion therefore intolerance – it’s just divisive in terms of those who are ‘in’ and those who are ‘out’ and maintain inequality – in the past that has been a deliberate policy to exclude certain persons / groups ’

‘ there is also the question of the protections in law for people to be able to practice their culture – religious and other cultural traits as well ’

‘ the real issue is how people in the dominant culture accept and value other peoples ways of doing things and the contribution that makes to the wider society – whether people see diversity as enhancing society or threatening it ’

### **Barriers**

Major factors identified as presenting barriers which impact on ethnic peoples participation are largely linked with acculturation attitudes. Acculturation refers to changes in behavior, values and identity that occur when individuals from one cultural group are in continuous contact with people from another cultural group.

Research participants suggested that as ethnic peoples become more acculturated to their host society and adopt the host society’s behaviors and attitudes, they may increasingly identify with the new culture. However their ethnic identity and attachment to their home culture do also remain strong.

This acculturation attitude is called integration (i.e. taking on the host society's culture and values while retaining one's own cultural identity). Other acculturation attitudes include :

- assimilation (adopting aspects of the host society's culture and relinquishing one's own cultural identity)
- separation ( maintaining one's own ethnic culture and identity and rejecting the host society's culture) and
- marginalisation (rejecting both the host society and one's traditional culture).

Ethnic peoples who have become integrated were observed as possessing higher self esteem than their peers who are separated or marginalized. Ethnic peoples who are poorly equipped to deal with the conflicting demands of their dual cultural environment are seemingly more prone to marginalisation.

Ethnic peoples continue to experience difficulties with regards to greater participation in the development of social policy due to inadequate English language skills, limited emotional support networks, and limited involvement outside their workplace.

Inadequate consultation, stereotypical and patronizing attitudes and the need to respond to unrealistic deadlines are additional barriers which restrict participation by ethnic peoples in the development of social policy.

Research participants also acknowledge that there are an inadequate number of suitably qualified ethnic peoples who are policy analysts. This situation needs to be urgently addressed. Currently, ethnic peoples tend to pursue higher qualifications within the finance and commerce fields and a need exists to encourage interest towards gaining social science credentials.

Ethnic peoples also need to engage in contemporary initiatives through which they are able to improve their understandings about how particular systems work and how to better access services they need.

**Research participants responses:**

‘ limited number of ethnic peoples adequately qualified to successfully undertake employment in social sciences ’

‘ yes, as there is with a whole range of different groupings in society - the only way that you can deliver equity is to seek to identify barriers – lack of recognized formal qualifications, lack of proficiency in the English language, gender and race bias employers, institutional glass ceiling, language, cultural and institutional barriers.’

**Conclusion**

The thematic principles discussed above are all threads entwined in the complex but crucial kete which is ‘ wellbeing ’. Essentially wellbeing concerns the extent of our inclusiveness as a society which champions positive human rights and access to genuine participation , free from discrimination and prejudice.

Significant contemporary initiatives through which ethnic peoples are able to pursue positive human rights and access to participation are explored in the following chapter.

## Chapter Seven

### Significant Contemporary Initiatives

#### Discussion

The emphasis in this section is on providing an insight into the workings of key representative national organisations which are concerned with ethnic peoples wellbeing.

This research is I believe unique in that it explores through qualitative research ethnic peoples own views and reasons regarding pertinent aspects of their participation in the development of social policy that affects their well being

The primary objectives of this research have been to

- identify those issues in society, which are of concern to ethnic peoples
- identify barriers, which limit ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy, which may affect them
- to ascertain major avenues through which ethnic peoples may participate in and contribute to the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

The use of qualitative research methodology has been critical with regard to achieving these stated objectives. I believe that there is much more that ethnic participants can and want to contribute towards societal issues that impact upon

their wellbeing. The fact that I as researcher hail from an ethnic background, and for all intent and purposes, perhaps of similar socio-economic background to the majority of current research participants, has proved beneficial. I was able to undertake this research knowing that I had the full support, encouragement and trust of all ten research participants and that I was able to relate effectively to their differing perspectives. Consequently this provided for stimulating and informed discussion.

Between 1980 and 1999, Aotearoa/New Zealand underwent major social and economic changes which, I contend, today further emphasises the need for greater participation by ethnic peoples in the development of social policy that impacts upon their well being.

The regulated economy of the late 1970's and early 1980's featured subsidies to control price and wage fluctuations, state housing and mortgage subsidies for low-income people, and an unemployment rate of 4% or less. 1984 is often seen as a turning point in the history of Aotearoa / New Zealand as it heralded in an era of major public sector reforms.

The nature and extent of administrative reforms between the mid 1980's and the early 1990's were part of a carefully crafted, integrated and mutually reinforcing reform agenda. Aotearoa / New Zealand has gone the farthest along the entrepreneurial path...in one fell swoop it has done away with the old civil service, freeing department managers to negotiate their own contracts with their employees. It eliminated regulations that inhibited competition in both the private

and public sectors – forcing government owned business into more competitive markets. And it adopted a budget system focused on performance and an accrual accounting system modelled on business accounting .

Some results of these widespread reforms which impacted upon ethnic peoples included fully targeted income support, market rentals for housing, privatised major utilities, user charges for health, education and other government services, and a restructured labour market designed to facilitate change. These changes, in part at least, resulted in substantially widened income inequalities in New Zealand. Benefit cuts in 1990 resulted in the mean equivalent disposable income of households with a beneficiary dropping below that of superannuitants, and to less than half that of house holders who were neither superannuitants nor beneficiaries.

In addition to these ‘economic’ changes there were accompanying structural changes which impacted upon key wellbeing sectors of health, education, employment , housing and immigration.

These social and macroeconomic changes created inequalities and inequities for ethnic peoples with regard to employment status, education, income and housing and also , no doubt impacted upon their well being, and continue to do so in contemporary society.

There does not appear to be any in-depth multidisciplinary longitudinal analysis of ethnic peoples wellbeing during this period of considerable prolonged change.

### **Significant Contemporary Initiatives**

Key contemporary national organisations which are concerned with the wellbeing of ethnic peoples include The New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils (**NZFEC**) and The Office of Ethnic Affairs (**OEA**). Their roles are further discussed. There is also a discourse on the Treaty of Waitangi as research participants are of the opinion that contemporary debates of its significance do affect the wellbeing of ethnic peoples.

It is my contention that it is within these organisations that there ought to more urgent and robust representation of issues that concern ethnic peoples' wellbeing. Such representation will necessitate more effective participation by ethnic peoples in the very processes which ultimately impact on key decision making that acknowledges and accepts the challenges of an increasingly diverse contemporary population within Aotearoa / New Zealand.

#### **New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils (NZFEC)**

The inaugural meeting of Ethnic Councils to form a Federation was held in Wellington on 4<sup>th</sup> March 1989. Representatives from Auckland, Wellington, Lower Hutt and Christchurch Ethnic councils and representatives from the Auckland and Wellington Race Relations Office were present.

The New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils (Incorporated) was formed at a meeting in Christchurch on 15 July 1989 attended by representatives of the Ethnic Councils in Auckland, Hamilton, Lower Hutt, Wellington and

Christchurch. Less than a year later, on 30<sup>th</sup> June 1990, the inaugural national conference was held in Auckland, New Zealand.

The Federation is seen as forum through which ethnic groups give and receive support and co-operation and also provide a joint approach to issues of common concern affecting their wellbeing . In its initial stages, the Federation grappled with issues such as racism and prejudice and the lack of financial support from central government. It was a time where very little was being done for ethnic minorities in Aotearoa / New Zealand. The existence of the various ethnic associations or societies was largely due to the hard work and dedication of its members. Furthermore, a number of issues and decisions on ethnic affairs (e.g. immigration) were often being made by the government and other agencies with little or no consultation or input from ethnic communities. It was also felt then, as it is now, that the government and the business communities tend to regard ethnic immigrants as a source of investments for generating capital and employment in Aotearoa / New Zealand . A human face was not put to these immigrant investments. The cultural and other needs of the immigrants were not being addressed. It was as though once the immigrants had brought their millions of dollars into the country, their integration into the New Zealand ways of life would automatically happen.

While the ethnic population in Aotearoa / New Zealand has increased dramatically, discriminatory practices have not gone away. Prejudice and racism continue to rear its ugly head .

### **Inaugural conference**

The theme for the conference was: 'Multi Ethnic New Zealand: A Commitment For The Future '. 170 Ethnic community leaders and government officials attended this conference. Also present was a delegation from the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), which is supported and funded by the Australian Government.

For the first time in New Zealand there was a gathering of groups of non-Pakeha ethnic groups representing the interests of the many different ethnic communities that call New Zealand home. It took more than 140 years since the arrival of the first ethnic Chinese gold miners in Central Otago in 1860, for an Ethnic Federation to be formed.

