

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.

**He iwi moke, he whanokē
Iwi social services, policy and practice**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of**

**Master of Arts
in
Social Policy**

At Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand

Taimania Rickard

2014

Abstract

Whānau centred organisational policy and social work practice is well established within iwi and Māori organisations. Shifts in government policy thinking toward more holistic and collaborative social service provision, characterised by the development of Whānau Ora, affirms the past and current practice of iwi and Māori organisations. Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou has successfully provided whānau centred social services with the support of government contract funding since 1992. This thesis examines the current policy and practice of the Rūnanga with reference to the development of Māori social policy and in particular Whānau Ora, arguing that Māori social work practice has developed ahead of and in parallel to official government policy. Emerging themes include Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector, the impact of politics and the economy on direction and service provision, community influenced social work, the natural and forced inclusion of tikanga in social services and research and the potential for official whānau centred social policy to increase the effectiveness of iwi and Māori organisations to deliver services in line with a Māori world view. This study was completed within a Kaupapa Māori research framework specifically tailored for the project. Recommendations for future research, both specific to the Ngāti Porou community and to Māori development in general are made at the conclusion of the thesis. Recommendations for iwi social service providers and the public sector are also made.

He Mihi - Acknowledgements

Ki te kahore he whakakitenga, ka kore te iwi e tupato

Whakatauki 29:18, Te Paipera Tapu

This thesis is dedicated to my Nanny Honor Rickard (nee Kōhere) of Rangitukia who used to often ask me if I was going to “help my Māori people”. I sincerely hope that this thesis is a contribution to the great volume of work that has been done to do just that.

This thesis has challenged me deeply and I am grateful for the support of every person who has contributed and encouraged me, sometimes quite forcefully, to get it completed. Ka nui te mihi aroha ki a koutou. I am especially grateful for the financial support I received from Massey University through the Purehuroa Awards and from the Turitaka Trust.

To my supervisors Rachael Selby and Awhina English, thank you for the invaluable direction and encouragement, for keeping me accountable and for believing in my ability.

To my whānau, thank you for letting me turn your house into my office, for supporting me in everything, for telling it like it is and for generally being wonderful.

To Peter, thank you for letting me ignore you to do my work and for still loving me despite my lectures on colonisation, I am very lucky.

To Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and all the participants, thank you for allowing me to complete this research with you, for sharing your stories and for working tirelessly for the good of our people. Your contribution to this work is invaluable.

And finally, to the indomitable people of Ngāti Porou, I am proud to be counted among you.

Ngāti Porou upholds a legacy of independence, self-determination and commitment to the retention of mana motuhake. It is hoped that this work honours that legacy.

*Te Wiwi Nati o Porourangi
He iwi moke no Waiapu
No Whangaokena no Hikurangi
He Nati te Wiwi, he whanoke!*

(nā Tā Apirana Ngata, Te Wiwi Nati)

Contents

Abstract	iii
Ngā Mihi – Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter one. From the Royal Commission to Whānau Ora: Māori policy development	7
The Royal Commission	8
The Royal Commission in context	9
Urbanisation, assimilation and integration	9
Māori cultural renaissance and growing acknowledgement of Māori in social policy	11
Puao-te-ata-tū	13
Neo-liberal reform	15
Targeting policy	18
Aspiration based approaches	20
Whānau Ora	21
Chapter two. Ideologies, theories and debates: the foundations of Māori policy development	23
Assimilation, integration and colonisation	23
Western liberalism and an indigenous worldview: the political economy of Māori policy	26
Deficits and capacities, targeting and tailoring	30
Biculturalism, social inclusion and the international scene	32
Iwi Māori: the complexities of Māori identity	35
Tino Rangatiratanga	40
Chapter three. Methodologies and methods: best fit Kaupapa Māori	43
Research Design	49
Limitations and ethical considerations	53
Other studies with a Kaupapa Māori framework	56
A note to potential students of Māori research	58
Chapter four. Whānau Ora is not a new thing: the development of Ngāti Porou social services	61
Establishment of the services	61
Ngāti Porou services for Ngāti Porou people	62
Staff development	64
Relationships with the State	64
Whānau Ora	66
Chapter five. Ngāti Porou social services	70
Kaimahi	70
Contracts, policies and guidelines	70
Influence of politics	71
Feedback and evaluations	73
Relationships	74

Unique qualities of iwi social services	75
Whānau Ora	77
Challenges and opportunities	78
<u>Management</u>	79
Contracts, policies and politics	79
Feedback and evaluation	82
Relationships	84
Unique qualities of iwi social services	85
Whānau Ora	86
Challenges and opportunities	89
<u>Hapū Social Services</u>	90
Contracts, policies and guidelines	91
Feedback and evaluations	93
Unique qualities of iwi social services	93
Whānau Ora	94
Challenges and opportunities	95
<u>Conclusions</u>	96
Chapter Six. Analysis and discussion	97
Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector	97
The influence of politics and the economy on direction and service provision	103
Community influenced social work	108
Iwi centric: a comparison between the natural and forced inclusion of tikanga in social services	112
Challenges and opportunities	113
Chapter Seven. Conclusions and recommendations	116
Recommendations	119
Bibliography	121
Appendices	131
1. Massey University Human Ethics Application 11/72 including;	132
Letters of invitation	147
Information sheets	152
Consent forms	156
Interview schedule	158
Focus group question schedule	160
Transcriber's confidentiality agreement	161
Authority for the release of written transcripts	162
2. Research assistant confidentiality agreement	163
3. Glossary of Māori terms	164

Introduction

...delay without action could not survive indefinitely. The first action took place on the east coast in the territory of the Ngāti Porou. Under the inspired leadership of Sir Apirana Ngata, M.P. for the Eastern Māori Electorate, remaining blocks of Māori land held in common were incorporated and administered as sheep stations by committees elected by the owners. The scheme proved a success and demonstrated the hitherto unbelievable fact that the Māori sheep farmers could be as good and better than some of their Pākeha competitors (Buck, 1949, p.384)

The excerpt above is taken from Te Rangi Hiroa/ Sir Peter Buck's 1949 book *The Coming of the Māori*, and refers to the establishment of Sir Apirana Ngata's Māori land development initiatives in the early 1900s. Because of the individualisation of title, Māori land was held by large numbers of descendants of the original title holder in shares too small for efficient productive use. Because of this, Māori landowners were under increasing pressure to alienate their land to Pākeha farmers for use in 'productive' enterprise. As a solution to the problem and as an avenue for Māori economic and social development, Ngata proposed the consolidation of land holdings and the farming of that land by Māori farmers.

It may seem strange to include an excerpt on land development in an introduction to a thesis on contemporary social service development, but many similarities can be drawn between the Māori land development initiatives of the 1900s, and the current move toward more holistically focused social services. In a time when the rhetoric of Māori social policy is increasingly promoting collectivism and collaboration through Whānau Ora, it seems fitting that those same values in the developments of our past, be acknowledged as evidence of a 'whānau' approach that has existed not only in a social sense but also at the level of official initiatives. What is interesting now though, is that where those values were once inconsistent with the government's ambitions; they are now fashionable, informing government policy and if not embraced at least accepted.

A number of the goals of the land development schemes are noticeably similar to the goals of iwi social service development; self-determination for iwi, hapū and whānau, better socio-economic outcomes for iwi members, protection and maintenance of collective assets both physical and cultural, collaboration of resources and knowledge and survival in a Pākehā dominated political world. At a higher level they are about values, about who decides what is valuable and important; they are about pressure to conform and responding to that pressure and they are about forging a way forward in a changing world. Furthermore, in much the same way as a recitation of natural whakapapa, this small excerpt reveals a link between the innovators of the past and the developments of today.

It is not surprising to see that the “first action” in corporate Māori farming took place in the rohe of Ngāti Porou. It would be easy to say that this was simply because Ngata was himself Ngāti Porou. However, both historically and contemporarily, Ngāti Porou has, even outside of this initiative, shown a proclivity for action and for surviving despite the pressures of colonisation, with our “mana whenua, mana moana, mana tangata, and mana Atua” still intact (Te Runanga o Ngati Porou 2013b)¹.

Just as pioneering action in corporate Māori farming took place in Ngāti Porou territory, so too did pioneering action in iwi driven, government funded social services. Since 1992, Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou has delivered a wide range of its own, distinctly Ngāti Porou social services in partnership with successive governments. This thesis focuses on how those services are delivered in an environment where it is becoming increasingly common, for social service rhetoric to encourage a holistic approach, predicated on a Māori worldview (Owen 2001). With that in mind, the aim of this thesis is to examine the current social service policies and practices of an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora collective, in the context of national policy, politics, economics and iwi and Māori development. This thesis examines the influence of policy on practice and of

¹ Macrons are not used for bracketed citations and bibliographical references for Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou as official documentation developed by those two entities does not use macrons. For the sake of consistency with the rest of the text all other references to the two entities use macrons.

practice on policy with the goal of providing weight to the argument that ‘Whānau Ora’ in substance, if not in name, has been the policy and practice approach of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and many other Māori organisations since their establishment.

In 2009 the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives was established to develop an “evidence based framework that would lead to; strengthened whānau capabilities; an integrated approach to whānau wellbeing; collaborative relationships between State agencies in relation to whānau services; relationships between government and community agencies that are broader than contractual; improved cost-effectiveness and value for money”. (Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives 2010, p.6). The *Report of the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives* was released in early 2010 and included the following six recommendations;

1. The Taskforce recommends that an independent Trust be constituted to govern, coordinate and implement Whānau Ora, and report to a dedicated Minister of Whānau Ora;
2. The Taskforce recommends the establishment of a specific Whānau Ora appropriation(s) to be managed by the Trust;
3. The Taskforce recommends that Whānau Ora services are integrated and comprehensive, and focused on measurable outcomes that will contribute to whānau empowerment;
4. The Taskforce recommends that Whānau Ora services are shaped by te ao Māori;
5. The Taskforce recommends that all government agencies with responsibilities for any aspect of whānau wellbeing commit to the Whānau Ora principles and support the Whānau Ora approach, and;
6. The Taskforce recommends that the Trust establish regional panels to ensure Whānau Ora contributes in positive and realistic ways in local communities (pp. 9-10).

Later in 2010 a number of ‘Whānau Ora Collectives’ were established to develop and eventually deliver these whānau centred services. While recommendations one, two and six were quickly addressed, the exact shape and direction of Whānau Ora services was not prescribed, instead, allowing for collectives to develop Whānau Ora in line with the needs of their own communities. Collectives, and the organisations that comprise them, have an important role to play in how Whānau Ora as a policy will look in the future. It would thus be a valuable exercise to complete research with

one of these organisations as they navigate the initial stages of developing and implementing Whānau Ora. Due to the political environment, the implementation of Whānau Ora has been slower than anticipated. Because of this, the focus of this research, originally intended to be the implementation of Whānau Ora, has shifted to pre-Whānau Ora policies and practices, with the hope of providing a foundation that can be utilised in the implementation stage as it occurs.

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter one. From the Royal Commission to Whānau Ora: Māori policy development, discusses Māori policy developments and the social, political and economic contexts in which they were and are developed and implemented and that are of particular relevance to the community of interest in this study. The *April Report* of the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) is used as a starting point for discussion. The aim of this chapter is to provide a foundation on which to build both a platform for the discussion of the ideologies and theories that drive these developments and a case for the acknowledgement of Māori organisations as the real pioneers in whānau centred service delivery.

Chapter two. Ideologies, theories and debates: the foundations of Māori policy development, discusses the ideologies, theories and debates that have shaped Māori policy development outlined in the preceding chapter. Chapter two focuses on six particular areas; assimilation, integration and colonisation; Western liberalism and an indigenous worldview: the political economy of Māori policy; capacities and deficits; biculturalism, social inclusion and the international scene; the complexities of Māori identity and; tino rangatiratanga.

Chapter three. Methodology and method: best fit Kaupapa Māori outlines the particular approach to Kaupapa Māori research that was employed in this study and the specific methods used. The discussion focuses less on the critical nature of Kaupapa Māori research and rather on the diversity and in some instances conflicts that exist within Māori research, with the aim of formulating an approach that best fits this particular research. The chapter touches on both tikanga and relationship, arguing that the most important tikanga in research is in fact relationship.

Chapter four. Whānau Ora is not a new thing: the development of Ngāti Porou social services presents the perspective of a prominent former employee and CEO of the Rūnanga who played an integral part in the establishment of the Rūnanga's social service programme. The chapter explains the establishment and development of Rūnanga social services including Hapū Social Services and Whānau Oranga, the motivations behind their establishment, the original and continual goals of the social services, challenges and the social services in reference to Whānau Ora.

Chapter five. Ngāti Porou social services presents the findings of focus groups and interviews with kaimahi and management of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou Whānau Oranga unit and with members of the Hapū Social Services Group with the aim of examining and explaining the current shape and form of Ngāti Porou social services. Presentation of data focuses on a number of key areas. These include; what services are currently offered by the organisation; what policies and practices are currently in place; how those policies and practices are reviewed and by whom; the methods of obtaining feedback from service users and how this feedback is used and staff expectations and preparations regarding the future implementation of Whānau Ora.

Chapter six. Analysis and discussion analyses and discusses the findings outlined in the two previous chapters drawing on literature and other relevant documentation. The analysis is organised into five sections; Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector; the influence of politics and the economy on direction and service provision; community influenced social work; comparisons between the natural and forced inclusion of tikanga in social services and challenges and opportunities.

Finally Chapter seven. Conclusions summarises the key argument that Whānau Ora is in substance if not in name a well-established approach among iwi and Māori organisations that has developed both ahead of and in parallel with official Māori policy. The chapter also makes predictions about the future of Māori social services, their relevance to wider New Zealand society and where work needs to occur to ensure their effectiveness. Recommendations are provided at the end of the chapter.

This study was conducted in the Gisborne and East Coast region with current and previous staff of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou now transitioned to Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou following settlement of historic Ngāti Porou claims under the Treaty of Waitangi. For the purposes of simplicity, the organisation will generally be referred to as Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou or the Rūnanga throughout this document as this was the organisation's name during the bulk of this study and it is that entity rather than the new one, that most of the information gathered refers to. Furthermore, as many staff had worked in the organisation for some time and some participants no longer worked in the organisation, they generally referred to it as such. There are a small number of occasions when the organisation is referred to as Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou when discussing future aspirations or specific information that has been cited from a document created by that entity. The term 'Rūnanga social service arm' is used to refer to the combined Whānau Oranga unit and Hapū Social Services Committee.

The iwi of Ngāti Porou on whom this study is based, is my own iwi. Both of my parents are from the Waiapu Valley, widely considered to be the Ngāti Porou heartland. This project has a Kaupapa Māori and qualitative approach in order to enhance the body of knowledge around Māori social services and Whānau Ora in a Māori way. Furthermore, while iwi social services are not exclusively for iwi members or Māori they are targeted at Māori whānau and individuals.

'Pūrangiaho te kitea o Hikurangi' means 'Hikurangi is clearly seen'. It is hoped that through this thesis that the social service achievements of Ngāti Porou are clearly seen, that the challenges faced and overcome and the challenges still to face provide good lessons for those that wish to progress Māori development into the future.

Chapter one

From the Royal Commission to Whānau Ora: Māori policy development.

Few would be ready to guess where this will lead. But at least something can be said about where it has come from. In essence it comes from a long series of determined efforts since the beginning of colonisation to preserve the character and values of Māori life (Royal Commission on Social Policy 1988, p.43).

In 1988, the Royal Commission on Social Policy could not readily predict the scale of the changes that would occur in Māori development in the decades following the publication of the *April Report*. While at the time, the report was highly criticised, looking back over more than 20 years of social change for Māori, the report was a marker for important ideological, attitudinal and policy changes beginning to take place in Māori and national policy development (Barnes & Harris 2011). During that time and since, Māori society has grown through neo-liberal reform, the development of the Treaty settlement process, the rise of modern Māori political consciousness, the new social democracy and the recent return to the political centre right (Walker, Ranginui 2004; Cheyne, O'Brien & Belgrave 2008; Barnes & Harris 2011). This chapter will examine the social and political context in which the Report was written and the development of Māori policy and social services since its publication in 1988. It will touch on the social, political and ideological influences on Māori policy and social services since this time, with a view to understanding the current and future direction for Māori development with a focus on Whānau Ora. Chapter one will conclude with an overview of Whānau Ora as the most recent Māori policy development.

No doubt there will be some important developments in Māori policy not discussed in this assessment, however those that are included are considered the most important for this study as they have had and do have the most effect on the community of interest. Because of the volume of material that needs to be covered chronologically in this chapter, a more in-depth exploration of the theory and ideology behind developments will be provided in the following chapter.

The Royal Commission

Many contemporary studies of Māori development use the 1984 Hui Taumata (Māori Economic Summit) as the key starting point for their discussion and rightly so. However, in this instance the Royal Commission was chosen for its focus on social policy and the status of the Commission's report as a national policy publication, albeit a highly criticised one. The Royal Commission on Social Policy was a six person team consisting of senior public servants, professionals and academics who worked together for approximately two years. The Commission was tasked with undertaking a "nationwide enquiry designed to set social policy goals" and to formulate recommendations on how to make New Zealand a "more fair and just society" (Royal Commission on Social Policy 1988, p. xvii). Within this framework, the Commission dedicated significant effort to examining policy concerns facing Māori and developing recommendations to remedy these. With regard to the social, political and economic circumstances of the time, the recommendations of the Commission can be conservatively described as ambitious and included an upper House of Parliament comprising 50 percent Māori membership, a Bill of Rights entrenching the Treaty of Waitangi and for the Treaty to be instated as the New Zealand Constitution (Barnes & Harris 2011).

Unfortunately for the Royal Commission, its report was required to be released earlier than was intended. It therefore suffered in its clarity and readability and faced significant criticism because of this (Durie 2003a). However, the fundamental aspects of the report were still fairly clear and if this timeline is reflected upon, it can be seen that development has moved in the direction the Commission was advocating for, albeit more slowly and less drastically than what was recommended. Whether this development is a direct or indirect consequence of the report or simply the result of inevitable social change is however, unclear (Barnes & Harris 2011).

The Royal Commission in context

Urbanisation, assimilation and integration

Before analysing post-Royal Commission Māori development, it is important to have an understanding of the historical and social context in which the Commission was working. For the first half of the twentieth century, the Māori population was largely rural with the ability to maintain a strong collective identity and lifestyle. Because of this, there was little need for government intervention in the everyday lives of Māori whānau. Following World War Two however, a large proportion of the Māori population migrated to urban centres, greatly changing the structure of both Māori and New Zealand society, the consequences of which would be far reaching and significant (Cheyne et al. 2008). New Zealand was in a season of industrialisation and demand for labourers was high. Māori left rural communities in waves to satisfy this demand, gaining employment in processing and manufacturing and in large State-owned enterprises and government departments (Ringold 2005). However, far from the prosperity and social acceptance it promised, rapid urbanisation, while beneficial for a number of individuals and whānau, proved to be detrimental to Māori society as a whole (Walker, Ranginui 2004)².

One of the most serious consequences of urbanisation was the breakdown of traditional social structures, and the replacement of these with an often poverty stricken and discontented urban Māori community (Durie 2003a). Also contributing to mounting pressures was the decline of once growing rural Māori economies whose populations had been diminished by urbanisation. During this time many Māori ties to homelands were weakened, the Māori language suffered and traditional collective support systems were partially dismantled, drawing Māori society into something of an identity crisis, a crisis which would lead to multigenerational deprivation among many Māori whānau in the years to come. In saying this, urbanisation would also eventually produce a motivated and visible urban Māori community that would be instrumental in future Māori advancement. Urban Marae like Hoani Waititi Marae in Auckland which was also to house the first Kura

² (Walker, Ranginui 2004) has been used here rather than (Walker 2004) as the bibliography contains a reference to an article by P. Walker also published in 2004. P. Walker is not cited within the text.

Kaupapa Māori, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club in Wellington, Ngā Tamatoa and the Māori Women's Welfare League are all organisations that have contributed to strong urban and pan-Māori communities (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

Policy during this time however, did not recognise the plight of the urban Māori community or the effects of urbanisation on the Māori population. In 1961, more than a decade after large scale Māori urbanisation began, Jack Hunn, Secretary of Māori Affairs, released a report that finally acknowledged an urban Māori future. Prior to this, little effort had been made in the public sector to address the concerns of an increasingly urban Māori population. In its most recognised function, the report highlighted the widespread deprivation that would be the focal point of Māori policy for the next half century. The report confirmed that Māori urbanisation had created something of a Māori social underclass, with the demographic profile being one of low income, low education, disproportionately high crime and alarming health outcomes. While identification and acknowledgement was an important step in addressing Māori issues, the report was overwhelmingly deficit focused, setting a perilous precedent for the next forty years of Māori policy (Cheyne et al. 2008).

Furthermore, Hunn argued that the key objective of Māori policy should be the integration of Māori into 'mainstream' New Zealand society. He encouraged further urbanisation, the individualisation of land title, the idea of *tūrangawaewae* based on urban home ownership³ and a gradual movement away from a dedicated Māori Affairs Department. While Hunn's intentions appear to be benign, he was clearly operating from the colonial perspective that was standard among the governments of the time. Policy makers of Hunn's and previous eras, generally believed that the way forward for Māori development was through assimilation and integration of the Māori population into the dominant European culture; an attitude that still raises the ire of many Māori commentators today (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

The Western idea of the nuclear family was the norm on which social policy was based, leaving little room for the acknowledgement of traditional Māori concepts of

³ Hunn encouraged Māori to replace the idea of ancestral lands and Marae as *tūrangawaewae* (Place where a person has rights of residence and belonging through descent) with the idea that every individual and family could essentially have their own *tūrangawaewae* through home ownership

whānau and collectivity. At this time Māori constituted approximately eight percent of the New Zealand population and had a very different experience of family to their non-Māori counterparts. In terms of serving majority interests and winning elections, successive governments were under little or no pressure to acknowledge Māori culture or worldview in this respect (Cribb 2009, p.7). Public policy did not need to acknowledge family diversity as the Māori population was neither large enough nor vocal enough to force change.

Arguably the quintessential policy of the period was the expansion of the Māori housing programme. In what has become known as ‘pepper potting’, Māori families were placed in predominantly Pākeha neighbourhoods in an effort to integrate them into ‘mainstream’ New Zealand society. The problem, was that the Western idea of the nuclear family was not the norm for many Māori families and the placement of these families into communities that did not share their values, exacerbated the issues associated with the loss of whānau and community support. Such an approach to policy has now been condemned as not only ineffective but also detrimental to positive Māori development (Walker, Ranginui 2004; Cheyne et al. 2008). Half a century on from this report, New Zealand has learnt the hard lesson that the idealistic ‘one New Zealand’ approach to policy is largely unhelpful in progressing Māori and thus national development (Bradley 1995b; Walker, Ranginui 2004).

Māori cultural renaissance and growing acknowledgement of Māori in social policy

While on one hand, official policies were working toward the integration of Māori into a largely Pākeha population, by the late 1970s the stirrings of the Māori cultural renaissance were being felt within both Māori and Pākeha society. Māori political consciousness was growing and in particular the Māori land rights movement. Māori issues were in the public eye in a previously unprecedented way with both the 1975 land march and the occupation of Bastion Point being televised. Such scenes were a far cry from the image of racial harmony that had been pedalled to both the national and international communities by successive New Zealand governments (Cheyne et al. 2008). The early 1980s also heralded the arrival of Māori medium education with Kōhanga Reo or language nests established around the country in an independent Māori initiative. This would eventually grow to include total immersion Māori and

bilingual education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Distinctly Māori urban organisations were also expanding with Hoani Waititi Marae being established in Auckland as an urban marae and organisations like the Māori Women's Welfare League and the National Māori Council increasing in numbers and influence (Walker, Ranginui 2004). In 1984 the inaugural Hui Taumata or Māori Economic Summit was held by influential Māori leaders from around the country and hosted at Parliament. From the Hui Taumata came the idea of the development of a distinctly Māori economy, the product of which can be seen today in the increasing economic power of Māori organisations (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

Furthermore, the Treaty of Waitangi Act, championed by the then Minister of Māori Affairs Matiu Rata, was made law in 1975, enabling Māori to address contemporary breaches of the Treaty. By the 1980s there was a growing acknowledgement of Māori values in social policy. Of particular note were the Māori Language Act 1987 establishing Te Reo Māori as an official language of New Zealand, and the Treaty of Waitangi (State Enterprises) Act 1988, which achieved the inclusion of the momentous section 9 of the State-Owned Enterprises Act 1986, "Nothing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi".

By 1985 the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal was extended to include historical claims dating back to 1840, setting in motion a move toward retribalisation and the rebuilding of the Māori economy. The government had declared that its preferred counterparts in Treaty negotiations were iwi, encouraging the creation of Rūnanga, governing bodies of iwi given political legitimacy through legislation (Webster 2002). Furthermore, the period of neo-liberal reform had begun, enabling the devolution of social services to non-government organisations, contracts for which Rūnanga could apply. Iwi development came to prominence during this period provoking discussion on the definition of the term, the organisation of modern Māori society and who could rightfully make decisions for Māori (Walker, Ranginui 2004). A more detailed discussion of the relevant debates in this area is provided in the next chapter.