The objectives of the New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils reflects those of its affiliated regional Ethnic Councils and are stated in Rule Three of the Federation Constitution. These are as follows:

1. to promote joint action and cooperation among ethnic councils on issues of common concern.
2. to promote and preserve, ethnic customs, languages, religions and cultures throughout New Zealand.
3. to support the rights of ethnic individuals and groups to enjoy equal opportunities and have equitable access to and an equitable share of the

resources, which the Government manages on behalf of the communities.

4. to raise consciousness among ethnic communities of the needs, aspirations and status of the Tangata Whenua
5. to monitor legislation and other measures including by-laws affecting the interests of the ethnic communities throughout New Zealand and to take appropriate action.
6. to promote the recognition of New Zealand as a multi-ethnic society in order to remove the monocultural philosophies and structures that exist within New Zealand Society.
7. to do any other act which supports the objective of the Federation.

Ethnic Councils throughout New Zealand often function and serve as consultative bodies for Local Authorities and the general public on matters related to ethnic affairs. The core of any important and positive relationship is to do with the extent to which goodwill, trust, caring and compromise are established and practised in a very direct, ongoing, one on one personal basis. Members of Ethnic Councils derive an increasing sense of appreciation, strength, determination and energy where such positive initiatives are undertaken.

Ethnic peoples figure prominently in positive statistics such as educational and professional attainment, per capita income and only minimally in the negative statistics such as violence, crime and unemployment. This has been achieved through their ability to adapt very rapidly to the changing social and technological

environment and an overriding general desire to become worthwhile participatory citizens.

The following Policy Proposal for the Future of Multi-Ethnic Aotearoa / New Zealand was formulated at the inaugural conference.

**Policy Proposal for the future of Multi-Ethnic Aotearoa / New Zealand**

The New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils believes that New Zealand is a multi-ethnic society in which the Maori people have special status as Tangata Whenua and special rights under the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Federation has made a commitment in its Constitution to raise the consciousness among ethnic communities of the needs, aspirations and status of the Maori people. The Federation fully supports the efforts of the Maori people to correct the injustices which have occurred since the Treaty was signed, to preserve their treasures, and to fully participate in decisions which affect them.

However the Federation believes however that the challenge for the future of our country is to formulate a national policy, which responds to, the cultures of all New Zealanders while at the same time reflecting the special status of the Maori people as Tangata Whenua and their special rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. The foundation of this policy must be respected to ensure the mana of all cultures.

It also proposes that a national policy for the future of multi-ethnic New Zealand should incorporate the following principles and that these principles form a suitable basis on which to judge whether present and future Government and local Government policies truly respond to the cultural diversity of New Zealand society:

1. All New Zealanders should have a commitment to New Zealand and share responsibility for furthering our national interests.
2. All New Zealanders should be able to enjoy the basic right of freedom from discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, age, gender or disability.
3. All New Zealanders should enjoy equal life chances and have equitable access to and an equitable share of the resources, which the Government manages on behalf of the community.
4. All New Zealanders should have the opportunity to fully participate in society and in decisions, which directly affect them.
5. All New Zealanders should be able to develop and make use of their potential for New Zealand's economic and social development.
6. All New Zealanders should have the opportunity to acquire and develop proficiency in English and languages other than English and develop cross-cultural understanding.
7. All New Zealanders should be able to develop and share their cultural heritage.

8. All New Zealand institutions, which provide services to the public, should acknowledge, reflect and respond to the cultural diversity of New Zealand society.

Ethnic Councils are viewed by research participants as having a very important role to play in the future. It is encouraging and interesting that largely through their own voluntary initiatives and with limited Central or Local government assistance, ethnic communities continue to pursue issues that affect their wellbeing.

It is believed that the Government of the day must continually recognise in words and in deeds that Aotearoa / New Zealand is increasingly a multiethnic and multicultural society. There is much that to learn from all the world's many diverse cultures, which is not just a matter of songs and dances, but also from the different approaches to work, education and business; the organisation of family life, of raising children, of respecting and caring for the aged. To not avail ourselves of the many opportunities that ethnic peoples collectively present would be extremely short sighted.

An important aspect of the Ethnic Councils Constitution is that its commitment excludes any issues of homeland politics i.e. what happens in the original homelands of members remains in the homeland. This allows the Ethnic Council to focus on issues relevant to its members here in Aotearoa / New Zealand and indeed this is a major premise upon which affiliated regional Ethnic Councils pledge their support to the New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils.

### **The Office of Ethnic Affairs ( OEA)- Te Tari Matawaka**

The Office of Ethnic Affairs - Te Tari Matawaka - was launched in May 2001, as an organisation within the Department of Internal Affairs, and replaced the Ethnic Affairs Service established in 1992. At the time the Ethnic Affairs Service was established within the Department of Internal Affairs. This was based on the then government's recognition that, while a number of government agencies (in particular, Te Puni Kokiri and The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs) existed to represent the interests of the Maori and Pacific Island peoples, no specific point of contact existed for the more than fifty other ethnic groups represented in society. Significant issues of concern to these smaller ethnic groups required increased government involvement, especially in view of the growing number of migrants at the time. These issues included community and neighbourhood relations due to language difficulties, issues of prejudice and discrimination within sectors such as housing, employment, education and immigration.

A primary role for the service was to provide an avenue for the views of different communities to be represented to the government, and for Government policies to be communicated to ethnic groups. The Service developed a strong working relationship with the NZFEC. Contact with the Federation's network of regional ethnic councils enabled the Service to maximise its effectiveness. However it was acknowledged at the time that the scale of the Service was limiting its ability to respond to demands from an increasing ethnic sector of the population. Consequently, the Service was superseded by the creation of the Office of Ethnic Affairs.

The Office provides policy advice, information and referral services for government, non government agencies, ethnic communities and individuals on issues for ethnic people. Its vision, purpose and activities are as follows:

**Vision:**

Helping ethnic people to be seen, heard, included and accepted.

**Purpose:**

The Office of Ethnic Affairs creates a climate so that people from ethnic communities can fully participate in and contribute to all aspects of New Zealand life.

**Activities include:**

- advising government about issues affecting ethnic people
- providing a point of contact between government and ethnic people
- offering an information service for non-government agencies, ethnic communities and individuals so they can get access to government services
- promoting intercultural awareness in New Zealand
- publishing the Ethnic Link newsletter and an Ethnic Calendar
- maintaining a database of ethnic people interested in being nominated for positions on boards and committee

Those with whom the office of Ethnic Affairs works, its stakeholders, are:

- from the majority of people in New Zealand. Te Puni Kōkiri and the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs advise on issues for Māori and Pacific people in New Zealand
- migrants, refugees, long-term settlers and descendants of early settlers
- ethnic community organisations
- government agencies and local authorities
- voluntary and community organisations and service providers
- multicultural centres and migrant and refugee centres.

### **Introduction to Ethnic Perspectives Guidelines**

‘ Ethnic Perspectives in Policy ’ identifies the current Government’s objectives and desired outcomes for the ethnic sector; and the roles, policy values and outcomes to develop public policies and services for the ethnic sector.

The guidelines have been developed by the Office of Ethnic Affairs to help agencies working with or for ethnic people, or whose work has a significant impact on ethnic people, to identify factors that are likely to be important in that process.

The guidelines are a resource to be used to identify and respond to ethnic peoples’ perspectives on policies and services. The guidelines are intended to help agencies to identify, plan and evaluate policy and services that are appropriate for the ethnic sector.

Three initial guidelines which have been developed are :

- policy guidelines, which pose questions that will help to clarify and identify interrelated issues affecting ethnic people
- consultation guidelines, which provide information about engaging with ethnic communities.
- Ethnic responsiveness guidelines, which provide a set of self-help standards to enable any agency to review its operations and services to determine how well it is responding to ethnic communities.

### **Scope**

'Ethnic Perspectives' sets out the current government's approach to developing policies and services for ethnic people and is a useful tool that can sit comfortably beside other policy frameworks, for use by policy analysts and as safeguards to ensure that differing perspectives are taken into account as policy advice and services are developed. 'Ethnic Perspectives' is additional to requirements to consider Treaty of Waitangi implications in the preparation of policy advice. In certain circumstances it will be appropriate to consult with Māori or to seek advice on this from Te Puni Kōkiri.

### **The Treaty of Waitangi**

Given the very important contemporary debates about the significance of The Treaty of Waitangi and issues regarding the Foreshore and Seabed, the quality of the partnership between Maori and the Crown is of huge importance to Ethnic peoples in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand.

At issue here is the notion of citizenship within neo liberal democracies. For instance, what would be the status of the Ethnic Peoples if it were such that the next Elections heralded in an era which sought to dismantle, and /or undermined the Treaty of Waitangi ?

The Treaty of Waitangi signifies a partnership between races. It is the foundation document of Aotearoa/New Zealand and perhaps the first official social policy document. Treaty rights flow from the doctrine of aboriginal title. These rights are as alive today as they were in 1840. From the Maori standpoint its role and status has never changed. It was, and is now a transaction of importance that was embarked upon solemnly by the Maori participants. As the years have gone by, the Treaty has become identified with the tupuna, who were parties to it. It is viewed as one of the sacred treasures of Maoridom.

From the Pakeha side the importance of the Treaty has waxed and waned, and is perhaps now waxing again. For the first twenty years of our colonial history, it was recognized and observed as a contract binding on both parties. but later especially during and after the Land Wars, the colonists worked persistently to minimize its importance. In 1877 they achieved their objective when a New Zealand Court declared it a nullity devoid of any legal effect.

That view prevailed for nearly a hundred years, but with the passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 and other legislation, the legal status of the Treaty has been changed, perhaps irrevocably, not withstanding the power of Parliament, which some see as absolute.

It is a significant finding of this research that there remains much to be done to better impress upon the general ethnic population the significance and understanding of their place vis a vis the Treaty of Waitangi. (Appendix 4)

I believe that it would be seriously short sighted if ethnic peoples allowed themselves to be misled by the uninformed and often emotional popular dismissive culture which is too often engaged in Treaty debates. Such debates, it ought to be noted, are often promoted ultimately by those within society who often subscribe to divisive racial and cultural superiority political leanings. Such actions serve to reinforce determinants of settler societies who adhere to the misleading and fanciful notion that ‘we are all one people’.

Ethnic peoples need to exercise tolerance, patience, understanding and fair-mindedness when addressing Treaty issues. I do believe that ethnic peoples will need to exercise their democratic rights to duly participate in discussions about Treaty issues as the outcomes of any deliberation between Maori and Pakeha is highly likely to affect ethnic peoples wellbeing. The focal point being that it must be genuinely realized that the Treaty of Waitangi is recognized both within the nations laws and also internationally.

Rather, as Ethnic peoples we must, when and where appropriate, learn to better appreciate our collective strengths inherent in our unique diversity while honouring the Treaty of Waitangi and demonstrate these in non threatening actions. Importantly, ethnic peoples must, when appropriate, begin to increasingly voice their views on the significance of the Treaty as a founding

document of the nation and its significance upon our wellbeing. Such important and necessary dialogue can only be beneficial and, I believe, is long overdue.

Ethnic peoples must more readily acknowledge that it is indeed Article Three of the Treaty that is applicable to their wellbeing. When attempting a deeper understanding of the Treaty the following three questions also need to be addressed:

- what happened when the Treaty was signed?
- what should have happened after the Treaty was signed?
- what will happen now?

An important theme emanating from the qualitative research data has been the acknowledgement that there are a diverse range of ethnic people who do not want to be party to any contemporary political agenda which seeks to undermine the validity of the Treaty. I believe that many ethnic peoples have much in common in their ideologies and life interpretations particularly in relation to their relationships with Tangata Whenua.

It is important that ethnic peoples must not allow themselves to be misled by short-sighted / mischievous utterings of those seemingly interested in political gain or, by those who misguidedly profess to be speaking for 'all other New Zealanders'. It is, I believe, our democratic right and indeed our function, to be worthy citizens who seek to promote the future wellbeing of ourselves through

dignified means and which does not include subscribing to not recognizing the Treaty of Waitangi. Indeed recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi ought to be a fundamental requirement of all Tauwiwi. Ethnic peoples need to ensure that they do maintain their dignity and do not become captive of divisive ‘politricks’ – that which politically seeks to pit one against the other, while engaged in seemingly underhanded and divisive dealings. Our differing cultural teachings and associated principles do not, I suggest, actively engage in perpetuating divisive ‘politricks’, which seek ultimately to oppress.

The advent of the Treaty is unalterable. It is recognized in fact. Those who profess otherwise need to ‘wake up from your sleep and slumber’ (Marley, 1945-1981).

I would suggest too that it is equally a moral obligation to ensure that as manuhiri ethnic peoples contribute towards constructively recognizing the sacredness of the Treaty of Waitangi and its importance to Maori as a cornerstone of their rites of passage in Aotearoa / New Zealand. It is a huge challenge that we have set ourselves and as such needs to be given due regard. Ethnic peoples I believe are, in the main, unlikely to be party to illegal acts such as advocating the non recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi and subscribing to the notion that we are all ‘one people.’

This is further illustrated in the following **responses by research participants** regarding the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi :

‘ ..... I think the treaty of Waitangi is very unique. I think as ethnic peoples we have to honour the Treaty – at the moment there is a lot of tokenism when talking about the Treaty....’

‘... It is part of the constitution of the country, its part of the history, its part of the judicial system. I think you can’t just obliterate something and say it didn’t exist when it did...’

‘...there is significance relevance from the ethnic communities in terms of its impact on our daily lives. Understanding of it is very low in the ethnic communities – people have managed to get by without it . our input into broadening social policy is limited if we do not understand the Treaty of Waitangi.’

Interestingly, it was evident that research findings suggest that there be important educative initiatives towards enlightening ethnic peoples about the Treaty of Waitangi. This would also entail an examination of key societal institutions and events, for instance the observance of Waitangi Day, the role of the Waitangi Tribunal and the importance of contemporary debates about the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi and certain political leanings towards effectively dismantling the Treaty of Waitangi.

It would be fair to say that we continue to be at an important phase in the history of race relations in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Another important issue to consider in understanding the Treaty of Waitangi is the significance of Maori title and Treaty rights. It is important to recognise that the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 did not alter the nature of Maori rights to land, forests, fisheries. These were protected by the doctrine of aboriginal title. The Treaty confirmed the doctrine and Article the Second provides a guarantee of the continuance of the rights until they are extinguished in a manner conforming with the Treaty as by a freely conducted sale of all those rights or by statutory taking which does not offend against the principles of the Treaty.

The significance of Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi, is of huge importance to ethnic peoples as this article provides rites of passage for ethnic peoples to settle in Aotearoa/New Zealand and to be availed of the benefits and obligations of citizenship. I have deliberately included this little insight into the Treaty to purely demonstrate that often the finer points are not widely known to members of the diverse ethnic communities, hence highlighting the importance of educating ethnic peoples on Treaty of Waitangi issues that will, hopefully, inspire more careful and considered responses when further engaged in contemplating Treaty issues.

## **Conclusion**

Contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand continues to challenge societal relationships between ethnic peoples, Tangata Whenua and Pakeha. Ethnic peoples must actively promote their views regarding the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi and not be hoodwinked by contemporary political musings which profess to represent ethnic peoples views on the Treaty as being supportive of whatever agenda one is trying to promote.

It would seem that within liberal democratic socio/ political environments one ought not to be surprised when ethnic peoples seek greater participation in processes and initiatives which impact upon their wellbeing. Clearly ethnic peoples can no longer be expected to adhere to the assimilationist or 'melting pot' theories which espouse that we are 'one people'. We have never been one people.

Contemporary initiatives do provide limited opportunities for ethnic peoples to engage in processes that enable their effective participation in the development of social policy. However there needs to be increasingly robust initiatives undertaken towards enhancing more effective participation.

## **Chapter Eight**

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

#### **Conclusions**

Throughout this journey it has become progressively evident that issues that impact upon ethnic peoples wellbeing social inequality and justice need to be addressed efficiently and professionally. Research findings indicate that there exists a genuine desire within the ethnic community to better understand and participate in the development of social policy that affects their well being.

Participation in decision making depends on both individual initiatives and available opportunities. Opportunities however can be seriously prejudiced by attitudinal and organizational barriers.

It is my contention that no single issue will affect our social cohesiveness and wellbeing more than the proper handling of policies that address our increasing diversity and its challenging complexities.

Effective participation by ethnic peoples in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing is increasingly viewed as inevitable by ethnic peoples . As it is with Maori and Pacific Islanders, Ethnic Peoples ought to be given serious consideration with regards to being able to engage in capacity building.

I believe that it is incumbent upon key ethnic peoples representative organisations , such as the New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils to effectively

demonstrate through more robust initiatives insightful, informed and courageous leadership that will champion the cause towards more effective participation through the establishment of a bona fide ministry of ethnic affairs.

Ultimately, social policy affects all aspects of one's wellbeing. It lies at the heart of political controversy, and people and groups hold different beliefs about :

- (i) the nature of social problems,
- (ii) and how the state should address these.

Understanding the character of social policy today requires a historical perspective of its development. A history, that largely, does not reflect the insights and reasonings of those peoples who have successfully endured the constraints of colonialism. Significantly therefore, ethnic peoples need to genuinely increase their inquiry into understanding the character and influences of social policy today, and not step away from addressing the long term effect of contemporary social policy processes.

Assimilationist and “melting-pot” policies, while successful at times, have frequently increased tensions and provoked conflicts. Over time Government have adopted different kinds of policies regarding ethnic peoples wellbeing. Such policies have ranged from neglect or complete denial of the existence of wellbeing issues of ethnic peoples through devices for assimilation and integration to affirmative action or preferential politics and the recognition of pluralism.