Puao-te-ata-tū

Around the same time that the Royal Commission on Social Policy was active, a major review of the Social Welfare Department was being undertaken from a Māori perspective. The review was commissioned by the then Minister of Social Welfare on the basis of the disproportionate number of Māori social welfare clients and resulted in the now widely known report *Puao-te-ata-tu* (1988). The Committee undertook widespread consultation with Māori clients of the Department and heard significant grievances at every location. These included the discounting of marae and tribal records as sole evidence of age, the lack of acknowledgement of Māori custom marriage, inflexible Department procedures and a lack of respect for clients (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1988).

The key finding of the report was that the Department was “institutionally racist” toward Māori and particularly ignorant of the place of the child in Māori society. The committee viewed racism in the Department as a reflection of racism in the community and noted that of all the forms of racism that exist, institutional racism is the most destructive. The Committee also found that the Department was a “highly centralised bureaucracy, insensitive to the needs of many of its clients” (p.7), an issue which was no doubt present within the government as a whole and much larger than one report or review.

While the review was focused on the Department of Social Welfare, consultation with the Māori community raised equally grave concerns about other government departments. The Committee made a request that its terms of reference and recommendations be taken in to consideration by the Royal Commission on Social Policy (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1988). The Committee stated that the issues raised in consultation could not be dealt with adequately within the confines of a single department but that “to redress the imbalances will require concerted action from all agencies involved—central and local government, the business community, Māoridom and the community at large” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1988, p.8).

The Committee made 13 recommendations in its report, chief among those being to “attack all forms of cultural racism” and to “attack and eliminate deprivation and alienation” within the department (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1988, p.9). The Committee also recommended changes to certain legislation including the Social Welfare Act 1971⁴, the Social Security Act 1964 and the Children and Young Persons Act 1974 to better reflect Māori needs.⁵

The report also advocated for biculturalism, a concept whose meaning and practical working would continue to elude both policy makers and the public for the better part of the next two decades (Walsh-Tapiata 1997; Larner 2006). Simply put, the Advisory Committee intended biculturalism to mean the sharing of responsibility for policy and service design and delivery by both Māori and non-Māori as well as shared understanding and values, fostering of Māori language and greater accountability of the public service to Māori. In reality, although the concept is now embedded in national policy rhetoric, New Zealand is still struggling to come to terms with it in an increasingly multicultural and global environment. As the number of immigrants in New Zealand increases a more multicultural rather than bicultural policy approach has also been advocated for (Larner 2006). This is an ongoing argument that will be further discussed in the following chapter.

Despite these efforts, many aspects of the Department of Social Welfare remained the same in a practical sense. Any changes that were made were generally confined solely to the Department. Commentators such as Walker (1995) lamented the lack of real progress and the opposition of many Department employees to implement the recommended changes. Walker believed that *Puao-te-ata-tu* had basically been relegated to little more than a footnote on the political agenda, a good idea lacking the people and resources to see it realised. He did however, acknowledge the bravery

⁴ To allow for the establishment of the Social Welfare Commission

⁵ In particular, with regard to the Children and Young Persons Act, the Committee recommended that children be maintained within their own hapū, that tribal consultation would occur in the placement and care of children, that Māori specific practice is encouraged and that funding be directed toward positive Māori development initiatives (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare 1988).

of the then Minister of Social Welfare and the CEO of the Department for taking steps to address institutional racism in an unsupportive political environment. *Puao-te-ata-tu* did however contribute to the development of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 which constituted a drastic change in thinking from the monocultural approach embedded in the Children and Young Persons Act 1974 (Nash and Munford 2001). *Puao-te-ata-tu* is now a widely acknowledged document with a significant impact on Māori social work practice and a strong role in informing new generations of social workers (English 2005). As a particular point of interest for this study, it was during this period that Ngāti Porou social services was established as a product of a community needs assessment undertaken on the East Coast by the Department, in partnership with Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou. A separate chapter, Chapter four, has been written on the establishment of Ngāti Porou Social Services.

Neo-liberal reform

This period was also marked by the beginning of the neo-liberal economic reforms that would define New Zealand politics and policy for the better part of a decade and a half. The interface between the economy and social policy was at the crux of the Royal Commission's Work and while the ideal nature of this interface is always at the forefront of political debate, it can be argued that due to the rapid dismantling of a welfare state that had existed since the 1930s, finding an acceptable solution was more pressing than ever. Political economy, with particular emphasis on the economy part of the equation, has played a critical role in the development of Māori policy and Māori social services. During the two decades following World War Two, the New Zealand economy enjoyed a period of sustained growth and high employment on the back of the post-war boom and a generous welfare state. However by the late 1960s it was becoming abundantly clear that this was unsustainable and the substantial welfare state and its accompanying socialist ideology could not maintain the New Zealand economy in an increasingly global economic environment. As economic confidence was eroded, the socio-economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori that had been fairly well disguised by national prosperity became even more acute (Cheyne et al. 2008). Māori development stalled

with Māori support for the welfare state declining significantly (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

The Royal Commission was certainly operating in what might be deemed ‘interesting times’ for Māori, represented by rapid economic change, a growing national interest in the Treaty of Waitangi, increasing Māori political awareness and cultural renaissance, teamed with efforts by the State to get a handle on more effective ways to develop Māori policy. In a general sense, the Commission recommended that the government continue to maintain a strong role in social services, not just through cash transfers to beneficiaries and providers but also through direct provision and intervention in macro-level policies. An approach which was seemingly inconsistent with the devolutionary direction of the day. The Commission also recommended that social and economic policies be developed in a coordinated way that took account of the mutual impact of each on the other (Durie 2003a).

During this time, Western liberalism dominated the policy landscape with the tail end of the Fourth Labour Government’s neo-liberal reforms, followed by an equally neo-liberal National Party policy portfolio. Within Māori policy, the National Government had a dual focus, firstly, the settlement of historic grievances under the Treaty of Waitangi and secondly, the provision of social services. The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1985 allowed for the settlement of historic grievances and on the Fourth National Government’s policy agenda during its tenure was an explicit goal to reach full and final settlement as fast as possible (Cheyne et al. 2008). What is particularly interesting and in some ways ironic about this period is the fundamental conflict between the right wing individualist ideology that both political parties adhered to and their attempts to cater to what were largely collective Māori interests.

One of the significant occurrences of the period was the development of the ‘fiscal envelope’ which set the total cost of all historic Treaty settlements at not exceeding \$1 billion. This policy sparked nationwide Māori unity and discontent at levels not seen since the land rights movement of the mid-1970s (Walker, Ranginui 2004). While the idea was shelved as official policy, it remained as unofficial policy. Because of this, some iwi were shrewd enough to have it expressly stated in their

deeds of settlement that should total settlements exceed one billion dollars, they would receive a monetary payment based on the size of the overspend and their proportion of the original settlement budget. The first major settlements were completed in the 1990s with Ngāi Tahu and Waikato-Tainui leading the way. While the settlements, each worth roughly \$170 million, were equated to decidedly less than the current value of what historic losses amounted to, they provided an opportunity for iwi to build a strong contemporary economic base and increase capacity to support iwi members in a variety of ways (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Since 1990 approximately 38 settlements have been completed with a significant number in various stages of the settlement process (Office of Treaty Settlements 2013).

Perhaps more relevant to this discussion, although certainly influenced by Treaty Settlement, is that throughout the 1990s Māori social services became a highly visible part of the health and social service sectors. The government, based on the idea that greater choice, competition and less government intervention in the social service sector would lead to more efficient and effective services, implemented a policy of devolution. For Māori, this meant that iwi and pan-Māori organisations could gain contracts to provide social services that had previously been provided by central government organisations. Furthermore, those Māori organisations would have a degree of autonomy over the design and delivery of those services (Cheyne et al. 2008).

At the inaugural Hui Taumata in 1984, Māori leaders had expressed support for the idea of devolution as a way for government to support but not direct Māori development (Ringold 2005). However, while well intentioned, devolution did not always deliver on what it promised and there were major concerns held about it. These concerns dated back to the Royal Commission itself who expressed caution about adopting the policy in its proposed form. Key concerns with devolution included that the necessary checks and balances were not in place, proposed accountability mechanisms were untested, election processes were underdeveloped, economies of scale were reduced by the absence of central government, local bodies were unprepared for their new responsibilities and the political and economic motives behind the initiative were unclear (Walsh-Tapiata 1997). These concerns

proved to be well founded with later governments retreating toward more comprehensive government support and accountability measures for contracted organisations (Cheyne et al. 2008).

The reforms were a double edged sword. On one hand they provided Māori with an opportunity to have greater influence over the provision of social services in their communities, while on the other hand, they hit the Māori population hard in terms of unemployment and welfare cuts. Māori had initially left rural areas en masse to take up jobs in New Zealand's growing manufacturing industry. During the 1960s and 1970s the pay gap between employment requiring qualifications and employment that did not, was not a significant enough incentive to up-skill or gain qualifications for most Māori workers in big industry. When in the 1980s the government then began to privatise State-owned enterprises and relax trade controls, it was the manufacturing and processing industries that were most affected; industries heavily populated with Māori workers who did not possess the skill sets to thrive in the new knowledge economy (Ringold 2005).

According to Te Momo (2004) the New Right did not offer a way forward for Māori advancement but rather diminished already limited rights. After a decade and a half of somewhat brutal neo-liberalism and the more recent challenges of governing effectively under MMP (of which the National-led coalition was the first victim), the New Zealand public deserted the right in favour of a Labour Party that had distanced itself from its foray into neo-liberalism. After the Labour victory at the 1999 election, social policy took a social development focus leaning toward a more centralised service provision while keeping intact most of the economic reforms.

Targeting policy

The Labour-Alliance coalition that emerged after the 1999 election undertook a short lived attempt at bringing Māori social services under a Treaty umbrella. By this stage, what policy makers had come to understand in terms of Māori development was that services and policies targeted toward Māori and underpinned by a Māori philosophy were generally more effective than a one-size-fits-all approach to policy

(Owen 2001). The coalition attempted to develop this in the first year of its tenure through Closing the Gaps, a targeted programme aimed at addressing disadvantage in Māori and Pacific Island communities. The government was however to learn an interesting lesson about public perception when Closing the Gaps was abandoned, less than a year into the coalition's term, due to widespread public outcry over what was seen as racial privilege. The policy had made ambiguous use of Māori concepts and although Closing the Gaps was also targeted at Pasifika peoples, this led to a publicly held idea of Māori privilege (Humpage 2006). In 2000, a report by Chapple questioned the integrity of treating Māori as a specific group. This report alongside similar arguments, eventually led the Labour-Alliance coalition to withdraw the policy and initiate an investigation into the appropriateness of ethnicity measures in public policy (Humpage 2006). What is interesting to note, is that for the most part, the general public had not seen historic institutional disadvantage to Māori as a form of racial or ethnic advantage to the dominant European majority, but were quick to think otherwise when the situation was seen to be reversed (Cheyne et al. 2008).

According to Cheyne et al. (2008) targeting social services works better for Māori but also leaves room for Pākehā criticisms of racial privileging and separatism. This essentially creates a political problem for governments that receive sound policy advice in terms of the provision of Māori social services but who must also be conscious of the perception of the majority that holds the voting power. While both the right and the left seem to have been taking a similar approach in terms of targeting services toward Māori, the marketing of the approaches was significantly different, leading to different levels of public acceptance. Closing the Gaps may be regarded as a missed opportunity for the advancement of Māori interests. But while it may have been a more beneficial policy than what was eventually delivered, Closing the Gaps like the policies of the earlier 1990s, still had a deficit focus which is arguably of little benefit to Māori (Durie 2003).

Aspiration based approaches

In recent years new and more aspiration based approaches to policy have been developed. The Māori Potential Approach was developed by Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development and is unique in that it leans toward increasing success rather than ameliorating failure (Ringold 2005). Māori policy has for many years been preoccupied with the idea of reducing deficits which has inevitably moved the focus away from Māori achievement and the idea of success on Māori terms. By the mid-1990s there was an extensive range of critical analysis available on indigenous policy, society and social services to social and community workers. Such analysis was directed at moving away from a deficit approach to Māori policy. One of the major issues however, was that social services and many workers in that sector, had been conditioned by Western liberal ideology to think and practice in ways that were contradictory to such analysis (Ruwhiu 1995). This issue has been remedied somewhat with the rise of the Māori Potential Approach, co-production initiatives with the Ministry of Māori Development and now with the implementation of Whānau Ora.

Since 2000, both sides of the political spectrum have been working toward capacity rather than deficit approaches to Māori policy and social services. One such initiative has been the co-production pilot launched between Te Puni Kōkiri and selected Māori and iwi organisations. The initiative was based on the idea that better results occur when there is collaboration between Māori and government organisations and is essentially about moving away from devolution toward partnership. The rhetoric of co-production is that of community development from the ‘bottom up’. Co-production differs from engagement and consultation in that it requires a long term, high level commitment from both the organisation and the government. Such an initiative works best with organisations that are capable of high level engagement with the government (McKenzie, Whiu, Matahaere-Atariki & Goldsmith 2008). Co-production essentially operates from a similar perspective as Whānau Ora in that ideally it should provide Māori organisations and communities with both autonomy and support. However, for the many organisations that struggle with such a strategic relationship, this type of initiative will most likely be ineffective.

Whānau Ora

While its exact shape is still unclear, Whānau Ora essentially builds upon the Māori Potential Approach. The Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives was established in June 2009 with the aim of creating an “evidence based framework that would lead to; strengthened whānau capabilities; an integrated approach to whānau wellbeing; collaborative relationships between State agencies in relation to whānau services; relationships between government and community agencies that are broader than contractual; improved cost-effectiveness and value for money” (Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives 2010 p.6).

The Taskforce consisted of a multi-agency team with affiliations to the Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Justice, Housing New Zealand, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet; Treasury and the Department of Internal Affairs. The Taskforce reported to the Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector, Tariana Turia who later became the Minister for Whānau Ora on the recommendation of the Taskforce. The Taskforce put forward a framework centred on the whānau, rather than the individual as the core social unit in line with a Māori world view. Furthermore, the report advocated for inter-organisational and inter-sectoral collaboration in order to enhance both effectiveness and efficiency. The Taskforce made a number of recommendations including that Whānau Ora services be “integrated and comprehensive” and “shaped by te ao Māori”, that all government agencies with responsibility for any aspect of the Whānau Ora framework, related policy and services be willing to commit to the principles and support the approach and that the initiative be supported by regional governance groups (Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives 2010 pp.8-9).

The report built the foundation for an official Whānau Ora policy and programme that grew as a result of a support agreement between the National Party and the Māori Party at the 2008 election. A tender for services was sent out with organisations joining together to create Whānau Ora Collectives in their regions. Often these were iwi authorities and Māori health and social service providers. Initial progress was steady with successful collectives set up and researchers found to track the initial progress of the programme. In 2010 \$134.3 million was committed by the

government to the implementation of Whānau Ora over a four year period (Key 2010). Following the 2012 election, progress was somewhat slower. The future of the initiative was more uncertain as the Māori Party were no longer in the position of political kingmaker. It has only been since 2013 that the programme has regained momentum with the new Whānau Ora model of governance announced in July (Turia 2013).

One of the most important challenges for Māori and iwi social service providers has been to work creatively within government contracts (Walsh-Tapiata 1997) and since the advent of devolution, Māori organisations have attempted to work toward their aspirations while being limited by government policies that do not always encompass a Māori worldview. As a flexible and somewhat undefined Māori centred initiative, Whānau Ora if progressed, presents what could be a ground-breaking opportunity for Māori organisations to define the new parameters of a social service contract.

As the Māori population continues to grow as a proportion of the New Zealand population, it seems more and more likely, that policies and services based on a Māori worldview are the way forward. Māori development has come a long way over the past two decades built on struggle, debate, research and practice. Māori have endured through assimilation, struggled and grown through economic reform and advanced through aspiration based approaches. There are still however a myriad of challenges to face, politically, economically, socially and culturally as we move into a global era. The development of Whānau Ora could signal an ideological change within the New Zealand policy arena. However, social policy and social work practice within a collective framework is not a new idea. Māori and non-Māori have been advocating for the approach for many decades and in effect, Whānau Ora is a case of policy catching up to practice.

The following chapter will discuss the theories, ideologies and debates that are the building blocks of Māori policy, with reference to the events and developments outlined in this chapter.

Chapter Two

Ideologies, theories and debates: the foundations of Māori policy development.

This chapter discusses a number of the ideologies, theoretical positions and debates that have shaped the development of Māori policy that was outlined in the previous chapter. This chapter comprises six sections; assimilation, integration and colonisation; Western liberalism and an indigenous worldview: the political economy of Māori policy; capacities and deficits; biculturalism, social inclusion and the international scene; iwi Māori: the complexities of Māori identity and; tino rangatiratanga.

Assimilation, integration and colonisation

Debatably the most criticised directions in Māori policy, assimilation and its feeble successor integration have dominated the historical Māori policy landscape to the detriment of positive Māori development. The colonial ideology from which they were conceived, and their resulting consequences, have been the bane of Māori advancement and the cause of Māori struggle for more than 150 years (Walker, Ranginui 2004). While official policy has for the most part moved on from the rhetoric of assimilation, even condemning it in official reports, there is and may always be an underlying current of support for the ignorant and idealistic idea of ‘one people’ that is deep set in the psyche of many sectors of New Zealand society. There exists an argument, generally prevalent among those with little knowledge of Māori culture, history or aspirations that the government should strive to build a nation of New Zealanders, rather than a nation of Māori, Pākehā and others.

Colonisation and in particular assimilation, has its legacy in negative social and economic outcomes for Māori, a legacy with an undeniably long reach that continues to warrant continued discussion. In a more productive vein, the response of Māori to colonisation and in particular contemporary social, political and economic developments is important to any assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and future directions of Māori development (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

In New Zealand there has historically been an underlying desire to foster a mono-cultural sense of national identity and policy is often developed on the basis of that mono-cultural idea of wellbeing (Duncan 2008). According to Ranginui Walker (2004), assimilation is a situation of dominance and subjection where the coloniser thinks they have created unified society and this illusion is maintained by the ideology of one people. Supporting this assertion, there has historically been a strongly held belief among many of those in power that the assimilation of Māori into the dominant Pākehā culture would be the foundation of national unity and the means by which Māori 'disadvantage' might be solved. This has never been so overt, as in the period following the publication of the Hunn Report in 1961. Relevant policies of this persuasion included the encouragement of urban drift, the deliberate housing of Māori families in non-Māori communities and the down scaling of te reo Māori in School Certificate exams (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Furthermore, national structures had evolved which were rooted in the values, systems and viewpoints of one culture only and Māori participation was conditional on Māori subjugating their own values and systems to those of the power culture, an issue which still requires addressing today (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

Ranginui Walker (2004) asserts that "the coloniser once embarked on a policy of exploitation is committed" and that the colonial power cannot see that their dominance is not only bad for those dominated, but also for those in power (p.151). Despite the evidence that assimilation was producing negative consequences, not only for Māori but for New Zealand as a whole through negative social consequences and growing Māori disaffection, governments continued to stand by their policies. Institutional racism, the outcome of monocultural institutions which simply ignore and freeze out the cultures of those who do not belong to the majority, became embedded over this time (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

According to Kelsey (1990) active assimilation demanded that Māori adopt the psyche and behaviour of the Pākehā while the same society continued to discriminate against them for being Māori. This placed Māori in a grim position where both available options perpetrated further disadvantage. The so called equity measures associated with assimilation did not bring Māori all the promised perks and privileges of modern New Zealand citizens, but have rather made Māori more

unequal (Smith 1999). Furthermore, equality among individuals does not necessarily solve structural inequality and while some Māori thrived, Māori as a group continued to fall behind their Pākehā counterparts over a range of social and economic indicators (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

It is also a fundamental problem of the Māori struggle against Pākehā hegemony, that there is a tendency among conservative leaders to side with the dominating class against their own people, and the coloniser uses this to their advantage (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Walker provides the example of Graham Latimer's public response to a paper read by Hirini Moko Mead at the 1979 Labour Party conference calling for a Māori Parliament. Following the reading of the paper, the press were quick to seek the counter opinion of Latimer as President of the Māori Council, and interestingly also a member of the National Party. Latimer obliged the press, publically stating that the original Māori Parliament had grown out of disaffection but that as far as he could see, that was not a current issue. In more contemporary times, policy reform has been initiated to move Māori to the middle class. The assumption seems to be however, that once there Māori will take on the values and interests of the dominant Pākehā middle class, putting aside Māori values and interests (Smith 2007).

The assimilation approach to Māori policy has now been condemned as not only ineffective but also detrimental to positive Māori development. However, there are still currents of support for assimilation both in power and amongst the population. The most obvious example of this is the reaction to the then leader of the National Party, Don Brash's 2004 Orewa Speech where he attacked "racial privilege" for Māori and vowed to remove Treaty references in legislation and policy and dedicated Māori representation if elected to government. Far from the public being outraged by his unashamed racial politicking, National party support surged in the weeks following the speech, uncovering a strong undercurrent of support for the ideologies out of which assimilation was born.

Ranginui Walker (2004) asserts that the consciousness of the reality of a people's exploitation is a key to its liberation. It is important then for a community to have its own ideal vision, define itself in its own terms and maintain social cohesion within

the group in the face of change (Smith 2007). Looking to the future, while “the oppressed are dehumanised by the colonial experience...the great humanistic task of the oppressed is to recover their stolen humanity; to liberate themselves and to liberate their oppressors as well” (Walker, Ranginui 2004, p. 151). Far from dwelling too strongly on the injustices of the past it is now a challenge for Māori to forge a Māori way forward through a strong and cohesive vision. Policy, politics and cultural revitalisation are arguably now the key vehicles for post-colonial Māori advancement meaning that a commitment to a steady change by evolution is imperative (Smith 1999).

Western liberalism and an indigenous worldview: the political economy of Māori policy

In terms of Māori development, one of the key aims of the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) was to give concrete recognition to New Zealand’s dual heritage. A key point raised by the Royal Commission was that two major cultural traditions have shaped New Zealand’s socio-cultural landscape but that one of those had received significantly more weight in social policy development. These two traditions, one being Western liberalism and the other being an indigenous, specifically Māori tradition will be discussed here with emphasis on their major differences, how they interact and the effects of this interaction on Māori development.

The theoretical model of Western liberalism is one that has enormously influenced New Zealand policy since the colonial era. The term ‘Western liberalism’ is generally used to describe the social, economic and political position of Western democratic countries such as the USA the UK and New Zealand and is shaped by the ideals of democracy, equality and individual liberty. It has given rise to concepts such as ‘one standard of citizenship for all’, ‘one person one vote’ and the ‘separation of the powers’. More specifically, policies such as individual welfare entitlements, private contracting of public services and individual confidentiality in health care are all examples of a Western liberal approach (Cheyne et al. 2008).

Western liberal tradition generally holds the individual as the core social unit and individualist ideology now saturates the entire nation (Puketapu 2000).

In contrast, an indigenous or specifically Māori model, is shaped by collective rights and responsibilities (in much the same way as a traditional social democratic ideal) and by the interdependence of the physical and non-physical worlds. Wellbeing is not necessarily associated with the idea of individual equality but rather with the values and wellbeing of the collective (Cheyne et al. 2008). A critical factor for Māori appears to be whānau involvement and addressing issues of culture and identity. Internationally, an increased focus on indigeneity has also occurred (Durie 2003a). In particular the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 2007, is now a part of the international human rights rhetoric. While the adoption of the Declaration by the New Zealand Government seems to be more of a symbolic rather than practical step, that there is an international movement that supports Māori development is encouraging.

New Zealand also has a strong welfare state tradition (Cheyne et al. 2008). Liberal welfare states are those generally associated with market dominated social policy including means-tested and targeted social assistance, modest universal transfers and modest social insurance plans. The benefits of such assistance accrue mostly to low income working class groups and strict entitlement rules are attached to benefits to restrict uptake and present work as the most viable option. There is often stigma attached to social assistance which again lowers the take-up rate. The labour market is treated in a similar way to other commodity markets with full employment not generally the key goal (Esping-Anderson 1990).

The Māori economic ideal however, is for the most part, the achievement of wealth for the good of the community through cooperative enterprise. In a modern sense however, such enterprise usually serves the tribal interest rather than the bulk of Māori in urban communities (Webster 2002). Due to this, economically equipped iwi bodies have a tough task of balancing the social interests of their people with the corporate growth aspirations of their enterprises.

While the two traditions exist, Western liberalism has enjoyed a dominant position in the relationship. Ruwhiu (1995) questions why it is that already existing indigenous conceptualisations must be verified by Western conceptualisations in order to be seen as valid informers of policy and practice. He argues that tangata whenua concepts should be given priority when working with tangata whenua, a position that has gained traction since the time his article was published. He states that workers, practicing from their own tangata whenua viewpoint are in fact ‘informed’ workers, without needing to place emphasis on Western Eurocentric models, for instance Beck’s ‘cognitive behavioural theory’ and Maslow’s ‘hierarchy of needs’, both well-known and well used theories. There was at the time of Ruwhiu’s writing, considerable research in the social sector about cultural safety, colonialism and other such concepts, but there was little practical application. He further argues that while it is important for all social service practitioners to be culturally competent, it makes most sense for Māori to work with Māori rather than expending resources to better inform Pākehā workers (Ruwhiu 1995).