Our formal political structures continue to provide the following inherent barriers towards enabling more effective participation :

- the representation of people from non-English speaking backgrounds is poor at all levels of the New Zealand political system
- proportionate participation in political party processes and on the pre-selection policies of the parties themselves
- the administrative arm of Government, the Public Service has only limited representation of the ethnic community at large. This seriously impacts upon the quality and validity of policy advice and program management due to limited consultation and hastily compiled initiatives
- while most government departments have introduced equal employment opportunity policies to ensure the selection of staff on genuine relative merit, the reality is that in matters pertaining to ethnic peoples, non ethnic persons primarily representative of the dominant culture and blind adherence to prevailing political ideology, still hold ultimate decision making powers
- elected representation at the local and central government level does not equitably reflect the ethnic composition of respective community

populations. Remedying this situation depends in part on broader issues affecting social and economic equality, as well as on proportionate participation in party political processes and on pre-selection policies of the parties themselves.

### **Recommendations**

Research participants are seemingly increasingly of the view that ethnic peoples are able to best address issues which impact upon their wellbeing. These wellbeing issues include the following:

- social connection – participation in community activities including quality social interactions with one’s family
- security - both physical and mental,
- health , education, housing and employment – the quality of which is important
- freedom and the ability to pursue those values that are viewed as important i.e. religious, social, economic and political freedoms
- qualities of the physical environment - clean air, water and a general sense of comfort with the environment.

The benefits to Aotearoa / New Zealand of its increasing ethnically diverse population is huge. Aotearoa / New Zealand continues to be built in no small part through the labor and determination of its progressive ethnic peoples.

The hard work and sacrifices made by ethnic peoples equally demand appropriate recognition. This research has identified very strongly that there ought to be more serious consideration and accommodation of ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing.

Participation equates to being inclusive and to strengthen the bonds that unite us. These bonds are our commitment to this land, to progressing our democracy, to take pride in our bicultural foundations and to steadfastly accept and undertake the challenges of social justice in an increasingly diverse multicultural Aotearoa / New Zealand.

A key finding of this study is that research participants are of the view that a centralized whole – of – government approach towards addressing ethnic peoples wellbeing is desirable.

The establishment of a dedicated bona fide Ministry of Ethnic Affairs is overwhelmingly viewed by research participants as being long overdue.

It is perplexing that for sometime Pacific Island peoples have been able to avail themselves of the services of specific government Ministries dedicated to more effectively addressing their wellbeing needs but the increasingly diverse and complex wellbeing needs of Ethnic Peoples are not addressed through like equitable initiatives. Rather disappointingly they continue to be addressed

through lame , largely reactive initiatives through a well meaning but an inadequately resourced Office of Ethnic Affairs.

A suitably led and well resourced Ministry of Ethnic Affairs would provide the impetus to effectively plan a whole – of – government approach and better coordinate a variety of initiatives towards achieving specified goals. Such an initiative will importantly capitalize on progress made to date and would provide an accountable dedicated central government funded and coordinated approach towards enhancing ethnic peoples participation and wellbeing.

Research participants identified that a primary function of a Ministry of Ethnic Affairs ought to be to ensure government departments and agencies give appropriate weight to multicultural considerations in forming and implementing appropriate policy and that there is accountability towards delivering appropriate services

It would also importantly demonstrate to ethnic peoples and to society at large that ethnic peoples are valued as a significant sector of our society and are encouraged to participate in society through similar initiatives which have long been available to other sectors of the population as is evident in a Ministry for Pacific Island Affairs.

Research participants also expressed that it is largely unsatisfactory that there continues to be reliance on the continual goodwill of unpaid ethnic peoples as volunteers to undertake often trying and complex key central and local

government initiated tasks through philanthropic, charitable, academic and research bodies.

Additionally the official use of the term 'ethnic minorities' in reference to ethnic peoples is viewed as being potentially detrimental and restrictive. In the usage of international law, a 'people has the right to self determination, but a 'minority' does not. Being labeled a 'ethnic minority' may suit statistical analysis purposes but does little to acknowledge nor promote the true essence of our culturally rich sectors of population. In the main it inflicts a stigma on ethnic peoples which is quite often unhelpful and inherently discriminatory.

Ethnic peoples have a genuine interest towards progressive beneficial community relations. The unique bicultural foundations of Aotearoa / New Zealand must be recognized along with the notion that we are increasingly a multi ethnic society. It is recommended that Maori as Tangata Whenua ought to be given due recognition through the use of the term '**firstship**'.

It is fact that Maori did arrive first here in Aotearoa / New Zealand and are duly recognized as its indigenous peoples. There is much to be gained for both Maori and the wider population through the use of appropriate factual references. The term 'firstship' will also bring much needed clarity when engaged in Treaty of Waitangi discussions. It would, I believe, also demonstrate much needed maturity as a nation despite the many unsavory 'skeletons in our closet' regarding the inequality of participation of non Pakeha peoples in our pursuit for a more equitable participatory democracy.

Ethnic peoples have little opportunity to put their own views forwards or effectively challenge the treatment of controversial issues. Worse still, ethnic minorities tend to be misrepresented and unhelpful stereotypes perpetuated. They may only enter mainstream discourse within prescribed boundaries. The establishment consensus must not be disturbed. Unless there are alternative sources of objective and balanced information, one is at risk of being swayed by the pronouncements (and banalities) of establishment intellectual and market serving 'experts' .

This research poses important challenges regarding the wellbeing of ethnic peoples within contemporary Aotearoa /New Zealand. It challenges the social sciences within our neo liberal democratic society as well as statesman and policy makers towards more equitable representation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policy that affects their wellbeing.

#### **A Positional Statement.**

The challenges of the new millennium require that Ethnic peoples must ensure that they are better able to more robustly address their wellbeing concerns in Aotearoa / New Zealand through constructive participatory initiatives which must include appropriate recognition through a bona fide independent central government agency, informed dialogue and increased participation.

Vain is the word of a philosopher which does not heal any suffering of man. For just as there is no profit in medicine if it does not expel the diseases of the body, so there is no profit in philosophy either, if it does not expel the suffering of the mind . (source unknown).

It is for the political processes that link society and state to work out a policy, but if those processes are made powerless by the transfer of citizens' authority to the world market, to transnational business or to supranational institutions, what future is there for democracy and pluralism. It is those processes that are being undermined further by externally and ideologically driven privatization. Their interest lie not only in protecting national interests against external domination. A balance between society, state and market is also needed to enable the peaceful resolution of internal class, gender, race, ethnic, tribal and other divisions.

He kopu puta tahi, he tauri whiri tatou

Whiringa a nuku, whiringa a rangi, te whatia e.

Issue of the womb, we are a plaited rope,

Plaited on earth, plaited in heaven, we will not be severed.

**Kia Ora .**

## Appendix One

### Information Sheet

Massey University

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES

School of Sociology, Social Policy

And Social Work

Private Bag 11 222,

Palmerston North,

New Zealand

Telephone: 64 6 505799 extn 28

Or extn 18

### Information Sheet

Facsimile: 646 350 5681 or 5277

Email:SPSWPN\_Reception

@massey.ac.nz

### **Ethnic Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand:**

Towards effective Participation in Social Policy

Researcher: Ashish Maharaj

Supervisor (s): Dr, Jocelyn Quinnell

Email: J.Y. Quinnell @massey.ac.nz

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 2829

Dr Leland Ruwhiu

(Ph) 06-350-5799, extn.2830 Email:

1. Ashish Maharaj is currently a student at Massey University completing his masters in philosophy (Social Policy). This research project is being completed in partial fulfillment of the Masters in Philosophy (Social Policy) degree.
  
2. Dr. Quinnell and Dr. Leland Ruwhiu are supervisors and lecturers at Massey University, Turitea Campus, and Palmerston North. As my supervisors for this project, both Jocelyn and Leland can be contacted on the above phone numbers and /or email address.
  
3. This research project seeks to explore the perceptions of ethnic peoples about the level and extent of their participation in the development of social policy in this country. In particular it hopes to contribute towards a greater understanding of the increasingly complex relationship between ethnic peoples and the need for their effective participation and inclusion in the development of social policy.
  
4. I will identify a range of key individuals active within the ethnic community and informally engage in discussions about the research project. From these, key participants will be identified and then invited to take part in the study to obtain their views on ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy. Qualitative methodology will be used to obtain information relevant to the study, eg. Formal interview and story telling by participants. Participants will be asked to review the transcript of their interview.

5. Aims and processes of the research project will be explained to participants.

The major objectives of this research are as follows:

To identify those issues in society which are of concern to ethnic peoples

To identify barriers which limit the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policies, which may affect them.

To ascertain major avenues through which ethnic peoples may participate in and contribute to the formulation and development of social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

6. The researcher and participants will discuss any issues of potential harm at the initial interview.
7. The information gathered in the course of completing this project will be solely used for the purpose of this project and any publications arising from it.
8. Information gathered in the course of this research project will be kept in a secure, locked cabinet at the researcher's home. At the conclusion of the research the fate of the information recorded on audio tape will be decided in consultation with participants and the researcher. One of the following will occur: it will be destroyed after examination of the report, or returned to the participants if they wish, or stored by the researcher for use in future research on this area of inquiry.

9. The identity of the participants will remain confidential (unless they want their name included) to the researcher and any identifying information will be omitted from the research report and any publications arising from it.
  
10. Participants will be provided with a summary of the research findings by the researcher and will also have access to the final report from the School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work at Massey University, Turitea Campus, Palmerston North.
  
11. Participants will be invited to participate in this project however they may:
  - Decline to participate
  - Refuse to answer any particular questions
  - Withdraw from the study at any time
  - Ask questions about the study at any time during the participation
  - Provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
  - Be given access to a summary of the findings of the study when it is concluded.
  
12. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, PN Protocol 02/74. If you have any

concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Professor  
Sylvia V Rumball, Chair, Massey University Regional Ethics Committee:  
Pamerston North, telephone 06 350 5429, email

Your participation in this research project is appreciated – thank you.

## **Appendix Two**

**Massey University**  
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES

School of Sociology, Social Policy  
And Social Work  
Private Bag 11 222,  
Palmerston North,  
New Zealand  
Telephone: 64 6 505799 extn 28

Or extn 18

## **Project Title**

Facsimile: 646 350 5681 or 5277  
Email:SPSWPN\_Reception  
@massey.ac.nz

**Ethnic Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand:  
Towards more Effective Participation in the Development of Social  
Policy**

## **Consent Form**

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me.

My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time and to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. I understand that the information

that gained in this research will be used only for this research and publications arising from it.

I agree/do not agree to the interview being audio taped.

I also understand that I have the right to ask for the audio tape to be turned off at any time during the interview.

I also understand that the interview process will not be completed until such time that I have been able to edit a copy of the transcript of data that I have provided.

I will then send the edited transcript back to the researcher.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions as set out in the information Sheet.

Signed:

Name:

Date:

## Appendix Three

### Interview Questions

#### Question One

What does ‘ wellbeing of ethnic peoples ’ mean to you?

#### Question Two

What does the term ‘ social policy ’ mean to you?

#### Question Three

Do you consider that there is anything distinctive/different concerning the wellbeing of ethnic peoples?

#### Question Four

What is your comment on the statement that ethnic peoples participation in social policy is imperative in a democracy’, and why?

#### Question Five

Does the current socio/political environment encourage ethnic peoples’ participation in the development of social policy – if so, how does it? If however you are of the view it doesn’t, why not?

#### **Question Six**

**How might ethnic peoples be encouraged to participate in the development of social policy at local regional and stated (central government) level ?**

#### **Question Seven**

**Do you believe that there ought to be a Ministry of Ethnic Affairs? If so, what do you consider ought to be its primary goal ? If not, why not?**

#### **Question Eight**

**What does the Treaty of Waitangi mean to you, and do you consider it relevant with regards to ethnic peoples participation in social policy? If so, how? If not, why not?**

#### **Question Nine**

**How does your office contribute towards the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policy?**

#### **Question Ten**

**What are some of the barriers that currently limit ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy and how can these be overcome?**

**Appendix Four**  
**The Treaty of Waitangi**  
**(The Text In English)**

HER MAJESTY VICTORIA, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland regarding with Her Royal Favour the Native Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and anxious to protect their just Rights and property and to secure to them the enjoyment of Peace and Good Order has deemed it necessary in consequence of the great number of Her Majesty's Subjects who have already settled in New Zealand and the rapid extension of Emigration both from Europe and Australia which is still in progress to constitute and appoint a functionary properly authorised to treat with the Aborigines of New Zealand for the recognition of those islands – Her majesty therefore being desirous to establish a settled form of civil Government with a view to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence population and to Her Subjects has been graciously pleased to empower and to authorise me William Hobson a captain in Her Majesty's Royal Navy Consul and Lieutenant Governor of such parts of New Zealand as may be or hereafter shall be ceded to her majesty to invite the confederated and independent chiefs of New Zealand to concur in the following Articles and conditions.

**Article the First**

The Chiefs of the confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand and the separate and independent Chiefs who have not become members of the

confederation cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of sovereignty which the said confederation or Individual Chiefs respectively exercise or possess, or may be supposed to exercise or to possess over their respective Territories as the sole Sovereigns thereof.

### **Article the Second**

Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and to the respective families and individuals thereof the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession; but the Chiefs of the united Tribes and the individual Chiefs yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of Pre-emption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective families and individuals thereof the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the exclusive right of Pre-emption over such lands as the Proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them in that behalf.

### **Article the Third**

In consideration thereof Her majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her royal protection and imparts to them all the Rights and privileges of British Subjects.

W. HOBSON Lieutenant Governor

Now therefore we the Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand being assembled in Congress at Victoria in Waitangi and we the Separate and independent Chiefs of New Zealand claiming authority over the Tribes and Territories which are specified after our respective names, having been made fully to understand the provisions of the foregoing Treaty, accept and enter into the same in the full spirit and marks at the places and the dates respectively specified.

Done at Waitangi this Sixth day of February in the year of our lord one thousand eight hundred and forty.

(Here follows signatures, dates etc.)

**Te Tiriti o Waitangi**  
**( The Text in Maori )**

Ko Wikitoria te Kuini o Ingaranii i tana mahara atawai ki nga Rangatira me nga Hapu o Nu Tirani I tana hiahia hoki kia tohungia ki a ratou o ratou rangatiratanga me to ratou whenua, a kia a mau tonu hoki to Rongo ki a ratou me to Atanoho hoki kua wakaaro ia he mea tika kea tukua mai tetahi Rangatira – hei kai wakarite ki nga Tangata Maori o Nu Tirani – kia wakaaetia e nga Rangatira Maori te kawanatanga o te Kuini ki nga wahikatoa o te whenua nei me nga motu – na te mea hoki he tokomaha ke nga tangata o tona Iwi kua noho ki tenei wheua, a e haere mai nei.

Na ko te Kuini e hiahia ana kia wakaritea te Kawantanga kia kau ai nga kino e puta mai ki te tangata Maori ki te Pakeha a noho ture kore ana.

Na, kua pai te Kuini kia tukua a hau a Wiremu Hopihona he Kapitana i te Roiara nawi hei kawana mo nga wahi katoa a Nu Tirani a tukua aiane amua atu ke the Kuini e mea atu ana ia ki nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga o nga hapu o nju Tirani me Rangatira atu enei ture ka korerotia nei.

**Ko Te Tuatahi**

Ko, nga Rangatira o te wakamingenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki ki hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu – te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou whenua.

### **Ko te Tuarua**

Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarita ka wakaae ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino mgatiratanga o o ratou kainga me o ratu taonga katoa. Oti ia ko nga Rangatira o the wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wahi whenua i pai ai te tangata mona te whenua – ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te kuini nei kai hoko mona.

### **Ko Te Tua Toru**

Hei wakaritenga mai hoki tenei mo te wakaetanga ki te kawanatanga o te Kuini – Ki tiakina e te Kuini o Ingarani nga tangata maori katoa o nu Tirani ka tukua ki a ratou nga tikanga katoa rite tahi ki ana mea ki, nga tangata o ingarani.

(signed) W. Hobson

Consul & Lieutenant Governor

Na ko matou ko nga Rangatira o te Wakamienga o nga hapu o nu Tirani ka huihui nei ki Waitangi ko matou hoki ko nga rangatira o Nu Tirani ka kite nei i te ritenga enei kopu, ka tangohia ka wakaetia katoatia e matou, koia ka tonungia ai o matoa ingoa o matou tohu.

Ka metia tenei ki Waitangi i te ono o nga ra o pepueri te tau kotahi mano, e waru rau e wa te kau o to tatou Arikil.

## **English translation of Maori version**

**(By Professor Kawharu)**

Victoria, The Queen of England, in her concern to protect the chiefs and subtribes of New Zealand and in her desire to preserve their chieftainship and their lands to them and to maintain peace and good order considers it just to appoint an administrator one who will negotiate with the people of New Zealand to the end that their chiefs will agree to the Queen's (adjoining) islands and also because there are many of her subjects already living on this land and others yet to come.

So the Queen desires to establish a government so that no evil will come to Maori and European living in a state of lawlessness.

So the Queen has appointed me, William Hobson a captain in the Royal Navy to be Governor for all parts of New Zealand (both those) shortly to be received by the Queen and (those to be received hereafter and presents to the Chiefs of the Confederation chiefs of the subtribes of New Zealand and other chiefs these laws set out here.