One of the most interesting theoretical debates around Māori policy has to do with the fundamental conflict between indigenous and Western conceptualisations of wellbeing including justice, need, equality and the like. Need is a particularly important concept in the development, design and targeting of social policy programmes. Although need seems a simple word, its interpretations can have significant bearing on the approaches that policy makers take and thus on the final product. Western tradition emphasises need as material deprivation, directing resources toward immediate material demands of individuals. By contrast, the indigenous tradition holds a definition of poverty that incorporates intangible, non-material property such as language and culture. Historically, assumptions about family structure, rooted in this liberal Western tradition have resulted in policies based on nuclear family forms without due consideration for wider extended family commitments (Cheyne et al. 2008).

Furthermore, “Social work has its historical roots in England” (Weaver 1999, p.271) and accepted practice norms and cultural concerns and realities may be at odds because of this. As an example, an area where Māori and Western ideas of best practice are at odds is that of confidentiality (Ruwhiu 1995). Confidentiality

measures are often problematic when Māori concepts of whānau are taken in to account, as collective responsibility for the wellbeing of whānau members is an important consideration. Excluding whānau from interventions on the grounds of confidentiality restricts whānau from carrying out an important role. Furthermore, excessive confidentiality has led to inefficiencies and ineffectiveness between agencies working with the same Whānau (Selby 1995). There is a chance that a comprehensive multi-agency contract like what is proposed for Whānau Ora could go some way to remedying this issue.

It also seems now, that parts of the development of Western liberal tradition in other nations are no longer consistent with the New Zealand social and political situation. In the mid-2000s Western liberal tradition in the UK and Europe had moved toward the rhetoric of social inclusion. As the goal of an inclusive society came to dominate over a competing Māori discourse, indigenous and Treaty rights were increasingly presented as special privileges that contradicted an equal opportunity approach. In this way, Māori were no longer framed as socio-economically and politically excluded (and thus in need of special policy attention), but rather were increasingly characterised as a group whose inclusion within a Treaty framework, actively excludes non-Māori New Zealanders from their rights and privileges as citizens. It is consequently difficult to see how building an inclusive society was, as once suggested by politicians, a ‘leap forward’ for Māori (Humpage 2006).

The goal of an ‘inclusive society’ promotes an equal opportunity approach that sits in tension with the specific needs and rights of Māori as indigenous peoples and partners in the Treaty of Waitangi. The ambiguous consequences of this goal highlight the need for settler societies to develop policy that reflects their own socio-political circumstances, rather than simply adopting policy discourses that are popular internationally. New Zealand like other settler societies, should instead devise its own ‘dance’, with steps and a rhythm that best suits its own socio-political circumstances (Humpage 2006).

An important factor which further complicates the Māori policy landscape is the difficulty or almost impossibility of drawing a clear ethnic and cultural boundary between Māori and non-Māori (Humpage 2006). This lends itself to the position that

policy in New Zealand must take consideration of both our major cultural traditions across the board. For some Māori members of New Zealand society, neither a Eurocentric or Kaupapa Māori ideology meets all their needs and so a joint emphasis is important. According to Durie (2003b), there is space for both indigenous and conventional services to effectively exist alongside one another. While for many years, policy and services based on Western conceptualisations were forced on Māori, it would be equally as dangerous to assume that a Māori specific approach would work best for every person of Māori descent.

Deficits and capacities, targeting and tailoring

A major debate in the Māori policy space is that regarding the use and effectiveness of deficit and capacity based models. Deficit approaches have generally been the norm in Māori policy development since the release of the Hunn Report in 1961 highlighted the gaps between Māori and Pākehā development. Only recently has the tide changed to prioritise approaches that focus on Māori capacities rather than deficits. Deficit approaches to Māori policy have generally focused on the socio-economic disparities that exist between Māori and Pākehā rather than focusing on building Māori capacity and reaching Māori defined aspirations. Development in the Māori economy is set on a low baseline known as the ‘gaps’ between Māori and Pākehā and these gaps are structurally entrenched (Durie 2003a). While many of the policies and programmes that perpetrated the deficit model were well intentioned, they never the less failed to deliver positive and sustainable development, with Ranginui Walker (2004) describing deficit approaches as an artefact of colonisation.

Policies that have taken this position include the directive to all government departments to report on how they were reducing disparities between Māori and non-Māori following the deconstruction of the Department of Māori Affairs in the 1990s, provisions for Māori employment in the State Sector Act 1988, and even Closing the Gaps. This approach to Māori policy has in recent years come under increasingly intense scrutiny, forcing governments and even Māori organisations to look toward more capacity and aspiration based strategies for development (Ringold 2005). Many commentators agree that Pākehā New Zealand as the benchmark for Māori

development does not capture the dynamic state of Māori society. Measurements over time and between Māori may be more indicative of the real trends (Durie 2003a).

Targeting, tailoring and universal service provision, are other ideas that have been debated and examined in regards to Māori development. Whether services should be targeted to particular groups differentiated by ethnicity, gender, geography or other distinctions, is not a straightforward decision. According to Ringold (2005) every service or service area has certain attributes that lend themselves towards or away from targeting. There are also interesting theoretical positions regarding service delivery centred on the advantages and disadvantages of dedicated indigenous programmes as opposed to increasing the responsiveness of conventional programmes to indigenous values. Research would suggest that there is room and also necessity for both options in the contemporary social service sector. Tailoring policies and programmes for Māori has occurred frequently through initiatives such as devolution, decentralisation and contracting. Whānau Ora also could certainly be viewed as an initiative tailored for Māori. While it is not explicitly or exclusively for Māori, it is framed in such a way to make it an attractive option for both Māori organisations and Māori clients (Ringold 2005).

According to Durie (2003b), in order to create the best possible services, it makes sense to collaborate even when philosophies differ. In support of this, Puketapu (2000) asserts that there is no single organisation that can achieve all the goals of Māori development and that any organisation that does attempt to do so, will face serious capacity issues. Furthermore, Pakura (2004) argues that intersectoral collaboration is necessary for Whānau wellbeing. She argues that a singular approach to services for Māori does not work, and what is necessary, is a multi-faceted approach with collaboration occurring across entire sectors of the social organisation.

Programmes that are proven to be effective for Māori generally take a holistic approach, involve whānau, and incorporate tikanga and whanaungatanga (Owen 2001). According to Cheyne et al. (2008) targeting social services works better for Māori but also leaves room for Pākehā criticisms of racial privileging and

separatism. This essentially creates a political problem for governments that receive sound policy advice in terms of the provision of Māori social services but which must also be conscious of the perception of the majority that holds the voting power. Government funding criteria and processes also place constraints on the ability of Māori organisations to design and deliver effective services targeted toward Māori. Rigid funding criteria, poor inter-agency coordination, and silo mentalities of government funding agencies make it difficult, costly and time-consuming to secure the necessary funding. Finally however, while positive Māori development requires capable organisational infrastructure, it is the goals of Māori development that are more important than the organisational structures that drive them (Puketapu 2000).

Biculturalism, social inclusion and the international scene

The Royal Commission on Social Policy advocated for ‘biculturalism’ in policy making. They intended it to mean the sharing of responsibility for policy and service design and delivery by both Māori and non-Māori (1988). Since this time, the idea of biculturalism has become increasingly embedded, not only in policy but also in national values. What this means exactly, or even approximately is still however, not entirely clear.

There are a number of explanations for the growth of biculturalism. Ranginui Walker (2004) argues that biculturalism evolved largely out of urbanisation, specifically out of the increased interaction between Māori and Pākehā. Inter-marriage, shared work places, shared communities and an increased use of Māori icons as national icons have all led to an inherent biculturalism. Walker also argues, that while Pākehā culture was once simply English culture transplanted to New Zealand, after almost two centuries of close interaction, there is a distinctly New Zealand Pākehā community which has more in common with its contemporary Māori counterpart than its English mother.

In a more narrow policy context, Larner (2006) argues that it is the combination of neo-liberalism and tino rangatiratanga discourses that have given rise to the New Zealand conception of biculturalism. The neo-liberal reforms of the 1980s and 1990s

had a significant impact on Māori. However, Māori political resurgence had already gained momentum by this time meaning that Māori were in a position to respond to the challenges of neo-liberal reform. It is out of this interaction that Larner argues the rhetoric of biculturalism was born.

Regardless of its specific origins, there is an asymmetry in the bicultural relationship. For Māori to survive in the political economy, they are “impelled to learn and function in two cultures” (Walker, Ranginui 2004 p.389). Contrastingly, Pākehā who drive the political economy, are not subject to the same imperative and many are mainly monolingual and monocultural. There are however, a growing number of bicultural Pākehā and it is not uncommon for some Pākehā to have a better fluency in Te Reo Māori and knowledge of tikanga than many Māori, either by choice or by necessity (Walker, Ranginui, 2004).

Bicultural conceptions of citizenship are increasingly being challenged by the global economy and changing migration flows. Arguably the most important debate is around whether policy emphasis on a bicultural model, based on the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, is legitimate in a society with growing migrant and second and third generation migrant communities especially from the Pacific and Asia (Larner 2006). The key arguments of advocates for multiculturalism over biculturalism are that biculturalism does not represent the reality of the nation’s makeup and that one minority should not have priority over other minorities. They argue that other ‘disadvantaged’ communities miss out on opportunities and support because of a biased focus on Māori. This argument however would suggest that the driver behind biculturalism is Māori disadvantage when this is not entirely the case as it critically overlooks the importance of indigeneity and Treaty rights in the relationship between Māori and the government (Cheyne et al. 2008).

The conflicting argument includes an expressed suspicion among bicultural advocates that the multiculturalist rhetoric is diversionary and simply an excuse for the State to overlook its responsibilities to Māori (Larner 2006). Advocates of biculturalism cite the Treaty of Waitangi as a constitutional document that justifies the partnership position of Māori as signatories above other cultures. More practical arguments relating to indigeneity are also proposed and centre on the idea that it

makes more sense for nation states to protect their indigenous cultures above their migrant cultures. Ranginui Walker (2004) provides the example of language protection. He replies to arguments that Asian, Pasifika and other minority languages should be paid similar attention to Māori language in New Zealand with the counter argument that the primary protector of indigenous language should and can be the nation to which it is indigenous rather than the nation to which such cultures have emigrated.

Moving on from biculturalism, 'progressive' UK and European policy ideas have materialised on the New Zealand policy scene in fairly recent times, most particularly the theory of 'social inclusion' that was popular with the Fifth Labour Government and noted earlier in the chapter. There is however, a "fundamental tension" between indigenous aspirations in post-colonial society and social policy with a British or European perspective of inclusion and exclusion (Humpage 2006 p.226). Around the mid-2000s, the United Kingdom under Tony Brown was solidifying its New Social Democracy, the ideas of which would make their way onto the New Zealand policy landscape. During Labour's tenure as the leader of successive governments, the party began to push the new social democratic rhetoric of social inclusion. The idea was to identify and analyse why certain groups lack the means for social participation and integration and remedy those shortcomings (Humpage 2006). While on the surface it would seem that such an approach would be of benefit to Māori, there are some fundamental flaws in the reasoning behind social inclusion. According to Humpage (2006) the social inclusion discourse is fundamentally incapable of dealing with difference as it is based on the artificial polarisation between two apparently homogenous groups and doesn't account for all the varying degrees of inclusion and exclusion. The concept also defines a certain idea of 'normal' as an ideal to be aspired to, an ideal which may not be desirable for all groups in society.

One area specific to Māori where this idea fails is around voluntary exclusion for the betterment of the group. This is expressed through the desire for tino rangatiratanga, the rise in number of Māori service providers and the prominence of Māori medium education (Durie 1998). The Royal Commission summed this up well when they wrote that "those whose presence in this country is the longest occupy a special

situation, partly from the objective circumstances of colonisation, and partly from choice” (1988, p.42). A more detailed discussion of this concept is outside the scope of this study. However, the inclusion of social inclusion in national policy has provided interesting lessons on the failures of good intentions and the unique nature of New Zealand society, owing in great part to the place of Māori in that society.

On the international scene, interest in the rights of indigenous peoples has grown in recent decades, culminating in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007). The movement toward culturally competent methods of practice is not confined to New Zealand but is apparent in an increasing number of nations with significant indigenous populations.

Anti-racist theories have also developed over the past few decades in communities with indigenous or immigrant populations. Such theories have highlighted historical instances of the impact of racist ideology on social policy. Much of the Northern Hemisphere anti-racist literature however, focuses on migrant rather than indigenous populations. This focus may not be particularly relevant to a Māori population that enjoys a unique standing as a proportionately large group in a unique relationship with the government through the Treaty of Waitangi (Cheyne et al. 2008). Although there are fundamental differences between the plight of an indigenous population and an immigrant one, there are mutual benefits that can be gained from the study of one by another. Such a study is beyond the scope of this review but it is important to note that indigenous and immigrant populations the World-over face similar issues. However, international literature that is centred on immigrant populations in Europe and the USA must be approached with caution when applying it to the New Zealand situation.

Iwi Māori: the complexities of Māori identity

It is important to understand the current shape of and future projections for the Māori population both nationally and internationally in order to better understand the potential of Whānau Ora and similar initiatives to influence Māori development. Contemporary Māori identity is difficult to define, with whānau, iwi, pan-Māori,

community and the myriad of other identity groups contributing threads to the complex tapestry. Firstly, the Māori population as a proportion of the total New Zealand population is increasing and this has been a key feature of Māori development in the past two decades, the most significant increase occurring during the inter-census period from 1991-1996 when the Māori population increased by 20 percent. The Māori population is still on the rise with a forecast that by 2051 the Māori ethnic population will have doubled in size to close to one million or 22 percent of the New Zealand population (Durie 2003a, p.121).

This population growth has not however made the place of Māori in New Zealand society less complicated. It is now almost impossible to draw a clear ethnic and cultural boundary between Māori and non-Māori and the treatment of ethnic groups as discrete is increasingly problematised by the multiple affiliations claimed by individuals and families (Humpage 2006). Furthermore, biological factors such as inter-marriage and changing attitudes about race and ethnicity have further complicated how people self-identify, and are identified by others (Goldstein and Morning 2002; Harris and Sim 2002; Perlmann and Waters 2002). However, despite the diversity of the Māori population, Māori have generally been treated as a homogenous group in policy and politics. This discourse of philosophical homogeneity within the Māori population is now however, losing its appeal (Puketapu 2000).

Te Āo Māori is a complicated place, inhabited by its own internal ideological and social debates. Key among these, are competing perspectives on the appropriate social groupings and divisions and their political positions within the term 'Māori'. Since 1975, Māori development has been dominated by the Treaty of Waitangi. Widespread Māori unity, re-tribalisation and asset building founded on Treaty related progress, have been features of Māori development for the past 30 years. Managing the iwi-Crown relationship is now imperative to modern Māori development and it is out of this relationship that key debates on Māori identity stem (Durie 2003a).

A 1988 Waitangi Tribunal report argued that a variety of different groups can legitimately be established to represent Māori interests. This is a paramount

consideration in Māori policy especially in terms of entitlement to social services or at least perceived entitlement. However, while Māori communities are largely urban, Treaty settlements and the emerging corporatism that they have created has led to a widespread ability in Māori society to act more effectively from an iwi platform. However, as intellectual leadership rose up to fill the space left by the colonial breakdown of chiefly leadership, governments in the post-colonial era sometimes failed to address the question of the tribal mandates of the leaders with whom they chose to negotiate tribal claims, causing contention among some groups (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

The dynamic nature of contemporary Māori society means that there are a number of Māori organisations seeking and claiming to represent Māori interests (Durie 2003a). The existence of both traditional and contemporary Māori collectives that advocate for Māori interests, while both necessary, have led to some interesting debates. Nowhere is this more evident than in Treaty of Waitangi settlements where the government has chosen to deal with 'iwi' as the largest natural grouping in traditional Māori society. While urban and tribal authorities are for the most part complimentary, there are instances where their interests are competing. One such instance is the allocation of fisheries quota achieved through fisheries settlements in 1989 and 1992. The question of who can be defined as iwi for the purposes of allocation is one that has had to be answered through the legal system. Through the Waitangi Tribunal urban authorities sought to be defined as iwi for the purposes of gaining a share of the Māori fishing quota (Durie 2005). While the Waitangi Tribunal ruled in their favour, subsequent action in the High Court, Court of Appeal and the Privy Council resulted in the upholding of the traditional definition of iwi for the purposes of allocating quota, most recently under the Māori Fisheries Act 2004.

More generally, strong arguments have been made for a primarily iwi-centric view of Māori identity that incorporates hapū and whānau as the sub groups of iwi. A key argument is that pan-tribal identity is a construct of colonisation and not a reflection of historic Māori reality (Kukutai 2004). According to Pere (1988) there is no such thing as Māoritanga as every iwi has its own distinct tikanga. Furthermore, the degree to which individuals and groups identify with the term Māoritanga differs (Kukutai 2004).

Many Māori however, especially in urban areas, have lost links to their iwi and hapū but still maintain a ‘Māori’ identity which may be inconsistent with an iwi perspective (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Māori are also a mobile population prompting the need for an approach to Māori development that uses government, iwi and pan-Māori organisations’ resources to foster positive Māori development. Within this group, there are large numbers of young urban Māori three or four generations removed from their ancestral lands and resources, whose experiences and realities differ significantly from those who have maintained strong iwi ties (Durie 2003). A number of whānau, iwi affiliated or otherwise, can also have non-traditional primary affiliations which may or may not be to Māori specific groups, such as sports clubs and churches (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Finally, there is a worrying gap between tribal economic powerhouses and the many Māori individuals and households still suffering from a relatively low socio-economic position, particularly those with relatively weak iwi affiliations (Webster 2002). Because of these factors and others, tribal organisations are now being challenged to be more responsive to descendants who are geographically, socially and culturally diverse, economically limited and politically fragmented if they are to remain effective and relevant (Puketapu 2000).

Puketapu (2000) reflects that probably the most “potent criticism” of iwi centralisation is the “disintegration of tribal responsibilities at hapū and whānau levels” (p. 268). There are also strong arguments that hapū rather than iwi are the key political unit in Māori society and should thus be the key Māori Treaty partner in the Crown-Māori relationship. The fact that it is hapū rather than iwi who are specifically referenced in the Treaty and that many grievances are hapū and not iwi specific, substantiate this argument. In recent times however, a number of settlements have been completed at the hapū level, indicating that the Crown is more open to differing perspectives on Māori politics held in different regions. Such settlements include Ngāti Whātua groups, Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei, Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara and Te Uri o Hau and the various hapū of Ngāti Kahungunu (Office of Treaty Settlements 2013).

Even at the level of whānau, Māori identity is increasingly complex. As the social norms to which Māori were exposed began to change, so too did the outworking of

whānau in Māori communities. Bradley (1995a) makes the simple but true statement that not all Māori whānau are the same. He goes on to discuss what he sees as the different types of Māori whānau, from those who maintain strong iwi and hapū connections, those who have built a decidedly urban Māori identity to those whose Māori heritage has little to do with their everyday lives. At the time of his writing, the urban occupancy rate of Māori was around 85 to 90 percent and the total population was around 500 000. Many Māori still maintained tribal links in some form with this trending upward as the era of re-tribalisation began on the back of Treaty settlements that provided iwi with greater resources to maintain connections (Bradley 1995a, p.28).

Families in New Zealand as a whole are also becoming increasingly diverse, with about one in five children born in 2006 having more than one ethnicity (Cribb 2009, p.6). Many New Zealanders of mixed ancestry also identify primarily as Māori, according legitimacy to the creation of policy that focuses on Māori as an ethnic group. Reasons why multi-ancestry people identify as Māori include their residence within a predominantly Māori community, having a Māori partner, participation in Māori communities and organisations, their parents, appearance and upbringing (Durie 2003a).

Complex Māori identity has major implications for political representation, policy development and social service provision. Contemporary Māori not only have to find the balance between being Māori and living in a largely non-Māori society but also between the various whānau, hapū, iwi and pan Māori groups that contribute to a uniquely Māori identity. Reconciling contemporary Māori identities to the way Māori are represented politically and to approaches to social policy development is a challenge that is becoming increasingly pressing. It is a challenge that has called the relevance of dedicated Māori representation and dedicated Māori social services in to question, and caused people to reconsider ethnically based representation and policy (Kukutai 2004).

There has also been growing opposition to the collection of racial and ethnic data and the programmes and policies they support (Kukutai 2004). Some argue that data and definition are imprecise as ethnicity definitions for census and electoral roles are

different and criteria for inclusion differs according to legal, tribal and policy contexts (Chapple 2000). This ethnicity data is used to inform policy and distribute resources with a major issue being the sentiment raised when these resources and rewards are involved. Chapple (2000) argues that resources allocated to specifically Māori groups are a form of privilege and are disadvantageous to non-Māori. Look deeper into this attitude however, and it can be concluded that it may be a product, at least in part, of a sense of entitlement that is a feature of colonising culture. Kukutai further disputes arguments such as Chapple's with the counter argument that "ignoring ethnicity ignores the historical and contemporary process by which particular ethnic groups came to be disproportionately concentrated among those in need" (Kukutai 2004, p.104).

Tino Rangatiratanga

Māori attempts to deal with the government have been based on "finding a space to advance group interests within an imposed individualist framework" (Cheyne et al. 2008, p.140). Something that is important to understand however, is that group interests are not easily defined and nor is the 'Māori group'. One thing however, does remain certain; Māori individuals and organisations should be at the forefront of institutional attempts to give effect to changes over what constitutes Māoriness (Kukutai 2004).

Throughout the term of every New Zealand government in at least the last three decades, there has been a consistent call by many in the Māori community for tino rangatiratanga or self-determination (Ringold 2005). What exactly this means is difficult to say in an age where the Māori population is possibly more diverse than it ever has been, but concepts that are commonly associated with tino rangatiratanga include sovereignty and self-determination (Durie 1998; O'Regan and Mahuika 1993) and autonomy, active control and the right to exercise authority over Māori resources and destinies (Maaka & Fleras 2000). Looking at the evolution of Māori policy over the years it would seem that the nation has been incrementally moving toward a point where Māori are essentially driving the direction of Māori policy. Self-determination or tino rangatiratanga is an important consideration in

contemporary Māori society and according to Duncan (2008) any political system can only be legitimate in Māori eyes if it recognises and promotes self-determination. Furthermore, international convention now recognises self-determination as a right of indigenous peoples in Articles three and four of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) lending more weight to national arguments for tino rangatiratanga.

Whether Māori interests are best served within or independent of the national political system is arguable and finding a balance between Māori autonomy and national cohesion has been a challenge faced by successive generations of Māori and successive governments (Cheyne et al. 2008). Over at least the past two decades, Māori participation in government has increased. This is not merely a token participation but has led to a more decisive influence on policy and institutions. As well as a number of positive outcomes, the increased level of Māori participation in governance has led to a new set of tensions. The potential for conflict has increased, centred particularly on whether the best way to achieve Māori aspirations is through integration or independence (Durie 2003a).

Within this debate, Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development occupies an interesting position within the public sector as it is tasked with representing Māori interests from within the government, a complicated position at best. Developing Māori capacity to provide social services has been and is advocated for on both sides of the political spectrum (Cheyne et al. 2008). The motivation behind this advocacy however depends upon the political and social ideology that frames the actions of those involved. While the intended outcome is generally the same; the approach taken will tend to lend itself to effectiveness or otherwise. Although Māori advancement is important, groups in power tend to be primarily led by the idea of Māori advancement on their terms rather than Māori advancement on Māori terms (Durie 1998). While Te Puni Kōkiri is in a sense an organisation that advocates for Māori advancement, it is still a State organisation that is responsible to the executive and thus influenced by the politics of the day. It stands to reason then, to question the ability or appropriateness of Te Puni Kōkiri as a lead organisation in advocating for tino rangatiratanga, rather placing this role in the realm of dedicated Māori, non-government organisations.

Furthermore, iwi organisations, attempting to favour a Māori model of provision must still enter into a purchaser-provider relationship by “demonstrating their respective capacity to supply the required quantity and quality of services to New Zealanders in need as defined by government assessment criteria (Puketapu 2000). Even under newer capacity based models of policy this is still the case. However, although this situation seems to be diminishing tino rangatiratanga, it would be unwise to refuse government resources altogether. According to Durie (2003b), no one group can be absolutely autonomous in New Zealand, nor would it be a wise aspiration. Positive Māori development is not something that can be fully wrought within the bounds of the State or the social service sector but rather requires Māori responsibility for Māori advancement in partnership with the State but not in debt to it.

In conclusion there is a large and complex web of ideology, theory and debate that forms the foundation of Māori policy development. Māori development has grown through a number of changing and circulating ideas and their respective manifestations in policy. Some such as assimilation, integration and deficit policy models have been to the detriment of Māori advancement where as others such as capacity policy models, tino rangatiratanga discourse and more emphasis on a Māori world view in the public sector have provided significant benefits. Regardless of their immediate outcome however, developments in both the theory and practice of Māori policy have taught Māori, the government and New Zealand society some important lessons that should place us in a better position to continue to facilitate positive Māori development.

Chapter three

Methodology and method: best fit kaupapa Māori

This chapter outlines both the methodology used to inform this research and the methods used to complete it. As the focus of this research is directly relevant to Māori and the research was undertaken in a Māori community with a Māori researcher, it was appropriate to employ a Kaupapa Māori research methodology. This is also partnered with complementary methodology and methods of Western origin that are effective in academic research. This chapter will begin with a discussion on Kaupapa Māori research, briefly explaining its origins and widely accepted characteristics and then focusing on the particular form of Kaupapa Māori that has been formulated for this project. This discussion focuses less on the critical nature of Kaupapa Māori research and more on the diversity and in some instances conflicts that exist within Māori research with the aim of formulating an approach that best fits this particular study. The chapter will also discuss the research design and the methods that were used and will provide justification for their use. To conclude, this chapter will outline the ethical considerations and other challenges that influenced this project and will explain how they were addressed.

When I think about kaupapa Māori research, I see it really simply: it's a plan, it's a programme; it's an approach; it's a way of being; it's a way of knowing; it's a way of seeing; it's a way of making meaning; it's a way of being Māori, it's a way of thinking; it's a thought process; it's a practice; it's a set of things you want to do. It's a Kaupapa and that's why I think it's bigger than a methodology (Smith 2011, p.10).

According to Smith (2011), Kaupapa Māori is a fluid framework that has been built over time, through collaboration. Because of this, and because Māori culture cannot be contained within an easily defined boundary, Kaupapa Māori is more than simply a research methodology but rather, extends to a bigger idea of being, knowing, thinking and practicing (Smith 2011). It is not only a way of approaching research but a way of approaching life. With reference to the above quotation, this section will discuss the particular approach to Kaupapa Māori research undertaken within this project and the factors that influenced this approach. This section will briefly explain the history and definitions of and surrounding Kaupapa Māori research and

then move on to an explanation of the method and methodology used in this project. This chapter will also examine other research undertaken with a Kaupapa Māori methodology in order to lend weight to the legitimacy of certain approaches, challenges and considerations within this study.

Research ‘on’ Māori dates back to “contact and colonisation” and has generally focused on Māori to non-Māori comparisons based on the supposedly universal norms of Western society (Powick 2002, p.3). In most cases there was a clear gap between these universal norms and what was apparent in Māori communities. Because of this, Māori have more often than not, been stigmatised by the acceptance of the conclusions of such research. Consequently, decisions made and actions taken have generally done more harm than good regardless of whether or not the research had benevolent intentions (Walker, Ranginui 2004).

Kaupapa Māori theories have thus grown out of a criticism of Western research and out of a desire by Māori to regain control and be self-determining. The history of critical Māori theory is generally well covered in the existing literature and comparisons are often drawn between Kaupapa Māori and other critical theories such as feminist methodologies, environmental methodologies and other indigenous methodologies. This discussion will not expound on these relationships. It is however important to mention, that Kaupapa Māori does not by any means stand alone as a critical theory and has been influenced by and is an influence on other critical theories.

Te Awekotuku (1999) argues that the only way to deal with Pākehā defining Māori is to create our own work. Expanding on this, a case could then be argued that to then hold that work up in comparison to Pākehā research, would be to continue to allow that research to define our own work. Holding this argument to be correct, we should then allow our research to stand on its own legitimacy without constant comparisons and criticism of Western research, unless of course that is its focus. Therefore, instead of focusing too heavily on criticisms of Western research methodologies, this chapter will instead attempt to navigate some of the key theories, debates and ideas within a Māori research framework. Furthermore, far from neglecting the practical use of Western ideas about research on principle, this study

takes the stance that whichever methods and methodologies are appropriate and can positively contribute to the study, should be considered for inclusion.

Where previously Māori often disdained research due to its adverse historical consequences; over the past 30-40 years, a greater understanding and appreciation of research has grown within Māori communities and there is a significant body of Māori research completed by Māori now available and growing (Pipi, Cram, Hawke, R., Hawke, S., Huriwai, Mataki & Tuuta 2004). This change can be attributed to a number of factors including, but not limited to; the growth of Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa, the development of research capability among iwi due to historical research needs relating to Treaty settlements and Māori cultural revitalisation in general. Furthermore, many traditional educational institutes have made a commitment to developing Māori research capability and capacity (Pipi et al. 2004). This is certainly not to say that Māori have stopped approaching research with a meaningful level of cynicism but rather that the value of research is more widely acknowledged (Mahuika 2008).

Kaupapa Māori methodology has thus developed in a climate that is both critical and emancipatory and has been well described by scholars as an appropriate and effective option for research involving Māori communities (Walker, Eketone & Gibbs 2006). The term Kaupapa Māori is a broad one with commentators increasingly urging against defining it too narrowly (Walker et al. 2006). There is however consensus about some generally accepted features of Kaupapa Māori research. These include that Kaupapa Māori research is undertaken by Māori researchers and that those researchers have an appropriate knowledge of tikanga and te reo Māori and that they apply these in the research (Walker et al. 2006). In a practical sense this means that consultation should occur, Māori perspectives should be prioritised in examining the literature and in analysing findings and that appropriate tikanga should be incorporated such as whakawhanaungatanga, between researcher and participants and among participants where appropriate, koha, face to face interaction where possible and providing a space for the use of te reo Māori.

The view that Kaupapa Māori research is carried out by Māori researchers does not necessarily say that only Māori are capable of culturally appropriate research for

Māori, but rather that there are other culturally appropriate research methodologies that are a better fit for non-Māori researchers researching in Māori communities (Pipi et al. 2004). These considerations are not particularly relevant in this project but if future research was to occur with the participating community of interest, it may be the case that non-Māori researchers would take part.

As this project was to be undertaken by a Māori researcher, within an iwi organisation and focusing on policy and practice that is significant for Māori in particular, it was appropriate that a Kaupapa Māori methodology should be employed. This however is not as simple as following a well-defined and established framework or following other research closely. Referring to Smith's (2011) commentary, one endeavour of this research was to allow the people, the organisation and the circumstances to be the foundation of the research framework rather than to fit the people, organisation and circumstances into an existing framework.

Kaupapa Māori methodology does not necessarily fit into a qualitative-quantitative framework but does incorporate aspects of such frameworks, despite being inherently critical of Eurocentric ontology and epistemology (Henry & Pene 2001). The nature of the research completed here, lends itself toward qualitative methods due to its focus on the experiences and perceptions of people. According to O'Leary and Sandberg (2010) the qualitative research tradition utilises inductive reasoning, accepts multiple perspectives and realities and recognises the power of both participants and researchers, and does not "shy away from political agendas" (p. 113). The qualitative tradition is also held to be somewhat critical of the quantitative tradition that both preceded it and exists alongside it (O' Leary & Sandberg 2010) and this is almost certainly a reason why Kaupapa Māori research often sits well with qualitative methods.

But just as it can be limiting and even harmful to be bound by too stringent a Kaupapa Māori framework, so too can it be limiting to take an all or nothing type approach to qualitative methods. In developing a framework for this research, I have endeavoured to take the most appropriate aspects of relevant methodologies and methods and use them together rather than simply choosing one approach and fitting

the research into it. While this study does not lend itself to quantitative methods, it is entirely likely that should this research be built upon in the future, there would be good reason to collect quantitative data including demographic statistics and contract outputs and to use quantitative analysis tools like economic modelling.

According to Engel and Schutt (2005), qualitative methods are most often suited to what the authors term exploratory research. That is, research that seeks to find out how people act, operate, behave or work in certain settings. It is concerned with finding out the issues that concern people and how these people give meaning to their actions. This research is in some senses exploratory because of its focus on people's experiences and perceptions. However, because it is being completed within a particular organisation within the participants' capacity as employees rather than as individual practitioners necessarily, it is less exploratory than some previous research completed within the community of interest.

To a lesser degree, qualitative methods are also used in descriptive and evaluative research (Engel & Schutt 2005). Descriptive research provides a picture of a current situation, which is certainly the aim of this research; to examine the current policies and practices regarding social service provision within an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. This research could also be termed evaluative as it asks questions that could lead to critical answers such as 'how are policies reviewed, how are services evaluated and have you noticed any change in the way your organisation delivers social services in anticipation of Whānau Ora?' Furthermore, the Whānau Ora policy itself and the government's delivery of it, is examined as part of this project. It must be made clear however that this is by no means a formal evaluation. The use of qualitative methods in this project is justified, as the participants were asked to share their own thoughts and experiences in a semi structured setting that allowed them to have a hand in guiding the research.

Policy-oriented research is research that is designed to inform or understand aspects of the public and social policy process and is suited to qualitative methods (Alcock 2004). This research is certainly an attempt to better understand both a specific piece of social policy as well as social service policy in general. One of the key ideas of this project is to investigate the balance between government-driven policy and

practice influenced policy and the time frames and challenges associated with matching one to the other. This is particularly apt in this case, as Whānau Ora is seen both as an innovative new policy as well as one that is catching up to the reality of Māori social service provision. Furthermore, in terms of the policy there have been setbacks with regard to post election implementation that are referred to in the limitations and ethical concerns section of this chapter. It is hoped that this research can raise the profile of these issues and lead to further investigations, evaluations and solutions. Within this research, key people who have had and do have the responsibility for implementation at the policy level as well as a degree of influence in the policy environment were interviewed.

This research is also concerned with the practice experience of social workers, it can therefore, also be described as social work research. One of the key goals of social work research is to develop valid conclusions about the impact of social policy and the effects of social work practice (Engel & Schutt 2005). It is also about providing knowledge to help social workers solve everyday practice issues (Rubin & Babbie 2009). Such goals lend themselves to qualitative methodology, as practice experiences of social workers differ in ways that are more easily and effectively recorded by allowing for a wider range of responses. This research discusses issues such as practitioners' ideas on what makes their organisations services unique, what they see as opportunities for improved practice and service delivery as well as policy and practice challenges. In terms of both the range of participants and the range of issues addressed, policy oriented research and social work research overlap within this study in reflection of the way that social policy and social work practice overlap in reality.

To conclude this section of the chapter, a range of methodological principles and methods have been used to develop a research framework that best fits the particular factors of this project. A foundation of Kaupapa Māori research has been used with other methodological principles and approaches added as appropriate. The following section will explain the research design and the practical work undertaken to complete the project.

Research Design

The population of interest for this research is people currently or previously involved as employees with the development and delivery of social services within Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou (now Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou). There were no limitations on the length of time that a person needed to be employed by the organisation as a wide range of perspectives were being sought. In terms of the practice and service delivery end of the scale, only those involved during or after the time that Whānau Ora was first discussed within the organisation were included in the population of interest as a significant number of the research questions are related to practice in anticipation of Whānau Ora. At the policy and governance end, time of employment was not a restriction as those no longer employed by the organisation still had a broad knowledge of the policy and political issues that could impact upon the organisation presently and in anticipation of Whānau Ora.

The population of interest includes those involved in all of the social service programmes that Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou delivers except services that are funded by the District Health Board due to the additional ethics procedures attached to those services. The actual population sample includes people in managerial and staff roles as well as a group of people who provide Hapū Social Services that are affiliated to Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou but who are not directly employed by the organisation. While the perspectives of those in governance could not be directly sought, these perspectives are valuable could give more depth to further research.

Initially, letters of invitation were sent to both the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and the Chief Executive who then passed the request on to the Senior Manager of social services. At this point in the process, the intended project was an examination of the implementation of Whānau Ora within the organisation. However, upon further discussion it was found that due to political circumstances, the policy itself had come to a halt and thus the implementation of Whānau Ora within the collective that Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou belongs to had also stalled. It was then necessary to revise the project aims to reflect the current situation of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and of Whānau Ora.

The project outline was then sent back to the Senior Manager and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou was re-invited to participate in the research. The invitation was accepted and a meeting set up with the Senior Manager to discuss the best people to contact to get the practical aspects of the project underway. Those people, each the manager of a number of social service programmes were then contacted initially by email and then in person on receipt of a reply. Service managers then informed staff of the research and staff were then contacted either by email or at a meeting where they received information sheets, interview schedules or focus group question schedules and consent forms. Willing participants were confirmed via email or by their service managers.

In previous research projects, participants were sent letters through their organisations with the onus being on participants to reply to the research request. This practice aligned with what is generally considered to be ethical in standard academic research. However, many participants queried why they were not simply contacted directly and said they would prefer this in the future. The original reason why the letters were sent out in this manner was to minimise the sense of obligation to participate that potential participants may feel. Mutual obligation however, is a cornerstone of relationships in Māori communities and is not seen as something to be avoided (Mead 2003). Due to these lessons learned, once permission had been granted by the organisation, the majority of participants were contacted personally.

It was reiterated in information sheets, consent forms and during interviews and focus groups that participation was voluntary and that participants could choose to pull out of the research at any time and/or decline to answer any question. This was particularly important as the study was completed within a single organisation and may have seemed like an organisational requirement rather than a voluntary activity if this was not done. Participants were also given the opportunity to ask questions about the research prior to and during interviews and focus groups.

Data collection took place in three ways. The first was semi-structured interviews. In Kaupapa Māori research, ideally both the researcher and the research participants should play a part in defining the direction of the research (Bishop 1998). With this

as a consideration, proposed interview questions were given to participants before the interviews took place with participants afforded the opportunity to provide feedback. Interviews were primarily used for those in managerial or executive roles as often these participants had a range of specific knowledge regarding policy, politics and organisational direction that was not known or of immediate importance to social work practitioners. Those in managerial and executive roles had more of a strategic view of the organisation and as there were less managers and executives than social work practitioners, it was time effective to interview each one separately. In some instances, interviews were also used for those at the practice level who wished to participate but could not attend focus groups or those who wished to expand on the information shared in focus groups.

Focus groups were used to gather information from those social workers actively providing social services on a day to day basis. Because the pool of social service staff is fairly large, using focus groups was the most effective way to engage with this group. Furthermore, social service practitioners often had a similar knowledge in terms of policy and in particular Whānau Ora. Both focus group and interview questions are split into two sections, social services: policy and practice and Whānau Ora.

Finally, secondary sources such as organisational policy documents, presentation notes, annual reports and statistics were used to fill gaps in and expand on the information provided in focus groups and interviews and also to provide context for that information.

Interview and focus group questions were developed with reference to a number of factors. These were previous research, both my own and others, the current social service and social policy climate, the Report of the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives and the feedback of participants. The interview and focus group question schedules were developed with reference to Kaupapa Māori methodology literature. Whakawhanaungatanga is an important process within Kaupapa Māori research and helps to establish trust in research relationships. Whakawhanaungatanga was not a difficult process or even a process that had to be consciously created in this instance as it is simply common practice within iwi organisations. Time for introductions and

connections was however written in to the interviews and focus groups to be certain that this occurred. Informal time for whakawhanaungatanga between researcher and participants and among participants was also provided for through the sharing of food either before or after the interview or focus group.

Interviews and focus groups were all transcribed or summarised and returned to participants for approval. In the case of focus groups, summaries were provided instead of transcriptions because of the difficulties of recording exact wording and speaker in the focus group environment. There were some instances of people talking at the same time or two threads of conversation happening at once on particularly important points. A volunteer research assistant also assisted with note taking in order to record as much of the information as possible, as accurately as possible. This assistant signed a confidentiality agreement and also turned over all written notes. Transcripts and summaries were sent via email and/or mail and release forms were returned via mail in self-addressed postage paid envelopes provided to participants. Participants returned authority for the release of written transcripts/summaries forms via mail.

In one instance, members of a focus group on review of the summary, wished to provide new and more relevant information. In this case, a follow up focus group occurred. Not all members of the original focus group were able to attend and these participants provided written information via documents attached to email. Because there were fewer participants in the follow up focus group, a full transcription of the interview was provided and further authority for the release of written transcripts forms were also provided and returned.

For the sake of the presentation of findings, data was grouped, based on the role of participants in the organisation. Kaimahi, Management and Hapū Social Services each have their own section in one findings chapter. The reason for this is that different groups have different responsibilities and relationships which mean that the questions and/or the angle of questioning was different between groups. Data within each section is presented along similar lines to the interview schedules and focus group questionnaires as this was the most simple and logical option. Data from some

questions have been combined under the same heading where data from those questions was not substantial and could be appropriately placed together.

Another findings chapter was also developed from an interview with a former Chief Executive. The reason why this data is presented separately is because the interview focused more on the creation of Ngāti Porou social services, the motivations behind their creation, the original goals for the services and some important political insights from the point of view of someone who had held a number of positions in the organisation. These findings present the development of the social services in chronological order with comments on this development where included. This chapter also provides context for the other findings chapter and therefore precedes it in this thesis.

For the sake of analysis, data from both chapters and across every section was combined and organised according to important themes. These themes are; Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector; The influence of politics on direction and service provision; the influence of the economy on direction and service provision; community influenced social work, the natural inclusion of tikanga in social services and challenges and opportunities.

Limitations and Ethical Considerations

In the case of Kaupapa Māori Research it can certainly be argued that relationship between researcher, participants, organisation and community is more important than a pre-researched frame work. With this in mind, the following section outlines the important ethical considerations and limitations that are a part of this project and how these were addressed.

One important factor that is generally accepted about Kaupapa Māori research, is that the focus or particular ‘research product’ that is developed, should be formed in the process of the research in collaboration with research participants, iwi, hapū, whānau and others with a stake in the outcome (Smith 2011). This was particularly the case with this project as the initial proposal had to be redesigned due to the

organisations particular circumstances at the time. Prior to the 2011 election when the idea for this research was first developed, the Whānau Ora concept seemed to be consistently progressing with Whānau Ora collectives being created and given official status, public presentations being delivered and creation of Whānau Ora contracts expected in the not too distant future. Following the election however, the policy process stalled somewhat and the implementation of the policy is still in its early stages, with the future framework for Whānau Ora announced in August 2013 (Turia 2013). As well as providing an interesting lesson on the influence of politics on policy and practice, these circumstances necessitated a change of focus for this research. Initially, the research was to focus on the initial implementation of Whānau Ora with the aim of examining how an organisation shapes a new policy as it is implemented. This was particularly interesting, as Whānau Ora was at the time, a concept without much concrete definition with collectives given the opportunity not only to deliver a contract but also to shape it.

In terms of the redesign of this project, as a researcher I wanted to complete research with this particular community of interest as my iwi is of particular importance to me. Therefore, instead of opting for an entirely new project, adjustments were made in line with what was useful and relevant for the organisation at the time. The redesigned project was then agreed upon with Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and resubmitted to the relevant ethics committee where the amendments were approved. Except for the time required to redesign the project, the adverse impacts of this situation were minimal.

Some commentators mention that gender, and in particular being a female adds another dimension of difficulty to undertaking research with Māori communities (Te Awēkotuku 1999). While this may be the case in many other areas, Ngāti Porou has a strong tradition of female leadership and female creation of and access to knowledge across a wide range of areas is normal (Mahuika 1973). In support of this argument, more than half of those in managerial positions interviewed for this research are women. With this in mind, as a female researcher, it was not difficult to build relationships or gain access to information.

Something to be wary of in Kaupapa Māori research is adopting an idealised or over-generalised view of the Māori population (Smith 2011). This is particularly important when researching within a fairly small and specific group of Māori or within a single community. It is surprisingly easy to refer to or think of Māori as a homogenous group, especially when comparing Māori values with Western values. In order to counter this, a significant body of literature outlining Māori diversity was utilised as a tool to inform this research. Furthermore, rather than simply taking a Kaupapa Māori view, it was important for this research to take a Kaupapa Ngāti Porou view because of the population of interest.

There can be a conflict between the goals of Kaupapa Māori research and the university research structure. One important question that needed to be asked was; in the context of academic research to gain a qualification, what should the framework be in regards to the direction and ownership of the research? In the context where research is community based and not attached to qualifications it is easier to assume that ownership should lie with the participants and community. However, in the case where one of the key outcomes of the research is a qualification for the researcher, this question is more complicated. According to Powick (2002) research for personal career purposes goes against the philosophy of those being researched, which is inherent in Kaupapa Māori research. It would seem somewhat difficult then to reconcile qualification gaining research to a Kaupapa Māori philosophy. However, an educated population is likely to be beneficial to iwi, especially in the post-settlement phase where resources and opportunities for both social and economic influence are growing. In a case such as this one, where the researcher is a part of the collective group in which the research is taking place, it would stand to reason that a qualification gained by the researcher, provided they are willing to use that qualification for the benefit of the iwi, would be a desirable outcome of research.

According to Alcock (2004) there are three sets of interests that generally intersect in social research. These are the interests of the researcher, the interests of the researched and the “socially dominant political structures” such as governments, funding bodies and other large organisations (p.29). As a non-government provider that is reliant on government contracts for income, there can be a conflict between what participants would like to say about policies and what they feel they can say.

However, Ngāti Porou does have a long history of self-determination and of negotiating the terms of service provision and development with government. Furthermore, in the post-settlement era, Ngāti Porou potentially has a significantly greater degree of power through both the size of its asset base and statutory recognition of its mana by the Crown. There can also be conflicts or tensions across different levels of any organisation and such tensions were taken in to consideration in this study. Measures such as ensuring confidentiality, allowing participants to review the information they provided and completing interviews with people at different levels of the organisation separately were employed.

As a member of the Ngāti Porou and as a previous employee and affiliate of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou, I know a number of the participants and am genealogically related in some way to many of the participants. Participants were informed on several occasions that they were under no obligation to participate. Furthermore, if participants communicated that they were unable or unwilling to participate they were not approached again. One occurrence that supports this claim is that there were a number of staff members who could not participate due to their workloads and were able to communicate this comfortably albeit apologetically.

In order to minimise harm, participants were interviewed in their professional rather than personal capacities with a focus on process and policy and how practice is influenced by these rather than specific information about clients or practise situations although these did come up on occasion. Where participants did share information of a sensitive nature, this has not been included in the final report.

Other studies with a Kaupapa Māori framework

This short section of the chapter draws on a small number of other theses completed through Massey University that have been completed with iwi organisations and/or with a Kaupapa Māori (not necessarily exclusively) framework. The reason why this section has been included is because a number of the challenges and considerations faced in these studies are similar to those faced in this study. Providing examples of similar challenges and considerations lends more weight to the points made in this

chapter about issues such as insider research, obligation and reciprocity and the inclusion of tikanga.

For this section I looked at five other theses, four of which were at Masters Level and one at Doctorate level. All studies were what would be considered insider research in the same way that this study is considered insider research. For the most part, researchers were completing their research with and within their own iwi or Māori community, building on relationships that already existed. Because of these relationships and in a similar way to this study, approaches to participants were made directly rather than through a third person and were often people that the researcher knew or people recommended to the researcher by someone else (Bell 2006; Campbell-Knowles 2012; Fain 2004; Walsh-Tapiata 1997).

All researchers expressed the position that it was important to them that the study genuinely benefited and upheld the mana of their iwi, hapū, whānau and community. Because of this it was often the case that researchers went beyond what was ethically required by the University and offered participants more control over the research and also held themselves to higher ethical standards based on their Māori and/or iwi worldview. In particular, Swan (2006) notes that some participants asked to see drafts of chapters that included their information in order to be sure that that information was accurate and used in context. Swan granted this to her participants and also offered this consideration to all other participants. In my own study similar situations have also arisen. Because of the existing whakapapa relationships between myself and participants, participants often felt comfortable, possibly overly comfortable sharing a wide range of information. It was thus important to them to be able to check this information and the context in which it was being used and to remove certain information where they felt it was not relevant or that it should be held in confidence. There were also cases where people still wanted to change certain information after they had signed release forms and this was also granted. While it meant that the process took longer than what was anticipated, it was important to maintain good relationships with the participants and the organisation.

A note to potential students of Māori research

After completing this and other projects with Māori organisations and communities, it seems to be the case that the level of tikanga ‘strictness’ outlined in some texts gives an impression that it is more stringent than what actually happens and what is expected to happen in a practical research setting. In some cases, reading the literature can foster a sense of intimidation for those not well acquainted or practiced in Māori research, even those who are Māori and have grown up in Māori communities. While this was not an issue for this particular project due to it not being the first project completed in this community and due to a relationship already existing between the researcher and the organisation and in some cases the researcher and participants, it is important to note here, in the hope of encouraging other students who are perhaps unsure, to consider research with their own Māori communities.

One of the most important questions may be ‘how do we protect our knowledge without becoming too exclusive even within our own community?’ Because Māori do not have a positive historical relationship with research and research institutions it is justified that there should be strong protective mechanisms now in place. These rules and regulations are not only written in to the literature but are also implied in Māori communities and in research communities. Terms and phrases like “a Māori researcher, not just someone who happens to be Māori” (Irwin 1994, as cited in Henry & Pene 2001, p.236), while entirely true may deter the unseasoned Māori student who is not fully confident of their competency.