### **The First**

The Chiefs of the Confederation and all the chiefs who have not joined that confederation give absolutely to the Queen of England forever the complete government to their land.

### **The Second**

The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs of the federation and all the Chiefs will sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to by the person owning it and by the person buying it (the latter being) appointed by the Queen as her purchase agent.

### **The Third**

For this agreed arrangement therefore concerning the Government of the Queen, the Queen of England will protect all the ordinary people of New Zealand and will give them the same rights and duties of citizenship as the people of England.

(Signed) W. Hobson

Consul and lieutenant Governor.

So we, the Chiefs of the Confederation and the subtribes of New Zealand meeting here at Waitangi having seen the shape of these words which we accept and agree to record our names and marks thus. Was done at Waitangi on the sixth of February in the year of our Lord 1840

## **Appendix Five**

### **Human Rights Legislation**

#### **Basic Rights**

In democratic societies and individual's rights are protected by law. One of the most important of these is the right to equality before the law. This is particularly important in societies comprised of people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

All members of New Zealand society should be able to enjoy the basic right of freedom from discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion or culture. This, includes not only overt or conscious discrimination at the personal level, but also that unwittingly systemic discrimination which occurs when cultural assumptions become embodied in society's established institutions and processes. Equal employment opportunity and affirmative action requirements, for example, are a response to both the individual and systemic discrimination experienced by women, and non English speaking ethnic peoples.

Many New Zealanders are aware of such problems. Many others however, remain oblivious to such increasingly complex issues. Multicultural policies seek to eliminate such discrimination. They aim to protect the rights of all members of society to enjoy their culture and language and to practice their religion – within the institutional framework of new Zealand law,

parliamentary democracy, English as the national language and acceptable methods of conflict resolution. Fundamentally Multiculturalism is about the rights of the individual – the right to equality of treatment: to be able to express one’s identity; to be accepted as a New Zealander without having to assimilate to some stereotyped model of behavior. Multiculturalism is concerned to encourage all New Zealanders, including those from non Anglo-Celtic backgrounds, to share their diversity of cultures, rather than excluding one another or being forced to separate enclaves. It seeks to make it clear that color or language, style of dress or mode of worship, are no indication of the degree of personal commitment to the future of our nation. Being a New Zealander has nothing to do with outward appearance.

### **Issues (Re: Basic Rights)**

We need to adapt and reform the institutional processes of New Zealand society in order to accommodate and respond to the cultural diversity of today’s community. This is necessarily an incremental and evolutionary process – and one that has been happening in a somewhat erratic manner for decades. In terms of protecting the rights of the individual – and in particular, their right to equality of treatment – the legal system is critical.

There are four areas that warrant policy attention:

The law is inextricably interwoven with the culture of the society in which it evolved. New Zealand law is based on an English system that on the whole has served New Zealand extremely well. But laws and regulations may have an unintended, differential impact in a society comprising many ethnic, cultural and religious groups. There is a need to examine systematically the ways in which our laws and associated processes may impede equality before the law.

Administrative decision - making the daily lives and entitlements of all New Zealanders. New Zealanders who feel that they have been unjustly treated may appeal to the Ombudsman. There are concerns that barriers of culture or language may disadvantage ethnic peoples from non English speaking backgrounds in making use of this important machinery of review.

One of the most obvious threats to equality is where evidence in court is inaccurately or incompletely communicated because a witness does not speak or understand English. The presence of increasing numbers of new Zealanders with a limited understanding/knowledge of English poses a major challenge to equality of treatment in the judicial and quasi-judicial processes of new Zealand society. Professionally trained interpreters are necessary.

Racial prejudice in some form exists in all societies and within all groups in society. Ethnic peoples in New Zealand continue to be subject to public expression of race hatred, through offensive graffiti, inflammatory leaflets and posters, even in incitement to and acts of violence.

Objectives which could be pursued at central government level:

- to promote equality before the law by systematically examining the implicit cultural assumptions of the law and the legal system to identify the manner in which they may unintentionally act to disadvantage certain groups of New Zealanders such as its' Ethnic population, and
- to promote an environment that is tolerant and accepting of social and cultural diversity, and that respects and protects the associated rights of the individual.

### **Principal International Human Rights Instruments**

Principal Human Rights legislation relevant to Aotearoa/New Zealand and of particular interest to ethnic peoples.

The basic document is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations on 10 December, 1948. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights grew out of the United Nations charter, which provided in the preamble that the member states of the United Nations reaffirmed their faith 'in

fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.<sup>9</sup> It is a common standard of achievement and not a legally binding set of rules, but is a powerful statement. Acceptance of the Declaration by almost fifty nations of varying cultural, economic and political backgrounds is in itself significant.

While New Zealand does not have a written constitution, the protection of human rights has to be achieved in other way. The Human Rights Commission is one such avenue.

### **The International Instruments**

New Zealand's Human Rights Commission is a body constituted by the Human Rights Act 1993. The title of this Act states that the Act is:

An Act to consolidate and amend the Race Relations Act 1971 and the Human Rights Commission Act 1977 and to provide better protection of human rights in New Zealand in general accordance with the United Nations Covenants or Conventions on Human Rights.

These United nations Covenants or Conventions on Human Rights are what human rights professional commonly call International Instruments. The principal instruments relevant to New Zealand's current human rights jurisdiction are:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)

The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discriminations

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the Death Penalty.

The international Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. (CEDAW).

The Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination based on Religion or Belief

The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or punishment

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNROC).

The International Labour Organisation Convention 100 – Equal Remuneration 1951 and Convention 11 – Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) 1958.

### **The International Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)**

Most of the world recognize the UDHR. At the Vienna World conference on Human Rights in 1993, representatives of 171 States adopted by consensus the Vienna declaration and program. In doing so, they reaffirmed their commitment to the purposes and principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and the UDHR. This indicates a near world commitment to promote the rights proclaimed.

As New Zealand does not have a written constitution, the mechanisms for the protection and promotion of human rights have been established by statute.

The International Bill of Rights is comprised of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

### **The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees**

New Zealand acceded to this international instrument in June 1960 and the protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees in 1973. No part of the convention of protocol has been incorporated into New Zealand domestic law by legislation.

The Convention and protocol set a minimum standard for the treatment of refugees. They are regarded by practitioners in this area as valuable in that the standard is readily accessible in one document and associated particularly with refugees.

### **The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination**

The United Nations has been specifically concerned about racial discrimination and has devoted much attention to it in the knowledge that discrimination, and theories of racial superiority, underlie or preceded many of the political problems which confront the international community today.

Under the Convention States must:

Engage in no act or practice of racial discrimination against individuals, groups or persons or institutions, and to ensure that public authorities and institutions do likewise;

Not sponsor, defend or support racial discrimination or persons' or organisations;

Review government, national and local policies and to amend or repeal laws and regulations which create or perpetuate racial discrimination;

Prohibit and put a stop to racial discrimination by persons, groups and organisations; and

Encourage integrationist or multiracial organisations and movements and other means of eliminating barriers between races, as well as to discourage anything which tends to strengthen racial division.

The General Assembly Adopted the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1965. When states become parties, they undertake to pursue without delay a policy of eliminating racial discrimination in all forms and promote understanding among all races. The convention is based on the conviction 'that any doctrine of superiority based on racial differentiation is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous, and that there is no justification for racial discrimination, in theory or in practice anywhere'. in accordance with

New Zealand ratified this Convention.

## Appendix Six

### Synopsis of Research Participants responses to Interview Questions / Themes

#### Question 1

What does the phrase 'well being of ethnic peoples' mean to you?

#### Participants Responses:

'Groupings of people within New Zealand society who adhere to or feel a lineage with a particular indigenous grouping that is outside or different from the European majority'.

'People in New Zealand have wellbeing if they feel comfortable, integrated, accepted within the overall and broad New Zealand community'

Being at ease to be able to contribute

Identity and ability to contribute

Do not feel obliged to justify their rights

Practice of culture

Established access without/free from persecution or discrimination

Positive human rights

Shared participation

Integrating into community

Social/mental well being., do we as ca society really value ethnic peoples

## **Question 2**

**What does Social Policy mean to you?**

### **Participant's Responses:**

Policy impacting on people

Economic and social inclusiveness

Equality of access to key institutions

‘A specialized term which is employed by people those involved in governance – it is the plan, ideas, strategies those within governance have for the advancement of the population and in particular certain constituent parts of the population’

Jobs, health, housing, immigration, employment – range of aspects of wellbeing.

Wholistic well being – economics, environmental, health, education.

Setting objectives, building in methods, pathways in methods, pathways in which society can operate.

### **Question 3**

**Do you consider that there is anything distinctive/different concerning the wellbeing of ethnic peoples?**

#### **Participant's Responses:**

Language, duration of stay, mental wellbeing,

'...certain obvious things such as physical characteristics, skin colour, mode of dress, religious rituals...'