A deeper analysis of the literature however reveals that within the concepts, framework and academic wording there is actually space to move and design a personalised idea of Māori research. This may not initially be at the ideal level but may rather be a starting point that is built upon over time. Walker et al. (2006) state that the reality is that many Māori researchers are not fluent in Te Reo and neither are many research participants. This has certainly been my own experience, but through engaging in Māori research my level of competence in this area and in the area of kawa and tikanga has also improved. It could then be argued that Kaupapa

Māori Research can also be used as a tool to educate people not just in the subject matter they are researching but also in engaging with Māori communities in a practical sense.

It was something of a given to me that I would complete my academic research so as to be of benefit to Māori, in particular my own iwi, hapū, whānau and wider community. I also hoped that through the process I would be able to build better relationships in these areas and learn more about my iwi for my own sake. When tasked with researching about Māori research for the purpose of university assignments and writing methodology chapters for research, the idea of Māori research became somewhat more daunting. The frameworks, concepts and tikanga literature led me to create a fairly formal idea of what I should do. I wrote plans, memorised karakia, found translators, wrote highly formal consultation letters to people I already knew and formally offered hui at all stages of the research process. During the practical part of the research however, I found that interaction with Māori participants and organisations was more natural than what I had anticipated. What I came to realise was that relationships were the most important part and that tikanga was already inherent in those relationships. Therefore I did not need to continually remind myself of the correct tikanga, refer back to the literature or follow a specific process every time, I simply needed to be a member of my iwi, be a member of my whānau and hapū and be myself. This perspective is supported by the arguments of Ware (2009) who states that fear of loss of culture has prompted the enforcing of tikanga without knowing the values that underlie them and that tikanga in the modern setting can be used to face new challenges, opportunities and risks.

One of the biggest dilemmas however, may be that a researcher may be wishing to build a relationship with their iwi, hapū or other group through research, to learn about their history, whakapapa and culture through researching it, or to make their contribution through research, but in order to have access they need to have already built a relationship. Unfortunately I can offer little advice in this area except to say that the obstacles are worth surmounting and the benefits of Māori research especially within groups that you are connected to by whakapapa are worth the struggle of finding a way in.

To conclude, the methodology and methods for this research have been informed largely by Kaupapa Māori theories. The study does not take a singular approach to Kaupapa Māori but rather draws from different sources including other non-Kaupapa Māori theories to develop a framework for this research that is a ‘best fit’. The research and research approach are both strongly influenced and supported by relationships between researcher, participants and participating organisation.

Chapter Four

Whānau Ora is not a new thing: the development of Ngāti Porou Social Services

This chapter presents the voice of a key interviewee who was a manager and CEO of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and who led the development of the Rūnanga's social services in the early 1990s. Her in-depth knowledge and critical analysis of the establishment and development of the social services provide a strong foundation of understanding of the changing policies, practices and attitudes of government funders toward iwi providers. This chapter explains the establishment and development of Rūnanga social services including Hapū Social Services and Whānau Oranga, the motivations behind their establishment, the original and continual goals of the social services, past, current and future challenges and the social services in reference to Whānau Ora.

Establishment of the services

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou's social services arm was established in 1992 as a result of an East Coast community needs assessment initiated by the then Department of Social Welfare in partnership with the Rūnanga. At that time, Amohaere Houkamou, who would one day become the Chief Executive of the Rūnanga, was employed by the Department and was asked to lead the project. When explaining the motivations behind the establishment of the project, she discusses the influence of the then head of the Department,

She was conscious that they hadn't done much in terms of helping to support social services on the Coast, in fact they didn't know much about it...She thought it would be a really good project to look at how the Department could invest in social services for the Coast...From Kaiti up to Pōtaka a social services needs analysis [was proposed] and the specific focus of that needs analysis was to identify what were the particular social services needs and prioritise them community by community.

The initial goal of the project was an ambitious one, to identify the social welfare needs of communities and then devolve social service provision to those communities. This goal would eventually lead to the creation of the Hapū Social Services Group that is still a key component in the Rūnanga's operations today.

When speaking with communities however, it was found that a significant number of the identified needs were complex, high level issues including family violence, poor economic performance, complex health issues and housing, and communities did not feel “that they had the capacity to deal with them”. They were instead willing to develop and trial less demanding initiatives such as after school and holiday programmes, household budget services and youth activities. In response to this, the Department provided funding for pilot programmes that communities identified as suitable. Through these pilots, community capability was assessed and further funding and programme extensions were created where appropriate. Out of the needs analysis, the social service branch of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou was also created to address the more complex social needs identified in the study,

Part of the project was around building community, hapū capability to respond to their own social services needs and we clearly identified that they were capable of responding to a certain level of social services provision but not really some of the more hard line, difficult, complex matters...So we saw that actually we did need a delivery mechanism, it wasn't going to be at the hapū level at this stage but it was needed right there and then.

In order for the Rūnanga to assume the responsibility of service provision, they requested that Amohaere move to the Rūnanga and lead the social services, which she agreed to do. From the outset “the Rūnanga social services just continued to grow and grow”. According to Amohaere, “we got into justice stuff, we became one of the first family start providers, we ran parents as first teachers, we basically did everything”.

Ngāti Porou services for Ngāti Porou people

Amohaere argues that while the long term goal was still to have hapū responsible for providing most services, “for a sustainable model we needed to build hapū capability”. When speaking of the connection between Hapū Social Services and Rūnanga social services, she asserts that,

We developed probably one of the most integrated social services, health, housing packages across really the whole country...apart from it being a mechanism of delivery direct to hapū from within hapū. It also was the mechanism we used to provide some sort of general oversight for the Rūnanga's programmes...annually they would help us to clarify what were the high needs services, what was the general view of the provision of

services and just provide that constant monitoring, and we monitored them in terms of the specific services.

In terms of the desire to provide Ngāti Porou services for Ngāti Porou people, one of the motivating factors for this was the depth of local knowledge,

There was a real in depth knowledge of communities, what worked, what didn't work, who was going to try and exploit situations and who was going to also be really important around leading the various initiatives...we were really confident that we could actually deliver to ourselves, and we could be able to extract the resources that were being brought into Gisborne on the backs of Ngāti Porou and actually make sure it went to Ngāti Porou.

In the early stages of the social services development, interesting issues around the targeting of government funding became apparent and this intensified the drive for “Ngāti Porou social services for Ngāti Porou communities”,

It became evident to me in those first few years that there had been a lot of funding targeted for the Gisborne East Coast region off the backs of our [East Coast] statistics but actually very little of it had got past that Gladstone Road Bridge⁶...which was why I was so driven about the idea of Ngāti Porou providing its own social services to itself, but also very clear that we couldn't afford to allow just any old how, that we did have to develop really professional [services], and professional in a sense that they were tailored and customised to Ngāti Porou communities but also bore all the hallmarks of the best of a mainstream service...our added value was that we actually understood how to connect with our people, how to communicate with our people, how to hard line our own.

In most instances, because of the social demographic of the region, it has been a case of Ngāti Porou practitioners working with Ngāti Porou people, something that Amohaere describes as one of the “strengths of the Rūnanga”. In saying this, Rūnanga services have not been and are not exclusively for Ngāti Porou. Instead they are open to all whānau and individuals. However, due to the high percentage of Ngāti Porou people living in the region, it is generally the case that the overwhelming majority of both staff and service users are Ngāti Porou.

⁶ The Gladstone Road Bridge crosses the Tūrangānui River in Gisborne. Te Toka a Taiau, a rock considered the southern boundary marker of Ngāti Porou was situated in the river mouth area before being blasted for port development. Thus crossing the Gladstone road bridge from the direction of the Gisborne CBD takes you from the Rohe of the Tūrangānui a Kiwa iwi to that of Ngāti Porou.

Staff development

Investment in staff through training and professional development was one of the key actions that enabled the Rūnanga social services to become well established and grow,

A lot of our staff came to us with very little formal qualifications...most of them were coming and starting with us in their thirties and maybe even forties [and] hadn't done any formal education since they'd left school...we recruited them because we believed that the life experience that they had was actually really valuable.

Also in an appropriately symmetrical way,

It was work through the Rūnanga social services [that] gave a lot of Ngāti Porou women particularly, the opportunity to go back to school, finish a diploma, do a degree; some of them went on and did Masters. Likelihood, if that sort of employment opportunity hadn't occurred, they wouldn't have done it.

It was a goal of the Rūnanga to provide professional training opportunities for staff and hapū workers that combined the best of Ngāti Porou community knowledge with academic understanding and mainstream expertise,

There were so many Ngāti Porou people in universities and polytechs all over the country that were actually tutoring in these courses. I just saw it as a great opportunity to try and get some of those people back, not necessarily on a full time basis but through some shared tutorials, visiting lecture type arrangements...I also believed that the people at home had some insights that the lecturers and universities [didn't], they'd probably been a little bit too removed from Ngāti Porou so they didn't [have] some of the realism, the pragmatism, especially of the cultural base of a lot of our hapū people....when you get the combination of Ngātis [with a] more sort of mainstream, to some degree academic and theoretical set of skills, coming together with the Ngātis at home that had very much a practical, on the ground view and knowledge and skills, actually that was where the real potential for a really sophisticated Ngāti Porou social services framework [was].

Relationships with the State

Amohaere explains that from its establishment, the Rūnanga built unique relationships with State sector agencies whereby it succeeded in creating formal affiliations without being bound by the practice regulations of those organisations. She mentions a number of what would be considered 'mainstream' organisations that

had good training programmes and good reputations with the public. However, some of the programmes or the approach to delivery of the organisations did not fit in with the Rūnanga's philosophy,

We were able to be innovative around looking for potential arrangements that enabled us to accrue all the benefits from those arrangements without actually compromising our mana motuhake as Ngāti Porou...that was our bottom line. Delivering services to our own Ngāti Porou people based on our Ngāti Porou tikanga, but also knowing that we had the professional people. It was a combination of Ngāti Porou tikanga and mātauranga and any of the mainstream knowledge, skills, experience that actually ensured we could say we could provide a quality service.

Ngāti Porou was highly ambitious and went so far as to lobby the government of the day in 1996 to create a Vote: Ngāti Porou in the annual budget.

We wanted the government to give us, the Rūnanga [] the social welfare spend for all those Ngāti Porou people that were in receipt of social welfare, social services support. They said to us "well that's interesting but you know the majority of your people live away" and we said "yes" we understood that but what we would do is we would work with our taura here"...We'd say to them "ok of the Ngātis living in Auckland and Wellington, who are they going to, to get social services?" and we would then contract with those social service providers to provide services to Ngāti Porou...So we started floating a whole lot of submissions [and] proposals, based on the long term view of being able to provide services at home but also ensure that the Ngāti Porou living away from home had the same access to a Ngāti Porou worldview of social service delivery and of social services.

Amohaere also argues that in this respect, Ngāti Porou led the way for other iwi. At one particular iwi leaders hui in 1996, Ngāti Porou leaders had encouraged other iwi to renegotiate their relationship with the Crown away from a simple funder/provider relationship to one that incorporated their status as a Treaty partner. Amohaere advised that iwi should,

redevelop and renegotiate the way in which the Crown negotiates with us...it's just a funder, provider relationship and we've got no say around the development of policy [or] the design of the services, we're at the end of this process...we really wanted iwi social services to go "we've got to change that dynamic", where actually we become much more a part of the decision making and design of social services.

Whānau Ora

One point consistently raised, both in this interview and in those with staff, was that Rūnanga social services have been “doing Whānau Ora” for as long as they have existed. In terms of the formal social services, Amohaere reflects that,

In all humility, we were way ahead of the pack; like in our vision of what we could do...we were doing Whānau Ora then in 1996. We didn't call it Whānau Ora but in 2003 we formally changed the name of what was called the Ngāti Porou Social Services...we divided it in to two components...Whānau Oranga and Mātauranga Ngāti Porou. We knew that that's where it was going to be at.

The goal of whānau and community responsibility is one of the fundamentals in the development of Ngāti Porou Social Services. Amohaere also notes that this is a key goal of the Whānau Ora concept,

I think it's a fundamental view of Whānau Ora, that actually we are in the business to make ourselves redundant...we know that we've got a lot of whānau that for whatever reasons actually need support to help them to start to get into a better position to take control of their own lives not only control but take responsibility, but they do need help...we've always believed in that whole strengths based approach so we look for the strengths in whānau and we try to affirm them. We also look for those areas of vulnerability, of weakness and we work with them on that.

Ngāti Porou has a long history of political involvement and social service provision is no exception. Mana Motuhake Ngāti Porou is one of the cornerstones of the Rūnanga and this is reflected in its approach to service provision. When discussing the impact of politics on service provision in relation to Whānau Ora, Amohaere notes,

We were proactive politically at a national level. But the only reason we could be, was because actually we were doing this stuff on the ground...In Gisborne when we first started the Social Services, the Department said to us, 'we've got to have rangatahi services and elderly services' and we said 'no actually we've got to have whānau services because we can't compartmentalise our whānau...We knew that from day one...while everybody else was wanting to set up individual services here or there or start to divide families up and stuff, we resisted...we would not participate in any programmes that actually were premised on the idea that you treated that part of the whānau in isolation...which is why when Whānau Ora became such a formal programme it was absolutely natural that we should, it was just an affirmation of a way of working and a belief in the way you worked with Māori whānau, with Ngāti Porou whānau.

More recently, Amohaere has been a part of the Whānau Ora Taskforce in an ex-officio capacity. She makes interesting comments about Whānau Ora being a case of government policy catching up to actual practice but being hailed as a new innovation. She was interested that much of the conversation surrounding Whānau Ora seemed to be touting it as a new innovation when in fact she knew that the Rūnanga and very possibly other iwi organisations had already been practicing the fundamentals of Whānau Ora for many years. She argues that,

Whānau Ora is actually nothing new, our people have always known about Whānau Ora. So ok they might not have called it Whānau Ora, but the fundamental principles of what Whānau Ora is have always been part of our culture. So no I don't believe it was originated in some Crown agency. Actually I believe it's been a practice and a way of life that a number of our whānau have always maintained.

This point gave way to a conversation regarding what makes whānau strong and thus able to provide their own Whānau Ora, looking back to her grandparents' community on the East Coast, Amohaere says,

What I remember that made those whānau strong is that they knew who they were. So a sense of identity and a sense of belonging is critical to your own sense of self-worth...while they were not materially rich, they never went hungry...They never woke up in the morning and said, 'I haven't got any kai in my cupboard, I'll go and ask the Department of Social Welfare for a voucher'...Most of them didn't have any contact whatsoever with any government agencies so they were much more confident and capable because they had to make decisions for themselves.

Furthermore,

The whole community took responsibility. You belonged to that whole community, so if you were at the marae and you were Honor's mokopuna and you were naughty, and Honor wasn't there, then Apo would be telling you off⁷...we've got to think about what are the values that made us strong and what were the practices? And how we actually incorporate that into today's life. Because that's actually fundamentally what Whānau Ora's got to be about.

In terms of finding solutions for the future roll out of Whānau Ora, Amohaere mentioned the three key areas of State, provider and whānau, and the changes that she feels need to be made in each of those areas. She argues that the government needs to,

⁷ Honor is my own grandmother and Apo her sister.

look at changing its role, and being less concerned about having to be in control of everything...it just needs to get some smart contracting and evaluation tools and then with minimal fuss say, 'right Ngāti Porou or the Horouta Whanaunga Collective, we want you to work with these 300 whānau in your rohe, who in our view are some of the most vulnerable whānau. We want you to work with them and to be able to demonstrate over a period of time that this is the way in which you can prove their quality of life. We're gonna pay you x number of dollars and this is the information in terms of reporting and accountability that we want...It's not about bureaucracy. It's not about putting certain iwi providers or collectives through all these hoops. It's about working with whānau to do some real things and improve their daily lives.

When discussing providers, she notes co-operation and collaboration as important keys to making Whānau Ora work. In 2012 she attended a meeting with the Horouta Collective organisations to discuss opportunities in the 2012 budget. When speaking to them she said,

We can't actually go on our own anymore. We don't actually have the numbers to be efficient...We should be playing to our strengths and within our collective who actually has got the best practice and the best track record? And we follow their lead...We also need to be considering how we share some of our big office services...let's just find who of us has the best system and why don't we all just invest in that one? Who's got the best HR, recruitment or training programmes?...Let's use our collective best practice to ensure that we've got a quality of provision across everything we do....we save ourselves hundreds of thousands of dollars by not having to run our own little systems.

Thirdly, when discussing whānau themselves, who are at the core of Whānau Ora, she mentions,

It's really around whānau taking responsibility...as a member of this whānau who is in trouble and needs support; what can I do for myself? What can I do for my kids? What can I do for my husband?...That's a whānau decision; it's not the government's decision, that's not Ngāti Porou Hauora's⁸ decision...that's whānau taking responsibility for themselves...the more whānau are in control of their lives and being able to do something themselves it is more liberating for them than always being dependent on somebody else doing everything for them.

Overall she argues that,

It's not so much about money and it's not so much about programmes per se, it's actually about changing attitudes. It's about changing the way we behave;

⁸ Ngāti Porou Hauora is a primary health organisation that comes under the wider umbrella of Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou.

it's about being clearer about what everybody's contribution is to the overall outcome.

Amohaere's insights and arguments provide strong support to the conclusion that Whānau Ora is a well-established approach within both Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou and other iwi and Māori organisations. While implementation of the policy programme has not been as swift as anticipated, Whānau Ora could provide some significant opportunities for developing services that are reflective of local communities, encouraging those communities to be more responsible for the wellbeing of their own members, improving the effectiveness of the Crown – iwi/Crown-Māori relationship and developing more cost effective structures.

Chapter Five

Ngāti Porou Social Services

This chapter presents the perspectives of kaimahi and management of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou Whānau Oranga unit and members of the Hapū Social Services Group. The chapter has been separated into three sections based on the organisational roles of participants. Within these three groups of kaimahi, management and Hapū Social Services, responses are arranged by theme in line with the interview and focus group questions. The voice of participants is presented through quotations without identifying individuals and their specific job titles due to both their positions in the organisation and the number of separate individuals who have contributed to this section.

Kaimahi

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou (now transitioned to Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou) provides a wide range of social services. These broadly include whānau centred services, school attendance services, budgeting, nutrition, injury prevention, social work in schools, youth justice, youth employment, housing and counselling. This section of findings includes the responses of six kaimahi that work in various social service roles and are based in either Gisborne or Ruatoria. These kaimahi are responsible for working directly with clients on a daily basis and all services are provided under contract with various government departments. The comments of one manager, who also has a direct contact role with clients, have also been included in this section.

Contracts, policies and guidelines

There are a number of policies and guidelines that have an impact upon kaimahi practice. These include contract deliverables, organisational employee conduct policies and guidelines published by the local and national bodies to which kaimahi are registered and affiliated. Kaimahi job descriptions are based primarily on the government contracts that provided the Rūnanga with the bulk of its annual income prior to settlement of Treaty Claims. The Rūnanga's guidelines are generally focused

on operational issues such as use of the organisations equipment, workplace conduct and other general practice concerns. Contrastingly, contracts guide kaimahi in their specific roles. One Kaimahi mentions that his contract is “quite detailed but it’s easy to follow” and that “the Rūnanga comes with its own code of ethics as well that we want to fall back to, to make sure we’re on track”. When asked which of these two sets of guidelines were more important, Kaimahi generally answered that both were of equal importance and that “First and foremost we are employees...but we are given contracts to perform so in both respects I think they have to both be ticked”.

Guidelines of professional organisations are important as they ensure uniformity across the profession and reassure clients and other organisations that “training [has] been given to people that are dealing with the public” ensuring “that level of consistency”. In terms of training, kaimahi are aware of a number of options including formal study, conference attendance and practice specific training. However, resources available for these are not abundant due to the constraints of contract funding. Kaimahi generally have the opportunity to attend a national conference in their field annually and the Rūnanga also connects kaimahi with as many free training opportunities as possible.

Influence of politics

Government priorities have a significant impact upon Rūnanga services. Elections, restructuring and government budget decisions impact upon the availability, nature and value of contracts. The services that kaimahi can provide often “depend [] on government priorities” and kaimahi note that “whatever the priority of the day is for the government; those tend to be the contracts that we go for”. One aspect of this reality that is particularly concerning, is that in many instances, what the government is willing to fund “doesn’t suit our people’s needs”. Changes of government are also noteworthy challenges for iwi providers as “contracts can pivot on a change of government” and this can cause “a bit of a strain on our iwi provider resources”.

National policy priorities do not always match the reality of unique or isolated communities like those on the East Coast. Often the Rūnanga’s services “have to fit in somewhere” within the governments priorities despite those priorities not

necessarily matching the communities priorities. A particularly significant example is the restructuring of ACC driver licensing services. The move to centralise services in urban areas, has resulted in the Rūnanga losing its status as an ACC subagent, a position which it held for 18 years. According to one kaimahi,

It's had a huge impact, we used to be able to do the drives here, we've been doing this service here for 18 years...which means that our people have now got to go to Gisborne to do that drive. When we lost our services in April, the whole licence side of it, the impact was straight away and such that the police now are finding a lot of illegal drivers on our roads...driving to Gisborne to apply for a replacement licence, the cost of going there, the petrol cost for a \$34 license, it's had a big, big impact. So for me, all that 18 years of work, our people are going back to being illegal again.

Because of demand from the community, the service does still exist in a community advisory capacity but without government funding. The Rūnanga, the Police and the community have all appealed for the retention and reinstatement of the service but so far to no avail. Kaimahi do however note that they still need to work within these limitations and must do so creatively to extract optimum benefit for their communities.

The guidelines and deliverables set out in contracts do not always match the reality of a client's situation. Youth justice programme kaimahi provide an interesting example of this in the case of young people who re-offend or who are sentenced by the Court early in the programme. When a young person becomes re-involved with the Court system, what happens is that the Rūnanga service becomes "secondary rather than primary" meaning that completion of the programme for that young person is unlikely due to contract timeframes. When explaining a situation where a young person is sentenced to home detention one kaimahi explains that,

they could be on a bracelet for six months and they've been with us for one month...when the brace has come off, duration wise we've completed the programme, they haven't completed the outcomes...we're not contracted, paid to carry on the six months after that.

This is not an issue specific to Māori providers but rather one that contracted youth justice providers are likely to face nationwide.

Further to this, kaimahi have found that with the current Fifth National Government, “honing in” on priority areas or issues has been a key feature of contracts for service. In the area of injury prevention, the government’s current priority is road safety and this has meant that home safety messages and promotion, which are held to be important by kaimahi have been scaled down. In addition to this, kaimahi, in a similar fashion to their Hapū Social Service counterparts, note that youth currently take priority over other age groups and many contracts are reflective of this.

Feedback and evaluations

Services are evaluated against the key performance indicators within individual contracts. Overall, when assessing their interactions with clients, kaimahi tend to prefer word of mouth feedback from the community over written assessments noting that “verbal feedback is the most effective form”. The organisation is audited annually and this also provides important feedback. Depending on the service, other forms of feedback are also collected and client created feedback frameworks are often used. Youth services kaimahi explain that,

We make goals during our first introduction, and then we work based on those goals, achievable goals. Once we’ve achieved those goals we can either re-evaluate to make more goals or say ‘are you happy with what we’ve achieved?’...information is collected via media, photos or camera and observations by staff, incidents are reported, young people evaluate themselves by indicating the best part of the day and the worst part of the day.

Non-personal feedback is also collected from other agencies that are involved with the same clients. An example of this is feedback provided by Work and Income to the budget service regarding a decline in the demand for food allocations in the region that the budget service operates in. However, in terms of the sharing of specific client information between agencies, strict rules around confidentiality are maintained.

External evaluations also take place with national bodies and community groups. One example given is that there is a local nutrition management group made up of Marae representatives and community workers that meet quarterly to discuss the

Rūnanga's nutrition programmes and evaluate what is going well and what needs improvement.

Supervision is a contractual requirement and is a key evaluative function. Supervision is tailored to individual workers and contracts with supervision taking place for some kaimahi weekly, some fortnightly and some monthly. Supervision is flexible and kaimahi mention an "open door policy for those needing to make contact with a supervisor outside their scheduled supervision times". Although such situations do not occur often the value of supervision is felt most acutely when dealing with sensitive situations.

Relationships

Both internal and external relationship building is important and in most instances, kaimahi "have to have a very wide, extensive network". In terms of client referrals this is particularly important. Clients are referred to services in a number of ways. These include client self-referral, referral from family members or friends, referral from other Rūnanga services and referral from other providers. The Rūnanganui works from a holistic idea of wellbeing and service provision and clients often require more than one service,

If there are other issues we have to deal with, we have to have an overview of where we send these clients to, to achieve what they're expecting to have achieved...at the end of the day we're here, people come in and as I said, collectively with all their issues, deal with what you know you can deal with and if there is any other issue, you refer either internally to strengthening families or whatever the need may be.

There is significant internal interconnectedness between services. The usefulness of this interconnectedness can be seen in the relationship between the budget service and the youth employment service. Under new youth employment programme contracts, there is a requirement for clients to undergo a training module with qualified budget advisors. The Rūnanga is able to provide this service internally and it enables them "to achieve substantial savings as a result of tapping in-house on our organisations resources".

The importance of strong relationships between kaimahi within the organisation is also emphasised. Kaimahi are "developing quite a good strong internal resource for

each other” and can “go to each other quite confidently and communicate concerns...and then get an opinion on things”. In support of this, kaimahi also emphasise that “the Rūnanga has always encouraged good relationships at governance and operational levels”.

Interagency relationships are also highly valued and the Rūnanga works with a number of other agencies, both government and non-government, across all areas of its work. The Rūnanga’s connection with local schools is particularly worth mentioning. Recently the Rūnanga has been responsible for delivering a Ministry of Education School Attendance Pilot in partnership with Te Rūnanga o Tūrangānui a Kiwa⁹ covering the area from south of Gisborne to the East Coast. The Rūnanganui also has a long standing partnership with the Ministry of Education that is delivered through its Mātauranga unit.

In some cases, Referring clients to other agencies can be problematic. While the Rūnanga provides a wide range of services it is not a comprehensive ‘one-stop shop’ for every need that exists in its communities. In isolated communities like those on the East Coast, clients are not necessarily confident to access the other services that they are referred to, especially if those services are based outside of their own community. As mentioned with regard to the example of the driver licensing services, there can also be a significant financial cost, especially to those on the East Coast, of accessing additional services outside of the community.

Unique qualities of iwi social services

Kaimahi generally expressed a belief that as an iwi provider the Rūnanga is more able to identify and service community needs than what they would consider ‘mainstream’ providers. The difference between iwi and mainstream service providers as expressed by kaimahi is that iwi providers “do things to fit into what the community needs are”. When elaborating on this point, kaimahi generally pointed toward the natural incorporation of tikanga Māori into the fabric of the organisation as well as the kinship ties between kaimahi and the community. Most Rūnanga staff whakapapa to Ngāti Porou and in an isolated area like the East Coast this creates a

⁹ Te Rūnanga o Tūrangānui a Kiwa was registered in 1986 to be the mandated iwi authority for the tribes of Tūrangānui a Kiwa (the Gisborne area) whose tribal area is adjacent to that of Ngāti Porou.

unique situation whereby Ngāti Porou workers are delivering services to Ngāti Porou people, through a Ngāti Porou organisation in an area predominantly populated by Ngāti Porou. This was described as a case of “tikanga Māori within a Māori dominated community”. It was also noted that “staff whakapapa to Ngāti Porou, [are] employed by [a] Ngāti Porou iwi provider and [are] working in Ngāti Porou communities”.

Similar ideas were also expressed specifically about youth programmes including that,

We focus on whakapapa, pēpeha, who you are, where you come from, your genealogy and life skills which is mahi kai, mahi rukuruku, diving, setting the hinaki, craypots, tikanga which is pohiri, waiata, karakia and history...there is quite a difference, especially in terms of being Māori, acknowledging our Māori side as an iwi organisation. That’s probably one of the most important things that we can give our clients or services or whānau...we give them a sense of whakawhanaungatanga

While some members of the community are wary of the services because of a general scepticism about social service providers, kaimahi argue that there are “less stigmas” attached to the Rūnanganui as an iwi provider than to government organisations like Child Youth and Family and Work and Income. Kaimahi who have worked with government agencies note that “when you’re attached to a government agency rather than an iwi one, those barriers can be a real hindrance when you’re first trying to develop a relationship with new clients”. While mistrust can initially be a problem with clients, kaimahi believe that their status as an iwi provider and their membership of the same communities as their clients helps to overcome it,

We pretty much come with that iwi support base as well. Some of our clients know that. They know us in that other aspect, not just as workers for the iwi. Some of them do think that we’re part of a government regime but it’s [different] coming from an iwi provider it just gives them that comfort. You know there’s more of a trust there they find. But in saying that if we do trip over and drop the ball with them we’re the first ones to get hammered.

There are a number of cases where clients have accessed mainstream services but have later found Rūnanga services to be more effective. One kaimahi noted in a tongue in cheek fashion that this is because Ngāti Porou people will “only listen to their own”. Especially in Ruatoria, kaimahi know their clients outside of their

Rūnanga roles and this has often “opened the doors” to provide services and made clients feel more comfortable. The size of East Coast communities and the genealogical relationships that exist, also mean that it is almost impossible not to know your clients. In the communities that kaimahi work there is also an advantage to being an iwi organisation rather than simply a Māori organisation and kaimahi believe that as an iwi organisation “we are best able to deliver to our whānau as we have a direct understanding of their needs”.

Whānau Ora

There is a strong consensus among kaimahi that they and the Rūnanga as a whole are already delivering what the government would define as Whānau Ora. Kaimahi note that “Whanaungatanga is one of the principles that drives our iwi” and argue strongly that,

There has not been a difference in that the concept of Whānau Ora is at the very beginning of the Rūnanga’s existence...Whānau Ora has always and will always be an integral part of Ngāti Porou.

Kaimahi “don’t believe Whānau Ora has changed the way we work with whānau”. Instead it has been “business as usual”. Throughout the organisation, the approach is and has been ‘Whānau Ora’ and at least at the service provision end, it is only the terminology that is different.

Consistent with the Whānau Ora concept, providing holistic services that address clients concerns together rather than in isolation is important for the Rūnanga and kaimahi values reflect this,

I believe that if you get all the issues together, it enables you to complete a full [] assessment for your clients and gives you a full and clear picture of where you’re going, it’s not just putting a band aid on one thing and [other] things falling over.

There is however, some disillusionment with Whānau Ora as it can be difficult to help people understand the concept. For kaimahi “the challenge has simply been to get our people to understand the concept, that Whānau Ora is not a new idea, but has been reformed, reshaped”. There are also contracts where kaimahi work confidentially with individuals and they are unsure how these contracts could fit into a Whānau Ora programme that encourages collaborative, wrap-around provision.

Kaimahi see Whānau Ora as a significant opportunity and in particular, should Whānau Ora “get off the ground”, “having more resources” will be a meaningful improvement on the current situation. However, because of the immediacy of their everyday work, kaimahi have not generally tracked its progress. Whānau Ora as a policy, while important, is viewed as an issue for management and governance. The same is true of both the Ngāti Porou Treaty Settlement and contracting in general with kaimahi stating that “that’s between our senior management and the funders”.

Challenges and Opportunities

One of the challenges faced by both Kaimahi and the community especially outside of Gisborne, is being rurally based with a large geographic area to cover. One example given is that of specialist appointments at the Gisborne Hospital. Often community members will be called for an appointment at the last minute and be unable to attend through their own resources as it is not a planned expense. This can then put pressure on the Rūnanga to provide support. Often people,

haven’t had the chance to plan and we’re not just round the corner, we’re talking about people that have to travel from Hick’s Bay and they’re afraid not to be there because of the fact that they could go further down the list. Whatever they’re using to get there at such short notice is affecting other areas. That’s what I’m finding a lot of, because they’re always looking for money for petrol vouchers and stuff like that.

Kaimahi also agree that the current economic situation is having a significant impact in their communities and thus on the demand for many of their services.

Kaimahi argue that a community needs assessment to ascertain what services the community actually needs and wants would be an overwhelmingly positive step. As the everyday practitioners of the Rūnanga’s social service work, kaimahi cannot complete this task in addition to their current roles,

workers are seeing other needs out there but I think we’re just sort of focusing on our role, our jobs and I think we may get sort of tied up in doing that and we’re not seeing anything else

The Ngāti Porou settlement is one of the biggest opportunities that the Rūnanganui currently has, however, kaimahi are generally unsure of what the actual benefits will

be. In terms of the settlement, there have been little if any noticeable changes in their jobs, but there is a sense of anticipation about positive future changes,

Nothing has changed because of that. Not at this point. Still early days I think. I do believe that there are gonna be changes and really good ones so it's quite an exciting time to be here

Whānau Ora was also seen as a significant opportunity and this is covered in the Whānau Ora section of this chapter.

Management

This section presents the views and reflections of four current or past managers of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou who are or were based in either Ruatoria or Gisborne or both.

Contracts, policies and politics

The bulk of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou's funding outside of settlement comes from government contracts, the majority of which are in the area of social services. For managers, finding the right balance between the requirements of the contract and the values of the organisation is a priority. Practically, "that means managing the staff, ensuring that the service is not only appropriate but within the guidelines of our own policies". Dealing with contracts is challenging and depending on their area of responsibility, managers must deal with different aspects of the policy process. Managers acknowledge that politics plays an important role in determining the services that are provided and that they need to be "open to whatever the ruling body of the day has as a pet project".

A previous manager who was a part of the research team that undertook the original community needs assessment in 1992, argues that there was more scope to be creative within social service contracts in the 1990s than there is today. Furthermore, some recent government contracts have been highly prescriptive and she believes that this is in part a response to the legacy of the devolution era where,

What they'd [the government] been doing was cutting down the statutory services, cutting down social workers and social work funding and that work is getting devolved out to community and iwi without the resources that they

originally had, certainly without the training, but with full expectation that we will perform, that we will deliver on quite high risk work

In contrast to that, another manager who works in a different service area has more flexibility in the contracts they provide. In his experience, his team has “basically got free rein to design the programme how we best see it”. The team “meet[s] with [the senior manager] first and then we have a discussion about where we think we should go with it. She’ll give her feedback and we’ll give our feedback and we’ll come to [an] agreement and then pretty much, when we’re all on the same page, we’re away”.

He puts this flexibility down to having built a good record with the funder. In terms of having scope to influence service delivery and development of government programmes, having strong existing networks in the community is important. When discussing a school attendance pilot that the Rūnanga was involved with, one manager explains that;

What we brought to this particular pilot relationship, is knowing our communities, knowing our networks and being able to utilise them and work with them, in a way that supports getting our kids back into school. Our discussion with the Ministry is “you’ve got all the templates and everything but our inside knowledge is what makes it really successful”.

There are also occasions where a need will arise or the Rūnanga will identify possible improvements to a programme and either look to make these improvements or create a programme to address the need,

The way I see it is if we come up with an idea and look at how it will make things better, we first have to identify who would be the likely funder for it, because you know each government department has got different criteria. So we look at that and then we speak to our contracts managers who are different people depending on what Ministry it is.

In addition to this they also look for opportunities to collaborate with other agencies as this is an approach that the government favours and also one that makes sense for the organisation,

Sometimes we’re able to work a collaborative contract and most of them I have to say will give it a go if it meets what they need. It might be a short term and that’s really just to get us the resources to try what we think might be a good programme.

Situations have also occurred where trial programmes have been put in place and later extended when funders are convinced of their effectiveness. The youth justice programme based in Gisborne is probably the best example of this. The Rūnanga was provided funding by Child Youth and Family and the Ministry of Justice to run a trial programme. Following evaluation, the Ministry of Justice then offered further funding to continue a long term programme. Like their kaimahi and Hapū Social Service colleagues, managers have also noticed that the current government is “putting a lot of resources into rangatahi”. These programmes are also concentrated in Gisborne rather than in Ruatoria, with Ruatoria having “a couple of rangatahi programmes” but with most youth initiatives based in Gisborne “where the need is”.

Looking to the future, the Rūnanga anticipates moving toward more integrated “high trust contracts” where they will have more autonomy in the delivery of services,

Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Education, might be Ministry of Health, they will contract us as an organisation. We will do the way we see fit, but at the same time ensuring that the outcomes are met.

Furthermore, managers believe that,

There will come a day when the crown will say “we actually prefer to put our resources into employment” and we’d be saying “well your resources might go to employment but it’s actually needed in housing”, so we will determine for ourselves as to where the priorities lie...we will say to the crown, “well no that’s not our priority at the moment, you need to go elsewhere”...we haven’t been shy in saying that that it’s not our priority, [that] we actually need something else...then quite often our Chairperson will say “just because it’s not our priority doesn’t mean to say that you can’t fund us for such and such. We’ll find a way to make your outcomes and you put your resources in”...It’s like the Foreshore and Seabed stuff, we were never in favour of that, and what happens? We end up with having the ability to have an Act in place based on what we saw were the priorities.

One thing that is clear, is that funding will be accessed wherever it is available and then used creatively to both fulfil the contract and the needs of the community. The Rūnanga has a part to play in almost every aspect of the social service sector on the East Coast and the attitude of the organisation is that “so we should”,

Until such time as people have got themselves organised into what they need, there needs to be someone. We picked up the slack because there was no one doing it and if we’re gonna talk about whānau and hapū and can’t help

them...it's our obligation...and it's not only about Ngāti Porou, it's about those people that live in this region as well.

The Rūnanga as a social service organisation has made it possible for far more contract funding and thus social services to reach the East Coast. Contract funding covers a wide range of activities including wages, service resources, training, travel and administration and it is challenging to stretch funding across all those areas. One manager notes that anyone who signs up to work for the Rūnanga “knows what they are getting into” and if potential staff are “not thinking about whānau and hapū” then the job is “probably not for them”. The organisation is naturally Ngāti Porou centric and the tikanga framework is taken for granted in a positive way.

Feedback and evaluation

There were and are a range of basic feedback and evaluation techniques used by both managers and kaimahi. Whānau based and not just client based feedback is also very important,

We didn't measure the success of our services just by numbers. We would measure them by, how many people other than the target group would attend, so how many whānau would come.

In terms of formal feedback to funders, Rūnanga programmes are,

monitored every year by our funder and we also have an approvals audit every year to ensure that the policies and procedures are up to scratch, to maintain our Child Youth and Family approvals.

With internal policy evaluation however there is no systematic evaluation process. Rather policies are reviewed when “it's highlighted to us that it's not working or something needs to change”. When evaluating the actual delivery of a service however, “all our staff ask their clients, their people they work with to provide an evaluation”. This feedback is both used as evidence for funders and to improve programme delivery.

There are certain resources and skill sets that are necessary to the organisation being able to develop regionally based and specific programmes with the support of government funding and this includes good mechanisms for research, evaluation and development. In order to do this successfully “you actually have to have a very good structural analysis”. Unfortunately however,

Our people at home they know when something is good and they know when something is bad, they can't explain it all in depth, you know? But when you're working with government policy you have got to be so clear about systems, clear about policy, clear about law making.

In a small and fairly isolated area such as the East Coast, finding people to fill those roles is not always easy and it was mentioned that "those kinds of people don't come back and work at home because they can earn more elsewhere".

Limited finances from government contracts were cited as one of the reasons for this,

You can't live off those government contracts, you can't train, send them off to PD so that they keep themselves sharp and all of those things. But you just keep reminding yourself; the good grounding thing was you just keep reminding yourself that you're lucky to have a job in Gisborne and the coast.

Many Rūnanga employees have and do work for the Rūnanga because of the non-monetary benefits such as contributing directly to Ngāti Porou. Many staff, especially those in Ruatoria are long serving. Positions are not restricted to Ngāti Porou, but due to the community demographic, most staff are Ngāti Porou.

The recent inclusion of research and evaluation measures by the contract funders are of varying use to service providers,

Funders were building in research and evaluation systems, some were just humbug and they had them there because they had to, I know no one was reading the results, others were pretty thorough.

Research and evaluation measures developed in-house would likely be of more benefit than those developed at a national level, but this development would be costly. An aspiration among managers is to,

Develop our own research and evaluation tools that [are] driven from within our organisation. But that's a chapter for another part of the Rūnanga's development because it requires funding to bring in the right people...I wanted more evidence, I wanted to be able to articulate to our people as well as to the funders and policy developers, you know to extrapolate the meaningful information and have it at my fingertips.

It is also believed that the Ngāti Porou settlement will enable the organisation to do this,

That will all come with the TRONPnui settlement. It'll be amazing, it'll be your generation that will get in there and just whip it all up and be able to

map up and graph up the impact on families lives of Rūnanga activities, of government policy, those sorts of things.

Relationships

Working in the social service sector, there are a number of relationships that the Rūnanga must maintain. Internally this involves providing good lines of communication between those in governance and social service staff in order to match up the organisation's priorities with the communities' needs. In terms of maintaining a channel of communication between staff and governance, managers explained that this was generally the role of the CEO but that because the Rūnanga is an iwi organisation encompassing both genealogical and community relationships, they do have their own contact with those in governance. There is also a "blurring in terms of governance roles...in terms of what's governance in the non-Māori world". Particularly in terms of the accepted separation of governance and management, iwi organisations and their operations can generate a lot of debate around "culture and tikanga, within the context of the modern neo-liberal sort of world". In a broad sense accountability is more complex than simply management's accountability to governance as other tikanga relationships such as those between kaumatua and younger iwi members also exist in the same space.

Managers observe both everyday non-formal working relationships as well as formal arrangements with other organisations,

On the ground, staff work as closely with NPH¹⁰ as they do with anybody else and that's on a day to day basis especially with social workers themselves. We have good relationships with the schools...we do have a partnering agreement for our social workers in schools programme and the partners to that are us as the provider, Child Youth and Family as the funder, Ministry of Education and schools, all our schools under the cluster system.

In terms of relationships with other iwi, the Rūnanga works closely with the tribal authority for the neighbouring Tūrangānui tribes and on an as appropriate basis with other iwi,

We're in constant contact with them [Te Rūnanga o Turanganui a Kiwa], the rest of the iwi we tend to look at on an as and when basis, whenever they have a need that we might be able to fulfil...we might need something that

¹⁰ Ngāti Porou Hauora the primary health organisation for the Ngāti Porou Rohe

they have, we'll be involved with them but not just involved with them just for the sake of being involved.

Relationships with the community are addressed in the following section.

Unique qualities of iwi social services

When asked what makes Rūnanga social services unique from mainstream organisations, a previous manager made a comparison between her current work place and the Rūnanga,

There is already a kind of shared understanding...If they're [the Rūnanga] not thinking whānau-hapū it's certainly a Māori worldview. That's unique, you don't have to explain that when you walk in a building, so compare that with [current mainstream workplace], I have to bring in, a photo of Ōhinewaiapu¹¹. I don't have to, but I ensure that my cultural symbols are with me because it's not inherent in the environment in the same way that it is with the Rūnanga.

However, although the iwi worldview naturally inhabits the workplace, she did not believe that some kind of romanticised united Māori atmosphere exists but rather that people are diverse,

I'm not too romantic about it either, I understand our diverse realities...you have a shared whakapapa but oh my gosh, your values, your spiritual belief systems, you never take it for granted that you're all on the same page. We're all a consequence of colonisation which means that whatever the different hues are in the New Zealand Pākehā world, we're a reflection of that.

Because of the organisations place in the iwi and Māori community, managers believe it is easier for Rūnanga workers to build relationships with service users,

I think that we're able to get in closer to the clients we deal with, when I look at [our workers] I think that's definitely true and at some of the CYFS social workers that work with the same people. I think that's one of our strengths...I think there's just a stigma when you're attached to a government agency rather than an iwi one and those barriers can be a real hindrance when you're first trying to develop a relationship with new clients.

Interestingly, a fairly common situation exists where people in the community do not like the Rūnanga itself as a political body but do support and use the social services,

We have some interesting people that come in that don't really want to be here because this is the Rūnanga but really need to be here because they might need budgeting, they might need a license or something like that....We used to have this thing where people hated the Rūnanga. But on the

¹¹ Participant's marae

services...we were quite separate...at least they're engaging on the political level and have an opinion be it anti us or not...that opinion doesn't stop them from accessing the services that they or their family might need which is just as well...All I know is that the same people that are scratchy about the Rūnanga are quite happy to access the services and it's their right to access them because they're there for them.

The natural inclusion of tikanga also makes the organisation unique. Because of this tikanga, practice at the Rūnanga naturally centres on whānau and hapū and this influences contracting immensely,

From day dot we have been talking about whānau-hapū so that's the way in which all of our contracts are couched...those are our priorities and it's about trying to bring in the resources to ensure that their needs are covered.

Working consistently with community needs is also a key practice. In terms of the Hapū Social Services Group,

The Rūnanga doesn't have a say as to who comes and who doesn't. It's about who those communities say should be coming...our other contracts, they're based here because the need is too far spread for the hapū groups to manage them. If we have a central location that gives them the opportunity to work among all our hapū groups and we're then not just focusing on one or another. I think that's one of our unique areas that we're able to work in that way to see what our communities require of us.

Interestingly, some of the biggest changes in the community have come about through the professionalisation of whānau work. Prior to this, there were a large number of 'key movers and shakers' within marae and hapū that made sure that the needs of those marae and hapū were met. With the professionalisation and external provision of such services the function of such people is not utilised as much as it was previously. Today however, both managers and kaimahi consider this a deficiency in the current system and believe that more community immersed but not necessarily qualified people, would play a highly complementary role to the existing social services. There is also a belief that more flexible contract funding would provide more opportunity to utilise these unqualified but dynamic people.

Whānau Ora

Managers, like kaimahi and Hapū Social Service members, do not believe that Whānau Ora has had much impact on their work. They see Whānau Ora as "a policy

and really a concept that was being sold around the country or discussed around the country” as opposed to a set of decisions that have practical and immediate effects.

When asked if any changes had occurred due to Whānau Ora, managers expressed a belief that,

It’s something that we’ve been doing anyway and it’s really at that senior management level that those changes will take place and those agreements will be made. In terms of day to day operations we still work with the same people that we worked with before, those on the ground...we’re already doing our own form of Whānau Ora anyway.

Despite the low impact of Whānau Ora on practice, disappointment was expressed with the slow rate of implementation in the region compared to other regions,

I was aware through friends and colleagues of mine of how quickly other parts of the country were picking up on Whānau Ora...there was funding made available to get these researchers and evaluators in, setting up the systems so that they’re measuring right from the beginning...Disappointingly I hear we haven’t got off the taxi rank yet, we haven’t left the building so I’m not sure what that’s about but I think that as much as it wouldn’t be Tariana [Turia]’s¹² style to want to meddle with what’s happening at a regional level there’s got to be a point at which somebody says people need to get it together and get the show on the road.

In some way a justification of the slow implementation is that it can be difficult to gain support from regional organisations that would need to agree to give up some of their own resources for Whānau Ora to progress,

I have heard feedback though in a meeting here...that at a higher level between the different departments they’re all backing off from being involved. They’re backing off from letting go of the resources that are required to resource Whānau Ora.

Managers also see that politics has impacted on the development of Whānau Ora in that the implementation of the policy is subject to the government’s “flavour of the day”. They also “notice since the last election Whānau ora hasn’t been on the top shelf it’s sort of moved down the rung a bit”.

One of the biggest opportunities however, from Whānau Ora is that there is more scope for collaboration, meaning potential benefits for whānau who use more than

¹² Tariana Tūria, Minister for Whānau Ora

one service. The current structure of government departments does not lend itself to collaboration and,

What that does is it forces our people to fill out that form for that place, this stupid form for that place, tell your same story to the third and fourth agency and then our people become so adept at having to negotiate these different departments who should all be on the same page. I think the opportunity for Whānau Ora is to make that happen so that the lack of coordination of government services doesn't impact on our people the way it has.

Because of the lack of coordination, people have become fairly competent at dealing with a range of government agencies and this is seen as somewhat positive,

The upside of it is our people are really governmental service savvy. I just think it's hilarious the way some of our people go into the departments and tell the department workers what their role is.

The Rūnanga's desire to provide services collaboratively both internally and externally with other agencies and with the community despite current government structure, supports the argument that the Rūnanga has already been practicing consistently with Whānau Ora,

Collaboration's the word at the moment so you just have to. But it's better anyway, it's better for everyone if everyone's working together...I think the holistic approach is something that the Rūnanga sort of, I know the ones that were there before us, they said they were doing that anyway so if anything, when this starts coming out its going to sort of legitimise the way that we're doing things.

The combining of contracts that is proposed to take place under Whānau Ora is also anticipated to have significant impacts on streamlining both practice and accountability processes for the benefit of whānau,

I can see things where we won't have these separate accountabilities in terms of, my contract says I can work with 20 people on budget advice and Jo's contract says he can work with so many people on counselling, at the end of the day if we're talking about one family it's about bringing in the skills so that we're all working with [that] family.

Looking to the future of Whānau Ora,

If Tariana [Tūria] and everyone else that's supportive of Whānau Ora can get some cohesion and coordination at that level, at the same time as advocating continuously for a Treaty right instead of allowing those people who think that just because we've got our settlement that should be the end of the story...at this end with whānau, what I'm hoping it will do is provide the tools and resources for whānau groups, for marae whānau, for hapū whānau,

for communities to facilitate their own journeys to health and wellbeing whatever that looks like...you wouldn't have the big bureaucracy or the large iwi bureaucracy either, we would have to reconfigure that if we were genuine about the fact that we want our people to be authors of their own destiny or whatever it is.

There is a firm belief that one of the key roles of iwi social services should be to support people to be more autonomous and that Whānau Ora could line up with this goal,

We're part of that process I would hope, of making a difference, of ensuring that at some stage our people do what our people used to do really well for themselves, which was take care of each other...we've survived this long because our ancestors went out against the elements and foraged for food and hunting, all that. It's no different now days you just need key people in your families, go out find out what are the services available, what are the pathways?

Challenges and opportunities

The Rūnanga has been described as an “excellent mechanism for uniting the collective voice” of the iwi. But one challenge, similar to that in any other organisation, is that the leadership can have an overly strong influence on that collective voice. There have been times when the whānau voice has been harnessed effectively to bring in limited resources but creating more opportunity for this would be considered a positive.