Language, duration of stay, mental wellbeing, of Elderly, woma, young persons

Establishment - need to Break down barriers

Need measure of disparities - Very ethnocentric

Participation is important to avoid discrimination, colonial mindset

To take into account particular needs

Policy makers need to understand the origins of proper terms of reference for ethnic groups

Issues of belonging; need to be able to maintain and strengthen identity

Protection in law

How people of the dominant culture accept and value other peoples ways of doing things.

#### **Question 4**

**What is your comment on the statement that ‘ethnic peoples participation in social policy is imperative in a democracy?’**

#### **Participants Responses:**

Groundwork needs to be right      Absolutely critical

A human right to participate rather than a democratic right

Disenfranchised, social upheaval, anarchy    Minority in numbers    Stigma

Need appropriate legislation to allow multiculturalism

Need to be active, vocal lobby

‘...the important matter is for the people of ethnic origin to feel that their views and situations have been taken into account in the formulation of social policy...?’

Yes, or else it will be counterproductive

Different ethnic groups present differently

Participation is essential, crucial or else swamped by dominant culture  
ethos

Non participation leads to intolerance, inequality, fosters oppression

### Question 5

**Does the current socio/political environment encourage ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy, if so – how? If not – why not?**

#### **Participants responses:**

‘... although it means enlisting with a recognized political party, there is evidence that ethnic peoples are encouraged to participate in the development of social policy..’

Increasing tendency to participate,

Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) political environment

Need greater participation across the Board Office of Ethnic Affairs

A growing awareness Not to quota system Need to appreciate needs

‘ At the political level’ – yes, policy level – no, bureaucratic level – very low

Need to acknowledge cultural sensitivities

Need good quality policy analysts

Difficult to say – competing tensions e.g. immigration

Becoming increasingly diverse, an increasing celebration of multiculturalism

Consultation required

Narrow political mandates

Important to share and appreciate cultural heritage

### **Question 6**

**How might ethnic peoples be encouraged to participate in the development of social policy at local, regional and state (central government) level?**

#### **Participants Responses:**

Opportunities exist but not easily accessible

Organizations – Asia 2000, NZFEC, Asia Down-under Need to consult at more specific local level      Need to know what the issues are

Onus on government of the day to develop relationships, representation

Leaders of ethnic communities to be represented at various forums

Need to utilize the potential that schools present

Language affinity

Community workshops need to be ethnic people friendly

To be linked to specific outcomes, need to be measured

Appropriate dissemination / availability of information

Increased participation in government

Need to address particular non-inclusive government culture

### **Question 7**

**Do you believe that there ought to be a Ministry of Ethnic Affairs? If so what do you think ought to be it's primary role?**

#### **Participants Responses:**

Yes, now 14<sup>th</sup> of population and growing

To develop relationships

Advisory role

Reverse judgement – current office doing ok

‘...now whether the precise vehicle needs to be a ministry, or a department or an office I am not certain.’

Need to equality of status with others

Danger of proliferation of government departments

To make sure all minorities are catered for

‘ about capacity building – always talking about capacity building in Maori and Pacific

Island communities - well other communities need it just as much

Need a full Ministry

Goals – legislation – to eliminate barriers, bureaucratic – to foster understanding of issues

A positive step

Need to develop framework across government departments

Need to address contribution of racism to non-inclusion

Need to be inclusive

To promote ethnic communities

To promote equitable participation

Policy requirements

### **Question 8**

**What does the Treaty of Waitangi mean to you, and do you consider it relevant with regards to ethnic peoples participation in social policy? If so, how? If not ,why not?**

### **Participants Responses:**

‘...represents the basis of partnership upon which our country was founded...’

Acceptance of Law and Order

Need to understand history

‘.has a symbolism of sharing between Maori and other peoples and it provides, to my mind, a good basis on which the future of this country can be based..’

‘ the Treaty, in my view permits the notion of people other than the original British colonial settlers who came here and to be folded into the chemistry of everyday life...’

‘...so long people of ethnic background have an understanding and respect for Maori peoples stake holding and ‘ firstship’ is the word that comes to mind – they are the country’s first people and they deserve recognition and respect for that – I think therefore that the Treaty of Waitangi is indeed relevant with regard to ethnic peoples – that recognition of ethnic peoples position is enhanced if there is recognition of Maori peoples and recognition of the Treaty – that the treaty is a positive thing that should be regarded by people of ethnic origin, what ever that the origin might be, is likewise a positive thing...’

Due recognition

Formal document

Need greater acknowledgement

Relevant as part of crown

Both bicultural and multicultural but still very monocultural in outlook

Need to learn about, understand and acknowledge

Clearer understanding needed

Important part of our history/judicial system

Cannot be obliterated

Treatment must ensure that democratic principles apply

Fundamental

Needs to be a basic part of orientation to New Zealand, people should understand what it is when they come here...,

Very crucial document

Very low understanding

Very significant on a day to day basis

Tauitiwi need to acknowledge that the Treaty of Waitangi permits us to be here

### **Question 9**

**How does your office contribute towards the participation of ethnic peoples in the development of social policy?**

#### **Participants Responses:**

Reflect

Comment

Advise

Radio slot

Media consultation

Direct contact

Parliamentary debate

Advocacy role

Representation

Submissions

Wide range

Ethnic Perspective Policy

Recognition

Events

Encouraging participation in forums

#### **Question 10**

**What are some of the barrier that currently limit ethnic peoples participation in the development of social policy ? And how can these be overcome?**

#### **Participants Responses:**

‘...New Zealand is a country that is not averse to having people of different origins involved in the running but numbers do offer a kind of barrier..’

‘Reticence...I think that the part of any community that is small, and in particular say an ethnic community, the notion is that you keep your head down – there is a natural reticence on, don’t make too much fuss, work hard, get your children through their schooling and hope that things will be even

better for them, there is a degree of understandable reticence on the part of people of ethnic origin to take part necessarily in the development of social policy...'

'...there is the question of opportunity – you have an existing system that has been in operation for say 40-50 years which seems to be satisfied about itself in the way it does things – there is limited opportunity available for people of a different background or different set of viewpoints to necessarily become involved and that's part of the way things occurred, opportunities are not necessarily there for people of an ethnic background to suddenly become members of boroughs or city councils in big numbers...'

'...that policy makers in government departments still do not appreciate enough the limited resources and capability within the ethnic communities and how to engage them properly.

Inappropriate Representation

Language

Lack of confidence / knowledge

Greater effort needed to be involved

Ignorance to knowledge about the Treaty

Develop 'us' and 'us'

Lack of social policy

Perception

Lack of adequate consultation

Economically driven immigration policy

Lack of knowledge by government departments on how to facilitate  
different

Ethnic peoples issues

Government deadlines affects adequate consultation / participation

Need more effective / proactive insightful representation

<u>Themes</u>	<u>Key Themes</u>	<u>Contributory Factors</u>
Well being	Mental	Integration
		Resettlement
		Discrimination
		Inclusiveness
		Bureaucracy
		Social
		Depression
		Stress
		Esteem

**Representation**

**Political**

**Representation**

**Bureaucracy**

**Citizenship**

**Aspirations**

**Involvement**

**Prioritisation**

**Social**

**Relationships**

**Integration**

**Discrimination**

**Economic**

**Investment**

**Liberalization**

**Contribution**

**Social policy**

**Inclusiveness**

**Access**

**Consultation**

**Human rights**

		<b>International Conventions</b>
<b>Employment</b>	<b>Aspirations</b>	<b>Individual Community</b>
	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Representation Attitudes Stereotyping</b>
<b>Discrimination</b>		
	<b>Values</b>	<b>Individual Organisational Community Political</b>
<b>Representation</b>	<b>Accountability</b>	<b>Professional Individual Community</b>

Democracy

Citizenship

Inclusiveness

Participation

Liberalism

Obligations

Responsibilities

Treaty of Waitangi

Participation

Treaty of Waitangi

Legislation

Representation

Consultation

Understanding

Diversity

Respect

Appreciation

Access

Genuine

Rights

**Infrastructure**

**Needs**

**Bureaucracy**

**Central & Local govt.**

**Treaty of Waitangi**

**Significance**

**Genuine**

**Respect**

**Appreciation**

**Understanding**

**Education**

**Articles**

**Rights**

**Responsibility**

**Partnership**

**Sharing**

**Guardianship**

**Firstship**

**Firstship**

**Historical fact**

**Due recognition**

		Participation
		Taonga
		Responsibility
Infrastructure	Bureaucracy	Consultation
		Involvement
		Expertise
Infrastructure		Participation
		Understanding
		Representation
		Responsibilities
		Accountability
		Quality
Barriers	Consocialisationalism	Individual
		Political
		Organisation
		Responsibility