The political agenda of the Rūnanga has grown over the years to the point where it is now considered by some to be the key priority. It was argued that given these circumstances it could be an effective move to set up the social service arm as a subsidiary so that prioritising social services will be the sole function of a specific entity. Looking at early post-settlement organisation it seems that separately functioning entities with their own governance groups under a wider iwi umbrella are likely to be developed.

Economic development is also perceived to be at the top of the agenda but social needs such as education, culture and health care also receive significant attention. Managers believe that those in authority and the “ideas people at the top” need to be equally as concerned about people as they are about the projects that will carry Ngāti

Porou into the economic and political future. It is hoped that the Rūnanganui will retain a social development focus even as economic development grows as an iwi priority.

Probably the most significant opportunity mentioned across the board is the Ngāti Porou Treaty Settlement. However, managers like kaimahi have noticed little if any change in their everyday work,

I haven't seen any new opportunities and the changeover is really at the governance level not the operational end, that's where the transition and new look is...From day one when the settlements were talked about and the nui¹³ and the new entity was talked about, we were always advised that for us and our staff that were working on the ground it's business as usual.

Managers do however, believe that the Ngāti Porou settlement will provide a number of benefits but what exactly those are is not yet fully clear,

We haven't seen what's going to happen yet... I think what everyone's hoping is that we get to see it make changes in people's lives, so it isn't like Ngāti Porou's worth 100-200 million but most of our people are still living in poverty...For what I do, I see us being able to play a more significant role, so when I first started with [kaimahi], all we were doing was mentoring and at risk youth and now [kaimahi is] doing the fresh start stuff and now we've got a youth unemployment contract that we're doing which is a big part of the puzzle.

Hapū Social Services

This section presents the views from a focus group with 8 members of the Hapū Social Services Group. Hapū Social Services was established in 1992 and has committees in 11 communities from Kaiti to Pōtaka. The Hapū Social Services Group facilitates the provision of social service programmes within their communities with the funds to do so coming from contracts that are held by Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou. Currently, the Rūnanga holds a three year contract with the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) worth \$45,000 per year for the delivery of programmes aimed at preventing and alleviating family violence and it is through this contract that the Hapū Social Services Group is primarily funded. The Hapū Social Services Group also receives funding to provide Breakaway Holiday

¹³ Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou

Programmes through a contract between MSD and the Rūnanga. The division and allocation of this funding is decided among the group shortly before the start of each financial year and members explain,

That's what we decide at this table, is how it's going to be split up then we go back to our communities and we work out how we're going to distribute that money based on the programmes that come up.

Some committees use funding to provide programmes within their own communities, while others (usually those in smaller communities) use their funding to support initiatives in other communities.

Contracts, policies and guidelines

The services and programmes that are provided are all highly dependent on the contracts that they are funded by. Contracts are generally gained on the basis of availability rather than on the basis of identified need. This is in most cases a reflection of government priorities, which are not always viewed as appropriate especially when they focus on social ills,

I would prefer to say to this lot, here's what we want to do, get this funding not tag us under drug and alcohol, you know it's social ill stuff, we want to do something else but oh well it's available so we just pick it up. But I'd rather put it to better use than drug and alcohol and violence...there's got to be a better kaupapa than just that.

Because of this, Hapū Social Services must be creative with their funding in order to both fulfil the contract and provide benefits for their communities. One way to extract value out of contract funding is to link up with other programmes and events that are already happening. Members often "try and marry it in with something else that's going to happen so that the funding becomes decent".

The group members themselves do not necessarily directly deliver the programmes (although some do),

What happens is people from the community come to you with proposals to run a programme and once that's ticked off they get their funding to run their programme then they field a report on that programme they've run, they give you evaluation forms back from all the participants and a budget of how they used the funding, that's over a 12 month period.

The biggest changes that have occurred in the 20 years that they have been running involve the value of contract funding that was and is available,

When this Hapū Social Services was first established, entities were getting up to \$10 000 per annum. \$10 000 plus per annum and because of some inactivity amongst some of the community groups...because the contracts have declined, they've only been given something like two Grand to carry out certain family violence programmes.

Other changes include that all programmes now “have to be marae based” and that while previously there was a “huge selection of programmes you could run” programme choices are now more restricted based on government priorities. In a similar fashion to kaimahi and managers, members also observe a particular emphasis on youth development that was not always apparent.

Because funds are limited, most or all of the funding provided to committees is used to resource programmes with members providing administration and support services on a voluntary basis. In order to make the programme outcomes effective for participants, extra work is required that is not covered under contract funding agreements. One member argues that “If we actually kept a record of our hours they would be phenomenal. If we were paid there would never be enough money to pay us for those hours”. She also believes that “the government is moving that way now. They expect organisations to be doing these sorts of things” and that because of this “the volunteering is going up and up”. Another mentioned that “It’s not our job, we don’t do it for money we do it because we care” and that “if the programme needs it you do the extra to make the programme outcome good for participants”.

Contract outcomes are generally based on a Pākehā worldview and members view this as disadvantageous for Māori communities who have different priorities,

It’s what Pākehā says the outcomes should look like is what the measures are. That we’re being set up to fail because that wouldn’t necessarily be the way that Māori would look at outcomes.

Finally, members confirm that the Hapū Social Services Group and those that they employ are guided by the terms of contracts as well as by the Rūnanga’s policy guidelines. All people that facilitate programmes are also vetted by the police.

Feedback and Evaluations

In terms of programme evaluations, there are a number of ways that feedback is gathered. Unlike kaimahi, Hapū Social Service members view evaluation forms as the most useful method of feedback. Consistent with the organisations values, evaluation forms are bilingual with “one side English, one side Māori” and members explain that “there’s a lot who fill out the Māori side”. Members also mention that verbal and visual feedback is also important,

You have to take note of what’s going day by day, you know the oral feedback, how people are feeling and whether they want to come and do another programme with you too, that’s a positive.

Programme statistics are gathered including participant numbers and completion rates. Feedback is used to make improvements to programmes, develop new programmes and provide content for accountability reports to the Rūnanga who are in turn accountable to the Ministry of Social Development.

Although evaluation forms are a key form of feedback, some whānau cannot express themselves well through them or even through verbal conversations with facilitators. In these cases there have been instances where members have received positive feedback when other agencies have informed them that programme participants have accessed services that were recommended by Hapū Social Services,

We run some family violence programmes and some haven’t been able to express themselves. But then they’ve gone later on after having been to the programmes and then they’ve gone and got help and were able to have ongoing services, it takes them to the agencies they need.

In this instance it can be seen that strong community relationships play a significant part in allowing service providers to both provide services effectively and to evaluate those services.

Unique qualities of iwi social services

“We do it our own way...we’re not colonised” is one of the more memorable claims made by Hapū Social Service members and it does a worthy job of highlighting a mind-set that is held across the organisation and arguably across Ngāti Porou as an

iwi. In terms of delivering a culturally fitting service “we’re a step ahead as an iwi really, always have been” is another widely held view.

Hapū Social Service members believe that Rūnanga social services are unique in that they are culturally fitting for the communities in which they exist. Members, and the people they employ to facilitate programmes, are often part of the communities they are working in and are often genealogically related to the people they are working with. Also, when asked why their group is unique, one member answered, “Because we’re voluntary, 200 percent voluntary”. Another noted that “we give our time back to our iwi to our hapū”. In support of this, another member believes that “what’s unique is that we’re the only Rūnanga that gets a contract and it passes all the funds over to the [Hapū] Social Services groups, nobody else does”. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, members put in considerable voluntary hours to administer and support community programmes over and above what the contract provides for and this has built trust within their communities, “they trust us, we’re not doing it for the money eh”.

Whānau Ora

Hapū Social Service members in the same way as Rūnanga staff, overwhelmingly believe that they are and have been practicing Whānau Ora since the group was established,

Whānau ora is something that whānau have been doing for all of their lives...I think Tari [Tariana Tūria] grabbed the name as a flagship, Whānau Ora became a click word but yeah it’s been happening for all our lives.

Whānau Ora, as a government programme though has not been a priority for the Hapū Social Services Group,

In our social service area or hapū group we actually haven’t looked at Whānau Ora, we have looked at it but I think the implementation...you kind of don’t know for sure, it’s not a priority, as I say our profile is different from other communities.

The idea behind Whānau Ora is considered to be a good one, but the implementation has been problematic, “the idea is great; the implementation of it is a bigger headache than that”. Members consider that “policy delivery has been the big

failure” and Whānau Ora policy and the Whānau Ora concept is unfortunately not as well defined as it should be,

The big question is what is whānau? You can reconfigure it to suit a budget but what is it? And that’s where I think Mason Durie and them should have tightened up...given them some parameters eh otherwise we’ll just roam everywhere

One of the reasons that members believe Whānau Ora has been developed is that there were a significant number of organisations claiming to provide services for Māori but were not doing this effectively,

One of the reasons why it went the other way is because there’s too many mainstream social services organisations who claim to be servicing Māori which is something she wanted to stop because they’re not actually servicing Māori so if she puts it into Whānau ora and does it that way she cuts it out

Members generally believed this to be a positive step.

Challenges and opportunities

One of the biggest and most immediate challenges for the group is gaining and spreading their limited financial resources,

For starters we could do with more money...So when you say what do we do with our \$2000? Well what can you do with \$2000? Not a lot...Funding is a challenge especially if it’s going to stay the same for the next three years.

Often, funding that is allocated to administration, is instead used to provide further benefits directly to the community through sponsorship. However, members do not consider this a sustainable practice,

In our hapū social services we take administration costs out and we use it for sponsorship...Although I think at some time though the groups have got to allocate something for administration, you can’t expect our people to be running all over the countryside.

Population decline in the smaller rural communities is another challenge, “we’re losing a lot of people eh, there’ll be no one left to barrack for Hiku”¹⁴. “A loss of kaumatua” in particular is considered a contributing factor in the wider loss of “support networks in the community”. This is especially noticeable when “you’re

¹⁴ Hikurangi Rugby Club

dealing with those family violence issues and you bring them (kaumatua) in to support”.

One of the Groups future goals is to be able to uplift contracts independently of the Rūnanga in order to make hapū responsible for their own wellbeing,

I’d like to see our own hapū doing social services at home for us
...Opportunity wise I’d like to think that our social services would be able to uplift their own contract with MSD

Finally, making it work in a socially and economically challenging environment requires group members to innovate and to fill a number of roles,

Maybe we wear too many hats today, it’s still the same I guess, if you’re passionate about something you’ll do what it takes

Conclusions

From both this and the previous chapter a number of themes have emerged. Across the board participants believe that Whānau Ora is a well-established practice both within the Rūnanga and within Ngāti Porou communities. Participants see that Whānau Ora can provide opportunities but are unsure how these will materialise or if they will materialise at all. Whānau Ora is seen as a good idea but there are reservations about its implementation. Changes to policy are more evident at the higher levels of the organisational structure as those positions have more involvement in feeding in to policy development. Senior staff are also more likely to receive communication from both external agencies dealing with Whānau Ora and from organisational leadership.

Participants have a strong sense of Ngāti Porou identity and most hold a viewpoint that the Rūnanga and Ngāti Porou as an iwi maintains a high level of autonomy in their operations but also maintain good relationships with funders and wider government for the benefit of their services.

Chapter Six

Analysis and discussion

This chapter analyses and discusses the findings of this study drawing on literature and the perspectives shared in interviews and focus groups. The analysis focuses on a number of key themes that have been drawn together from the two previous chapters. This chapter examines where the experiences of the three participant groups are similar and where they differ and where these opinions and experiences sit within the broader social policy context. The analysis is organised under the following headings;

- Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector;
- The influence of politics and the economy on direction and service provision;
- Community influenced social work;
- Iwi centric: a comparison between the natural and forced inclusion of tikanga in social services and;
- Challenges and opportunities.

Whānau Ora as an established approach within Ngāti Porou and the Māori social service sector

Writing in the relative enlightenment of the present day, it is difficult to fathom that to policy makers, it has not always been apparent that programmes that are holistic, involve whānau and incorporate tikanga and whanaungatanga are the most effective for Māori. Instead, there has historically been an underlying desire to foster a mono-cultural sense of national identity, with an emphasis on a mono-cultural idea of wellbeing centred largely on the quantifiable needs of the individual (Duncan 2008). In recent decades, the government has increasingly leaned toward more holistic services, as politicians and policy analysts have come to understand that services underpinned by a Māori philosophy are generally more effective for Māori (Humpage 2006). Specific initiatives such as the Family Group Conference in Youth Justice and Strengthening Families through the Ministry of Social Development, display an approach that includes families and communities in social service

interventions. However while such initiatives continue to develop this has not been as coordinated, comprehensive or collaborative as is the intention with Whānau Ora.

Despite this trend however, Whānau Ora is still a seemingly bold move, debatably so because, of its clear, although not exclusively Māori focus. Considering that the Report of the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives was released in 2010 and Tariana Tūria appointed Minister for Whānau Ora the same year, slow implementation progress suggests that it is a move that the government is not entirely comfortable making. While targeting social services generally works better for Māori, it also leaves room for criticisms of racial privileging and separatism, of which the government is likely to be acutely aware (Cheyne et al. 2008).

An earlier policy of the Fifth Labour Government elected in 1999, Closing the Gaps, with a similarly perceived Māori focus was met by negative public backlash (Humpage 2006), notably being described as “social apartheid” by New Zealand First leader Winston Peters (New Zealand First Party 2000). In 2004, the support gained for the National Party by then leader Don Brash’s *Nationhood* speech to the Orewa Rotary Club again exposed a significant sector of New Zealand society with a strong distaste for Māori initiatives, a sector that any government hoping to be re-elected would surely be mindful of. Whānau Ora too has faced its own public perception issues including another dramatic labelling of the programme by Winston Peters as a “bro-ocracy” (Trevett 2012) and widespread media questioning around the allocation of funding.

The interesting thing however, is that for such bold policy, in substance it is not a new idea. Holistic wellbeing models such as Durie’s *Te Whare Tapa Wha* (1985) and Pere’s *Te Wheke* (1988) have been acknowledged by both academic and public institutions for almost three decades. Ruwhiu (1995) also noted that colonialism, cultural safety and other such concepts were already talking points in the social service sector and in a more practical sense, Walsh-Tapiata (1997) in her thesis *Raukawa Social Services: origins and future directions* explains a clearly Whānau Ora consistent approach taken by Raukawa Social Services.

Likewise in this study, the overwhelming response of research participants across all levels of the organisation is that ‘Whānau Ora’ is already the established approach within the Rūnanga’s social services. Kaimahi, managers and Hapū Social Services members note that the concept of whanaungatanga is one of the cornerstones of the organisation and the Rūnanga’s broad strategic direction is well aligned to the Whānau Ora concept. Organisational documentation supports the approach and a collection of annual reports preceding Whānau Ora, outline guiding principles that are in line with its concepts and values. In particular, relevant examples are ‘Providing every person of Ngāti Porou descent with the opportunity to actively participate in the development of his/her own whānau and/or hapū’ and ‘contributing to the enhancement and strengthening of whānau and hapū links’ (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou 2002).

Since 2003, the Rūnanga’s social services unit has aptly been named Whānau Oranga, indicating a clear emphasis on whānau centred services. That is however, not to say that this was the beginning of a whānau centred approach, as prior to 2003 the social services unit was named the Whānau Hapū Development Unit and comprised 65-70 percent of the total Rūnanga staff. The key goals of the unit were whānau centred with five out of seven explicitly mentioning whānau (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou 2002). The majority of the discourse both then and now refers to collective groups such as whānau and hapū. When individuals are referred to, it is often as ‘mokopuna’, clearly associating them by their whakapapa in a wider collective.

In addition to its centralised services, the Rūnanga also administers a Ministry of Social Development contract that is delivered by Hapū Social Service committees. According to the Report of the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives (2010), “The Taskforce is attracted to a system that encourages comprehensive and integrated provision rather than piecemeal provision. Comprehensive provision can be accomplished by provider organisations that are able to offer a wide range of appropriate services in a coordinated manner” (p. 58). The existence of the Hapū Social Services Group as a community based service and evaluation mechanism, enables the Rūnanga to provide services that are tailored to and owned by communities, in addition to more centralised services addressing complex social,

economic and health issues. This aligns well with Smith's (1999) assertion that it is important for a community to have its own ideal vision and define itself on its own terms. However, whether the combination of services is truly comprehensive is debatable as most services are still contracted individually.

In 1999 Brewin and Coggin completed an evaluation of the Ngāti Porou Community Injury Prevention Project (CIPP) and their findings also published in a 2004 article, contribute to the current argument. The CIPP focused on a number of areas including driver licensing, road traffic safety, family violence, alcohol and drug related harm, playground safety and forestry road safety. The project was considered highly successful and the evaluators noted the strengths of the project as being its holistic approach, the bringing together of whānau to identify areas of concern, that it was primarily marae based and that it was acceptable and accessible to the Māori community. Furthermore, the writers concluded that the success of Ngāti Porou CIPP "could be related to the fact that it was perceived as an intervention, chosen by local whānau, for the iwi, operating within a Ngāti Porou framework which addressed Ngāti Porou aspirations involving whānau/hapū at all levels of the project" (1999, p.13). These findings give a clear picture of an approach to social services that is consistent with the Whānau Ora concept.

In 1988 the Royal Commission on Social Policy had noted that Māori social policy issues that had been identified in their investigations would require collaborative action across central government agencies, local government and the wider community. Pakura (2004) also argues that for services to be effective, collaboration needs to occur not just within organisations but across entire sectors of the public service. As a social service agency, one of the issues, restricting the Rūnanga's ability to deliver a comprehensive whānau centred approach, is the disconnection between some of the government agencies with whom they hold contracts. In this respect, a formalised Whānau Ora programme with the option of a multi-agency contract, could enhance the Rūnanga's ability to take a comprehensive approach to service provision. However, the general challenges associated with contracting such as who drives the direction of contracts and the funding levels for particular initiatives are likely to remain important.

The impact of Whānau Ora on the Rūnanga and on the social service sector in general, has been more noticeable to those in higher level positions. This is because those in senior roles are more likely to be involved in strategic discussions about new initiatives and policy in general. Kaimahi working directly in their communities are less likely to notice changes or be aware of future directions as their day to day work is immediate and ongoing. This is likely to be a product of the higher level at which the Whānau Ora Taskforce was operating and may not necessarily be a fault in the system. The Taskforce was not tasked with delivering recommendations on the specific and practical aspects of day to day social work, but rather with creating an evidence based framework that would lead to desired changes from the level of government agency interaction to the level of whānau capability (Taskforce on Whānau Centres Initiatives 2010). It could however be argued that more bottom up input and more top down communication would add value to the implementation process.

As a point of interest, Whānau Ora, as a programme set up under a National-led government, does carry some of the rhetoric of the centre-right neo-liberal political ideal. The emphasis on whānau and community responsibility rather than State responsibility and the lessening of government in the everyday lives of whānau are well aligned with the values of the right (Cheyne et al. 2008). In a Beehive press release by Tariana Tūria following the 2010 government budget announcement, she says of Whānau Ora “this new approach will see families less reliant on State agencies and agencies acting as a facilitator rather than a fixer” (Turia 2010). While historically, Māori and neo-liberalism have seemingly been at odds, this statement by Turia seems consistent with both a Māori and neo-liberal worldview. It may be reasonable to say that Māori have not however made a considerable leap toward neo-liberalism although with the growth of Treaty assets building a strong corporate Māori presence it could be said that supports for business made by neo-liberal economic policy are now more beneficial to Māori than they once were.

Whānau Ora is strongly focused on collectivism, which has not been a key feature of neo-liberal politics. It could be argued that the key political voices in the Country are not as polarised as they once were, with each having to make political concessions due to such things as increased minority representation under MMP, less

majoritarian governments and even a general maturation of public attitudes (Cheyne et al. 2008). What is particularly different about Whānau Ora to the devolution of social services in the 1980s and 1990s, is that while non-government organisations and communities are encouraged to be the primary provider, that responsibility is now supported by millions of dollars of government investment in research, evaluation and resources for the implementation of the programme, namely \$134.3 million over the four years of 2010 to 2014 (Key 2010).

Whānau Ora has however, like other non-standard policies, been subject to the whims of electoral politics. The implementation of Whānau Ora did lose momentum following the 2011 election as the relationship between the Māori Party and the National Party was renegotiated in favour of the latter. It has only been since 2013 that the programme has re-established momentum with the new Whānau Ora model of governance announced in July (Turia, 2013).

The aim of the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives was to create an “evidence based framework that would lead to; strengthened whānau capabilities; an integrated approach to whānau wellbeing; collaborative relationships between State agencies in relation to whānau services; relationships between government and community agencies that are broader than contractual; improved cost effectiveness and value for money”(p.6). As yet, judgement cannot be passed on the achievement of this aim as Whānau Ora has not been fully implemented or evaluated. Consequently, the effectiveness of any Whānau Ora contract that the Rūnanga is party to, cannot yet be assessed. However, what can be concluded is that both social policy and social work practice within a collective framework has been practiced by the Rūnanga throughout its existence and by hapū and whānau independently of any agency. In general, Māori organisations, communities and academics have been discussing, criticising and advocating for the approach in the social work and political sectors for many decades. With this in mind, Whānau Ora seems to be a clear case of policy catching up to practice.

The influence of politics and the economy on direction and service provision

Based on the chronology of the development of Rūnanga social services, some interesting trends in political decision making can be charted. Firstly, the impact of the neo-liberal reforms of the 1980s were critical in the early period of Rūnanga social service development and it can be argued, that the push toward devolution was a key factor in the establishment of the services. Furthermore, the socio-economic consequences of neo-liberalism, particularly rocketing unemployment in Māori communities, put social services in demand as once self-reliant communities struggled to provide assistance under mounting economic pressures (Fitzgerald 2004). Cheyne et al. (2008) also note that the Department of Social Welfare was under pressure to shrink its operations during the time that it began to work with Ngāti Porou. It would thus be realistic to assume that the initiation of that relationship and the subsequent assumption of responsibility for service provision by the Rūnanga, was a part of the government's long term goal of down-scaling the Department.

The introduction and maintenance of a fundamentally neo-liberal State since the 1980s, has had a major impact on social service provision in Māori communities as well as in general. The original goal of the community needs assessment of service devolution to hapū reflects the neo-liberal policy of private contracting of public services (Cheyne et al. 2008). While in theory, the idea of community responsibility for community issues is an admirable one, the fact that the major identified social needs were complex high level needs that the community could neither effectively nor efficiently resolve on its own, demonstrate that there are definite limits to the down-scaling of the State (McCormack 2011) and pointed to deficiencies in the neo-liberal thinking.

One of the shortfalls of devolution was that government support for providers was not comprehensive enough. Economies of scale were significantly reduced through the unavailability of central government resources and local bodies were unprepared for their new responsibilities (Walsh-Tapiata, 1997). It was essential then, to the

success of social service programmes on the East Coast that the Rūnanga as an already established organisation with a visible profile, was willing to partner with the Department of Social Welfare. The Rūnanga seemed well placed to do so as it had already established social development programmes in response to Te Ara Kainga (The Pathway Home) return of Ngāti Porou Children to whānau care in 1988, had assisted in the establishment of Radio Ngāti Porou the previous year and had already made a deal with the government to purchase Pakihiroa Station on Mount Hikurangi with Crown loaned money (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou 2013b). What was also particularly pleasing about the development was that even though most services would be centralised at the Rūnanga, hapū were given significant responsibility for service provision and evaluation. This enabled the development of a more sustainable service through capacity building at the community level and shared responsibility. That is not to say that the issues such as under-resourcing that plagued other agencies were not evident at the Rūnanga, and this very problem was mentioned by managers who were working during the development of the Rūnanga's social services.

While devolution was touted as an approach that would lessen the role of the State in service provision, the government still took a prescriptive approach to the development of programmes and services run by iwi groups. Ranginui Walker (2004) argues that national structures have evolved which are rooted in the values, systems and viewpoints of one culture only with participation by minorities conditional on their subjugating their own values and systems to those of the power culture. Walsh-Tapiata writing in 1997 about Raukawa Social Services, argued that the State still dictates what they think is best for iwi and are wary of conceding control. This is corroborated by the comments of a previous Rūnanga manager who explains that despite a promising start to the Department of Social Welfare-Ngāti Porou relationship, it was not long before the Department reverted to contracts that were highly prescribed. Participants confirmed that under both social-democratic and neo-liberal governments including the current Fifth National Government, this is still an issue.

In an interesting political blend, the establishment of the Rūnanga itself and later the social service arm coincided with the ideological, attitudinal and policy changes that

the Royal Commission on Social Policy had advocated for in 1988. It is difficult to measure the actual impact of the Commission's work (Barnes & Harris 2011) but its conclusions were indicative of a general change in attitude to Māori Policy that would take place over the next few decades. It would also not be unreasonable to presume that the community needs assessment that was completed in 1992 was at least in part a result of the work that had been done leading up to Puao-te ata-tu. It would be an interesting extension of this work to look into how much impact the work related to that document actually had on the initial development of the Rūnanga's social services and on the development of other iwi social services across the country.