	<b>Ethical</b>
<b>Inadequate consultation</b>	<b>Networking</b>
	<b>Appreciation</b>
	<b>Immaturity</b>
	<b>Ignorance</b>
	<b>Responsibility</b>
	<b>Participation</b>
	<b>Involvement</b>
<b>Reticence</b>	<b>Acceptance</b>
	<b>Progress</b>
	<b>Enterprise</b>
	<b>Citizenship</b>
	<b>Appreciation</b>
	<b>Complexity</b>

Lack of knowledge

Understanding

Education

Services unavailable

Accessibility

Perceptions

Stereotyping

Representation

Attitudes

Own beliefs

Political

Initiative

Importance

Application

Community

Responsibility

## Bibliography

- Bobbio, N. (1987) *Which socialism?*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Brown, L.D.& Ashman, D. (1996) Participation, social capital, and intersectoral problem solving: African and Asian cases, *World Development*, 24, pp. 1467-1479.
- Burnheim, J. (1985) *Is Democracy Possible?*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Chong, D. (1991) *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement* (Chicago, IL, Chicago University Press).
- Cohen, J. (1996) ('Procedure and substance in deliberative democracy', in S. Benhabib (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, pp.95-119.
- Cohen, J. (1998) 'Democracy and liberty', in J. Elster (ed.) *Deliberative Democracy*, pp. 185-231.
- Cohen, J. and Rodgers, J. (1995) *Associations and Democracy*, London, Verso.
- Cohen, P., G. Sheridan, T. Freeth and M. Floyd-Pages (eds.) (1982) *It Ain't Half Hot Mum: Fighting Racism in the Media*, Camedia Pub Group in conjunction with Campaign Against Racism in the Media, London.
- Crosland, C. (1956), *The Future of Socialism*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- De'ath, C. and Michalenko, G. (1980). High technology and original peoples: *The case of Deforestation in Papua New Guinea and Canada*, In *Impact of Science on Society*, 30:3, 197-209.
- Finch, J. and D.Groves (1983) *A Labour of Love: Women, Work and Caring*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Fox, J. (1996) How does civil society thicken? The political construction of social capital in rural Mexico, *World Development*, 24, pp. 1089-1103.
- Frazer, Elizabeth and Nicola Lacey, 1993, *The politics of community a feminist critique of the liberal-communitarian debate*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York and London.
- Freire, P. (1982) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Penguin, Marmondsworth, UK

- Friedman, M. 1962: *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ginsberg, N. (1979) *Class, Capital and Social Policy*, Macmillan press, London.
- Gough, I. (1979) *Political Economy of the Welfare State*, Macmillan, London
- Habermas, J. (1995) *Justification and Application*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hayek, Friedrich A., 1944, *The road to serfdom*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Held, David, 1986, 'Introduction: New forms of Democracy?', in Held, D. and C. Pollitt (eds), *New Forms of Democracy*, Sage, London.
- Hirst, Paul, 1990, *Representative Democracy and its Limits*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Innes, J. (1996) Consensus building as role-playing and bricolage: toward a theory of collaborative planning, paper presented to the ACSP/AESOP Congress (*American Congress of Schools of Planning Association of European Schools of planning*), Toronto, July.
- Ihi Management Consultants (1987), *Bicultural Management Programme*, Department of Labour
- Jacobs, M. (1997) Environmental valuation, deliberative democracy and public decision-making, in: J. Foster (Ed.) *Valuing nature: economics, ethics and environment* (London, Routledge).
- Jesson, B. (1977) "Preface" M. Peters (ed.) *Cultural politics and the University in Aotearoa / New Zealand*, Dunmore press, Palmerston North.
- Johnson, J. (1998) 'Arguing for deliberation: some sceptical considerations', In J. Elster (ed.) *Deliberative Democracy*, pp. 161-184.
- Komberg, Allan and Harold D. Clarke, 1992, *Citizens and community Political Support in a Representative Democracy*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Lam, Wai Fung (1996) Institutional design of public agencies and coproduction: a study of irrigation associations in Taiwan, *World Development*, 24, pp. 1039-1054.

- Macpherson, C. B. (1973) *Democracy: Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Macpherson, C.B. (1980) *Burke*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Maloney, W., Smith, G. & Stoker, G. (1998) Social capital and urban governance: adding a more contextualised 'top-down' perspective, unpublished working paper, Department of Government, University of Strathclyde.
- Malthus, T.R. 1890: *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: Ward, Lock and Co.
- Mansbridge, J. (1983) *Beyond Adversary Democracy*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Marcus, George E. and Russell L. Hanson (eds), 1993, *Reconsidering the Democratic Public*, Pennsylvania University Press, University Park, Pennsylvania.
- Marshall, T.H. 1963: *Sociology at the Crossroads*. London: Heinemann.
- Marx, K. 1973a: *Capital*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Marx, K. 1973b: *Surveys from Exile*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- McLennan, Gregor, 1984, 'Capitalist state or democratic polity? Recent developments in Marxist and pluralist theory', in McLennan, G., S. Hall and D. Held (eds), *The Idea of the Modern State*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Marley, R. (1981) Top Rank'n ,Survivor Album, Tuff Gong Studios, Jamaica, 1980
- Miliband, R. 1969: *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Mill, J.S. (1873) *Autobiography*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1910) *Representative Government*, London, Everyman.
- Offe, C. and Preuss, U. (1991) 'Democratic institutions and moral resources', in K. Held (ed.) *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity Press, pp. 143-171.
- Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic Collective Action* (Harvard, MA, Harvard University Press).
- Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons: the evolution of institutions for collective*

- action* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Ostrom, E. (1996) Crossing the great divide: coproduction, synergy and development, *World Development*, 24, pp. 1073-1087
- Parry, G., Moyser, G, Day, N. (1992) *Public Participation and Democracy in Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Pascall, G. (1986) *Social Policy: A Feminist Analysis*, Travistock, London.
- Pateman, C. (1970) *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Plamentz, J. (1963) *Man and Society*, London, Longmans.
- Plato (1974) *The Republic*, Harmondsworth, Penguin
- Przeworski, A. (1998) 'Deliberation and ideological domination' in J. Elster (ed.) *Deliberative Democracy*, pp. 140-160
- Putnam, R. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R.D. (1993) *Making Democracy Work* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press).
- Rawls, John, 1971, *A Theory of Justice*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts
- Ritchey-Vance, M. (1996) Social capital, sustainability, and working democracy: new yardsticks for grassroots development. *Grassroots Development*, 20. pp. 3-9.
- Rousseau, J-J (1968) *the Social Contract*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Ruwhiu, L.A (1999) *Te Puawaitanga o te ihi me te wehi - The politics of Maori social policy development*, Massey University, Palmerston North
- Sartori, G. (1962) *Democratic Theory*, Detroit, Wayne State University.
- Schumpeter, J. (1976) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, London, Alen and Unwin.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A., 1947 (revised 2<sup>nd</sup> edition), *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Routledge, London.
- Sivanandan, A. (1992). UK commentary: sign of the times, an interview by

Paul Grant, IN *Race and Class: A journal for Black and Third World Liberation*. Vol. 33: APR-June, NO. 4

Spoonley, P.(1993a)*Critical Issues in New Zealand Society*, Oxford University Press, Auckland

Spoonley, P.(1984). *Racism and Ethnicity*- 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford press, Auckland.

Stokes, S. (1998) 'Pathologies of deliberation' in J. Elster (ed.) *Deliberative Democracy*, pp. 123-139.

Tawney, R. (1931), *Equality*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Titmuss, R.M. 1974: *Social Policy*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Titmuss, R.M. (1974), *Social policy: An Introduction*. London: Unwin Hyman

Tullock, G. (1993) *Rent Seeking* (London, Edward Elgar).

Von Hayeck, F.A., *The Road to Serfdom*, London, Routledge & Sons, 1945.

Wolff, R. P. (1970) *In Defense of Anarchism*, New York, Harper Colophon Books.

## Glossary

### **Ethnic**

That group of people whose ethnic heritage distinguishes them from the majority of other people in New Zealand, including Maori and Pacific people.

The New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils defines ethnic as ‘ related to a segment of the population within Aotearoa / New Zealand society sharing fundamental cultural values, customs, beliefs, languages tradition and characteristics that are different to those of the wider society

<b>Hikoi</b>	march
<b>Kete</b>	basket
<b>Manaaki</b>	entertain, befriend
<b>Mana</b>	power , influence, dignity
<b>Manuhiri</b>	visitor
<b>Mauri</b>	life principle, special character
<b>Rangatiratanga</b>	kingdom , principality
<b>Tangata Whenua</b>	local people, people of the land
<b>Tauwi</b>	foreigner
<b>Tikanga</b>	protocol, rules, custom, obligations
<b>Tupuna</b>	ancestor
<b>Wairua</b>	spitual essence
<b>Wellbeing</b>	concerns the extent of our inclusiveness as a society which champions positive human rights- and access to genuine participation free from discrimination and prejudice.