According to Duncan (2008) historically there has been an underlying desire to foster a mono-cultural sense of national identity and policy is often developed on the basis of that mono-cultural idea of wellbeing. Participants consistently made responses that support this point and expressed frustration with the general emphasis on "Pākehā defined outcomes" in government contracts. In particular, one member of the Hapū Social Services Group noted that contract outcomes were and are "what the Pākehas say the outcomes should be like...we're being set up to fail cos it's not like how Māori would look at outcomes". Often, outcomes that Māori consider positive such as whānau returning home on a more regular basis do not necessarily match up to required outcomes in contracts. This has meant that a key challenge for Māori and iwi social service providers is to work creatively within government contracts and to work toward their aspirations while being limited by government policies that do not always encompass a Māori worldview (Walsh-Tapiata, 1997).

It is probably more difficult to write critically about Māori policy today than it was when the deficiencies were glaringly obvious. While many of the obvious problems have been and are being dealt with, for the most part, successive governments have continued to uphold an attitude and consequently a policy structure that favours a Pākehā majority albeit less overtly (Walker, Ranginui 2004). An example of this that is relevant to this study is the restructure of ACC that has resulted in fewer ACC accredited organisations across the country. This has particularly impacted upon rural Ngāti Porou communities as the Rūnanga can no longer provide the marae based driver licensing service that has proven to be effective in the past. As noted

earlier, in 1999 a review of the Ngāti Porou Community Injury Prevention Project was completed by Brewin and Coggan. The driver licensing service was described as an effective service that was producing results. According to the evaluation “the marae based driver’s license course brought about significant changes in attitudes and behaviours in those that participated’ and ‘there have been reports of amazing spin offs from the programme” (Brewin & Coggin 1999, p.20). Participants in this study believe that this success continued right up to the restructure. The termination of this programme is not only a reflection of monoculturalism, but also of the lack of priority placed on regional needs in comparison to those of larger centres; a situation that tends to impact disproportionately on Māori communities especially in the Gisborne region where approximately two thirds of those living in rural areas with low urban influence identify as Māori (Statistics New Zealand n.d).

In a more positive sense, while for many years successive governments were under little or no pressure to acknowledge Māori interests, with the advent of MMP, re-tribalisation and Treaty settlement, larger iwi have become important political and economic players (Webster 2002). While it is outside the scope of this study, mapping the changing political influence of Ngāti Porou would be an interesting and worthwhile study. A large proportion of the available historical literature on Māori social services, focuses on State sector organisations such as the Department of Social Welfare and its units and discusses the inability of these organisations to work in a way that was effective for Māori, despite the evidence that was available. In the case of an organisation like the Rūnanga, this kind of analysis is not as useful in terms of actual practice as the Rūnanga has striven since the establishment of its social services arm to deliver those services in line with a Ngāti Porou worldview. This analysis is however, helpful when discussing the impact of contracting on the organisation.

Government priorities still have a significant impact upon Rūnanga services. Elections, restructuring and government budget decisions impact upon the availability, nature and value of contracts. “Finding a space to advance group interests within an imposed individualist framework” (Cheyne et al. 2008, p.140) has been a challenge faced by the Rūnanga in its service provision role. According to Cheyne et al. (2008) the structure and criteria of government funding place

constraints on the ability of Māori organisations to design and deliver effective services targeted toward Māori. The fundamental economic problem of limited resources to satisfy unlimited needs is always at the forefront of the social service sector. This is reflected in one of the major concerns that participants have at all levels of the organisation, which is maintaining contract funding for services. National policy priorities do not always match the reality of unique or isolated communities like those on the East Coast and the services that government will fund and the levels at which they will fund them do not always meet the needs of those communities.

Most of the participant group would prefer that contracts and other funding is sought on the basis of identified needs in their communities. However, they are realistic about the availability of resources and so are willing to accept whatever funding is available. Rūnanga staff and hapū social service committees then need to creatively design projects in order to both fulfil needs in their communities as well as deliver on the contract requirements. It is however hoped, that the financial security provided by Treaty settlement assets will enable Ngāti Porou social services to be less affected by the changing funding priorities of the government and more responsive to real needs and aspirations of Ngāti Porou communities.

Participants also identify a particular emphasis on youth at the expense of other groups. While this can be viewed as negative, realities and issues for Māori youth are still not being fully addressed by national policy (Biasiny-Tule 2006). Youth development is however an area where whānau and community is already considered an important factor in success (McLaren 2002), with initiatives like the Marae Based Youth Court and Family Group Conference critical and visible parts of the youth justice system. Youth service contracts with iwi providers present a significant opportunity to provide further evidence of this. As an organisation with an emphasis on whānau involvement and holistic health, the Rūnanga is in a prime position to provide youth services effectively, not only for the benefit of the young people that they work with, but also for other organisations through modelling best practice.

Developing Māori capacity to provide social services has been and is advocated for on both sides of the political spectrum (Cheyne et al. 2008). The motivation behind

this advocacy however is different and depends upon the political and social ideology that frames the actions of those involved. While the intended outcome is generally the same; the kind of approach taken will often lend itself to effectiveness or otherwise. Much has been said about deficit approaches to Māori policy and their impact on Māori communities. Subsequent sections of this analysis therefore, will focus more on newer developments in Māori policy, with the aim of supporting a positive way forward.

Māori policy has in recent years moved focus to the point where building Māori capacity and reaching Māori defined aspirations is at the forefront of Māori policy thinking. Successive governments have also recognised that programmes for Māori should take a holistic approach (Owen 2001). As an organisation that was established to be iwi focused, this change in national policy has not meant a change in attitude for the Rūnanga like other mainstream organisations. It has however, meant a positive change in the availability of resources and appropriateness of contracts. Appropriate examples include the Rūnanga's participation in Te Puni Kōkiri's Co-Production initiative, the establishment of the Marae Based Youth Court and the Rūnanga's involvement as a support agency and most recently Whānau Ora.

It seems that now that focused Māori policy is more common, drastic changes are unlikely to occur over a short space of time. Instead, policy, politics and cultural revitalisation are now the key vehicles for Māori advancement meaning that Māori organisations and people must be committed to a steady change by evolution (Smith 1999). Māori organisations do however, need to remain conscious that increased government resource for Māori initiatives and increased Māori policy work by government analysts, could potentially lead to a government defined concept of Māori values entrenched in Māori policy.

Community influenced social work

The findings of this study would suggest that best practice is not fixed, but is rather, specific to each situation. Nationally, there is understandably an emphasis on professional models of best practice but as participants pointed out, one of the

strengths of the Rūnanga is staff and volunteers who may not have an extensive formal education but do have a depth of knowledge of the local community. According to Ruwhiu (1995) people working from a tangata-whenua viewpoint are in fact informed workers, without having to place emphasis on Eurocentric practice models. Participants in this study observed that many of the foundation staff of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou were initially employed with more emphasis on their local knowledge and experience and their effectiveness within their communities than on their formal qualifications. The ‘tangata-whenua’ viewpoint as termed by Ruwhiu, has always been a legitimate or in fact the legitimate perspective in the Rūnanga’s social services. Furthermore, there is often a stigma attached to social assistance which lowers its take up rate (Esping-Andersen 1990), a stigma that participants have stated is reduced by the employment of workers who are well connected to their communities.

However, because of the realities of the social and political landscape and of contracting, including the necessity of being affiliated with national bodies, meeting contract standards, being legitimate in the eyes of the public and maintaining a high quality service; the Rūnanga, especially in the early years has facilitated training and relationship building that develop the professionalism of its services. Furthermore, participants claim that when Ngāti Porou who have a combination of formal education and mainstream experience, collaborate with those who have deep knowledge of and connection to Ngāti Porou communities, an ideal space in which to grow the potential of a highly successful and sophisticated service is created. The hapū social service qualification that the Rūnanga offers to all its Hapū Social Service committees displays an emphasis on the combination of formal training and community experience.

The professionalisation of what was once whānau work has however, created some interesting challenges. Nash and Munford (2001) note that struggles over professionalism and accreditation have long existed. Beddoe (2010) also argues that social work has consistently emphasised its community origins and is inclined to “reject the trappings of professionalism” that seem to be inconsistent with social justice (p.21). Such debates and challenges are also present in the context of this study. It was argued that significant changes in the community over the past two

decades are a consequence of this professionalisation, with Hapū Social Service members and Rūnanga staff now providing services that whānau used to provide for each other. While professionalisation has had a positive impact on the quality and legitimacy of services, it has also had some negative consequences for the communities in this study. Prior to the professionalisation of whānau work there were a large number of key ‘movers and shakers’ within marae and hapū that made sure that the needs of those marae and hapū were met. Today however, organisations are less able to utilise those who are not formally qualified but are dynamic community members, within the confines of a contract. Those people have also been somewhat replaced in the minds of the community by social service organisations. This means that people often bypass a step in the social service ladder that may enable them to solve their issues independently of formal service providers. This is an ongoing and important debate that the Rūnanga seems well placed to respond to through its utilisation of community integrated workers who it aspires to support through formal qualifications.

The transition of service provision from whānau and community to organisations, aligns with the historical chronology of Māori development. For the first half of the twentieth century there was little need for government intervention in the everyday lives of Māori whānau. Following urbanisation however, this began to change, as whānau increasingly came to rely upon the State rather than the whānau structures that had previously filled the social support role (Walker, Ranginui 2004). Today however, both managers and workers have noticed this as a deficiency in the community and are working toward utilising more people who could play a highly complementary role to the existing social services. More open funding would be useful for this purpose and more funding allocated specifically for training would be beneficial. In terms of Whānau Ora, the philosophy of whānau and community involvement rather than simply a treatment of the individual, may go a long way to remedying this issue. In a general sense, looking at ways to use such people more in service delivery, may assist in making services more effective and also more affordable.

Nationally, corporate retribalisation has had an impact on the roles of hapū and whānau. According to Puketapu (2000) probably the most “potent criticism” of iwi

centralisation is the “disintegration of tribal responsibilities at hapū and whānau levels” (p. 268). However, in the case of Ngāti Porou it can be strongly argued that this is not the case. The existence of the Hapū Social Services Group is a good argument for this point. While major services may be centralised at the Rūnanga, hapū groups still play an important role in service provision and monitoring of the Rūnanga’s services. It is also a fundamental goal of the Rūnanga that responsibility for social wellbeing will return primarily to hapū and whānau. Representation in iwi governance within both Ngāti Porou is also based on roheinga tipuna which are in effect constituencies based on common ancestry. While a discussion of this is outside the scope of this study, it is important to note that this is part of the philosophy of the organisation. It is also important to note that many other Māori organisations also have a strong emphasis on hapū representation in iwi governance. A brief search of iwi organisations’ websites will show a strong emphasis on hapū representation.

Finally, Ruwhiu (1995) asserts that it makes most sense for Māori to work with Māori and questions why already existing indigenous conceptualisations must be verified by Western conceptualisations in order to be seen as valid informers of policy and practice. While this is not explicit policy at the Rūnanga, it is for the most part, the reality of the practice situation due to the demographic of the area and the particular appeal of a Rūnanga position. For the most part, it is Ngāti Porou workers who are attracted to the Rūnanga as an employer because it offers an opportunity to directly impact on Ngāti Porou communities. Because of the realities of contract funding, remuneration is not impressive. This means that working in and with Ngāti Porou is one of the most significant motivating factors for potential employees rather than salary rates. It can also be strongly argued that because of this, the Rūnanga has not faced the same challenges that other organisations have when working with Māori whānau, such as being unresponsive to Māori worldviews and neglecting the role of the whānau and community in interventions.

Iwi centric: a comparison between the natural and forced inclusion of tikanga in social services

A tikanga Māori and more specifically, tikanga Ngāti Porou approach creates a point of difference between the Rūnanga and other organisations. According to Ranginui Walker (2004) constructs of a homogenous Māori population are largely illegitimate and the Rūnanga adds to this claim by being naturally and unashamedly Ngāti Porou centric. Most Rūnanga staff whakapapa to Ngāti Porou and in an isolated area like the East Coast, this creates a unique situation whereby Ngāti Porou workers are delivering services to Ngāti Porou people through a Ngāti Porou organisation in an area predominantly populated by Ngāti Porou. This situation has likely contributed to the natural incorporation of Ngāti Porou tikanga throughout the organisation. According to Mead (2003) “wherever Māori live and work, tikanga Māori or aspects of it follow them” (p.332) and this is the case at the Rūnanga. However, despite its status as an iwi organisation and its deeply Ngāti Porou values and goals, it is still bound by the legal aspects of a system founded upon a Western liberal social tradition such as corporate governance and management protocols, financial administration and government contracting. It would then be fair to say that the everyday reality of the natural incorporation of tikanga is more a product of the people rather than the organisational structure.

An interesting point to note in regards to research is a claim made in this study that tikanga within Māori organisations and communities is not as strict or as conscious as the tone of some Māori research literature may lead readers to believe. Instead it is more natural, fluid and accommodating. Ware (2009) asserts that some tikanga are now performed out of habit, as a traditional exercise or because of a fear of a loss of culture than because they are the correct action for the circumstance (Ware, 2009). The Rūnanga in its unique position as a Māori organisation in a large geographic area that is predominantly Māori, does not suffer so much from this issue, instead displaying a natural inclusion of tikanga which makes the research process less daunting than what it could be in an area where Māori organisations are surrounded on all sides by non-Māori perspectives. The best advantage a researcher has with an organisation like Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou is arguably not their ability to adhere to

a strict set of tikanga or even to have experience with Māori research, but rather the advantage is in building relationships with the organisation and its people.

One of the most important goals of the Rūnanga has been to give all Ngāti Porou access to a genuine Ngāti Porou experience of life. Although the Rūnanga's ambitious plan did not come to fruition, a good example of this goal was the proposal to the government in 1996 regarding a potential Vote: Ngāti Porou, in which the Rūnanga hoped to be the key social service and assistance provider for the 60 to 70 thousand Ngāti Porou across the country at that time. Constructs of a homogenous Māori population are considered to be largely illegitimate (Walker, Ranginui 2004) and this assertion seems to be one that the Rūnanga also makes at least at the level of iwi. The emphasis on Ngāti Porou services for Ngāti Porou people would suggest a belief that Ngāti Porou as a distinct group is best placed to serve Ngāti Porou needs. Politically, the emphasis for the Rūnanga has been on Ngāti Porou or other tribal groups as providers, rather than on a Māori specific service provision. The Rūnanga considers itself not just a government contract holder but a practitioner of a Treaty partnership.

Challenges and opportunities

Confidentiality is an interesting issue within Māori social services. According to Ruwhiu (1995) in the area of confidentiality there is a conflict between Western and Māori ideas of best practice. These two sets of values and the conflict between them are visible within the Rūnanga's contracted services. Some services such as the household budget service adhere strictly to confidentiality whereas other services are communally centred. The merits of confidentiality in this particular case may be an interesting analytical argument. In relation to Whānau Ora, the confidentiality requirements inherent in certain contracts the Rūnanga provides or even within particular practice areas, would make it difficult to take a more open, whole-of-whānau and whole-of-government approach as has been suggested by Whānau Ora. In this area the comprehensive contracting of Whānau Ora may go some way to remedying this issue. Alternatively, this may still be a consideration that may further complicate implementation. An exploration of how Whānau Ora affects the

functioning of confidentiality mechanisms as well as attitudes to confidentiality would be an interesting and useful research study contributing to social work practice.

The most significant challenge that the Rūnanga will face in regards to social services is funding. Members note that the value of contracts has not risen as inflation has risen and this makes it increasingly difficult to complete programmes effectively without increasing voluntary hours. The bulk of Rūnanga funding comes from government contracts and the shape of those contracts generally depends upon the priorities of the government of the day (Cheyne et al. 2008). On the other side of this challenge is the considerable opportunity that the Ngāti Porou Treaty Settlement provides. The basic financial redress worth \$90 million, plus cultural redress worth another \$20 million in the hands of an iwi which had already amassed approximately \$40 million in assets prior to settlement seems destined to grow (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou 2010, p. 35). While it is unclear what this money will be specifically used for, participants hope that some of it will be used to enhance hapū based social services and to provide support to hapū to build capacity and become self-determining. It is also hoped that the settlement will encourage more discussion about economic development, economic sustainability and building the capacity of hapū.

Webster (2002) outlines a distinct gap between tribal economic powerhouses and the many Māori individuals and households suffering from a low socio-economic position. This is an issue to be particularly wary of in the post-settlement era. One participant argued that it would be timely to establish the social services independently in order to protect them from the bigger political and economic aspirations and to ensure that they still receive their due attention. In doing so, the Rūnanganui could ensure that the economic gap mentioned does not grow. Initial post-settlement actions by the Rūnanganui would suggest that such a direction will be taken.

Iwi organisations are also being challenged to cater to a wide range of members that reside across the country and internationally and have different socio-economic backgrounds and priorities some that are decidedly far removed from iwi, hapū and even whānau aspirations (Puketapu, 2000). Given the Rūnanga's comfort with

engaging with national governance and decision making bodies and previous aspirations to be the main social service provider to Ngāti Porou nationwide, Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou as the post-settlement governance entity seems well placed to meet this challenge.

Finally, according to Smith (2004) it is important for a community to have its own ideal vision, define itself in its own terms and maintain social cohesion in the face of change. The social, political and economic changes that have taken place since the establishment of the Rūnanga's social services are not insubstantial. But despite this the Rūnanga has maintained its own vision of solidifying mana motuhake Ngāti Porou across the range of social, cultural and economic sectors. Given that it has now been more than 20 years since the establishment of the Rūnanga's social services, to aid its vision it may now be timely to reassess them. A number of kaimahi believe that another community needs assessment whereby community members would be given more opportunity to take ownership of the vision for a better community, would be highly beneficial. A partnership approach between the Rūnanga, government and potentially education institutions is likely to be the most effective approach.

Whether all the foundational goals of the Rūnanga's social services have been achieved cannot be said with certainty, but a combination of more whānau centred policy at the national level and increased resources through Treaty settlement, provides an unparalleled opportunity to build the kind of service framework that has been maintained as an ideal.

Chapter seven

Conclusions and recommendations

The findings of this research coupled with the available literature, clearly show that Whānau Ora as an approach to service development and delivery is already well established in Māori organisations and communities. While a whānau centred service has been practiced by many iwi and wider Māori organisations, the struggle has been to have the values of the approach recognised at a national policy level where the important decisions about resourcing are made. While the implementation of Whānau Ora is likely to have little impact on the core substance of the social services provided by iwi and Māori organisations, it does have the potential to significantly boost the ability of organisations to deliver those services effectively and affordably. Initiatives such as the establishment of Whānau Ora collectives, greater opportunity for those collectives to influence the substance and nature of the Whānau Ora contract and multi-government agency contracting could simplify the task of providing a comprehensive whānau centred service, make service delivery more cost effective and reduce the considerable amounts of time spent on administering individual contracts and applying for funding.

The implementation of Whānau Ora demonstrates however, that even in the case of a Māori focused policy initiative aimed at the level of whānau and community, those at the implementation end of the spectrum still feel disconnected from the decisions being made at the policy and programme development stage. There is still work to be done in integrating community perspectives in policy and demonstrating to those at the coal face of service delivery that their contributions are valuable and their input reflected in final policy development decisions. Organisations too, would do well to establish communications channels whereby practitioners are aware of upcoming policy changes that will impact on their practice and are given opportunities to feedback in to the organisations contribution to the policy process in a visible way.

For Māori organisations, working with the government is now an inevitability and the ability to maintain positive or at least productive relationships in this space is an

important tool in the success of those Māori organisations. Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou has successfully negotiated the complex iwi-government relationship for a number of years and this is reflected in its position as the largest social service provider in the East Coast region. Moving in to a post-settlement era in Māori-Crown relationships iwi and Māori organisations are moving into a stronger position to extract value from these relationships and contribute more to national decision making processes. Growing out of an organisation that has learnt to deal effectively with the government over more than a century, Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou is in a prime position to do this.

Despite the completion of many Treaty settlements and the near completion of many more, allowing iwi and hapū to grow in resources and influence, there is still much work to do for iwi and Māori organisations to operate with greater autonomy in the social service sector. Many iwi organisations are in the early post-settlement stages and establishing governance entities and finding the right balance between economic, social and cultural aspirations and their respective activities is a time and resource intensive task. For now at least, the combination of government with the backing of resources and Māori with the backing of tikanga is still the most effective option. While iwi may one day be in a position to provide social services more independently of government, currently capacity for this is limited. It could be argued also, that maintaining a strong partnership with government despite having the resources to operate independently will still provide essential value to Māori social services. Positive Māori development is not something that can be fully wrought within the bounds of the State, the social service sector or even within a purely Māori framework but rather requires Māori responsibility for Māori advancement in partnership with the State but not in debt to it.

Equally as challenging is the growing diversity of iwi and Māori populations that organisations like the Rūnanga are set up to represent. In a similar fashion to the necessity of maintaining relationships with government, iwi and Māori organisations must continue to look outward, to be adaptable and to allow for tikanga to grow and develop to meet new challenges. Initiatives like Whānau Ora that take a holistic and collective view of social service provision are likely to benefit not only Māori but all New Zealanders.

The political realm has a significant impact on the resources and support that are available for particular approaches to service provision. Whānau Ora is not simply a reflection of an evolving attitude in Māori policy but the result of a political agreement between the National and Māori parties and has suffered in its implementation because of the politics involved. However, despite the decisions being made by politicians, it will likely be up to the provider collectives to prove the value of the programme. Because of this it will be important to utilise the resources set aside for evaluation as effectively as possible both to prove and improve the value of whānau centred initiatives.

In communities that are somewhat insulated from the mainstream of New Zealand social organisation as is the case with the East Coast, the incorporation of Māori values is not only natural but it is the recognised norm. In this way tikanga can be ‘taken for granted’ allowing for that tikanga to adapt and provide support and value in an increasingly fast-paced modern world. While the geographical isolation of Ngāti Porou communities may have been seen in the past as a challenge to economic prosperity and social advancement, it has allowed Ngāti Porou to consolidate a strong cultural base and iwi/hapū identity. This will almost certainly be an effective foundation for the Rūnanga to stand on as Ngāti Porou becomes increasingly connected to not only a national but international community and economy through technological advances, growing trade opportunities, global indigenous connections and increased resources through Treaty settlement and the opportunities it affords.

In an international sense, there is also potential for Whānau Ora to have an impact on the way that social services are delivered to indigenous peoples the world over. Indigenous North Americans share similar socio-economic concerns with Māori as well as a similar socio-political history. Because of this, North American studies on indigenous peoples have been completed on a foundation of evidence from Māori research (Weaver, 1999). Thus it can be said that should Whānau Ora prove successful in this country, a similar initiative may prove equally as successful in North America. It is also likely that the development of Whānau Ora may also provide useful case studies for other international research in countries with both settler and indigenous populations.

“Mana motuhake Ngāti Porou, mo nga uri whakatipu” is part of the Ngāti Porou vision and means “Ngāti Porou, self-determining for the future”. The achievements and struggles of Ngāti Porou social services are a strong argument that this vision will be realised, supported by a national move toward holistic, whānau centred services.

Recommendations

For future research

1. Develop and complete a partnership research work between Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Porou, researchers and government agencies that produces a community needs assessment for Ngāti Porou communities to allow the Rūnanganui to assess current services against identified community needs and provide evidence to funders of where resources need to be directed in the future.
2. Map and analyse the changing political influence of Ngāti Porou and possibly other iwi groups to provide greater insight into what approaches and initiatives have aided their influence on policy and decision making in this Country, so that they can be further utilised.
3. Investigate and analyse the impact of Whānau Ora on confidentiality regulations and conventions with collectives as they implement Whānau Ora, with the purpose of developing a confidentiality framework based on a Māori worldview.
4. Investigate and analyse the impact of Puao-te-ata-tū on the establishment of the Rūnanga’s social services to contribute to the repository of both Ngāti Porou and Rūnanga contemporary history.

For the Rūnanganui (Recommendations 2, 3 and 6 can also be applied to iwi providers in general)

1. Lead the collaborative community needs assessment as noted above.

2. Partner with other iwi organisations to develop evaluation measures that are relevant to the social services provided by iwi organisations. Researchers could also be involved in developing these measures.
3. Continue to value and utilise community contributions to social service provision and advocate for this value to be recognised by government agencies.
4. Continue to encourage uptake of a hapū social services qualification.
5. Consider the development of a more formal internal evaluation process for social service programmes in order to both increase service effectiveness and develop a strong evidence base for government contract negotiations and policy development.
6. Capitalise on the government's current emphasis on youth development by continuing to provide and developing whānau centred youth services.

For government agencies

1. Explore options for more flexible contracting arrangements that allow for greater utilisation of community members that can contribute valuable skills and knowledge to social work practice but may not necessarily hold formal qualifications.
2. Give higher priority to tangata whenua concepts in contract arrangements.
3. Reconsider the removal of ACC services from Ruatoria.
4. Contribute to research as mentioned previously.

Bibliography

- Alcock, P. (2004). Research for social policy and practice. In S. Becker and A. Bryman (Eds.), *Understanding Research for Social Policy and Practice* (pp. 1-63). Bristol, United Kingdom: The Policy Press.
- Barnes, J., & Harris, P. (2011). Still kicking? The Royal Commission on Social Policy, 20 years on. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (37), 1-13.
- Beddoe, E. (2010). *Building professional capital: New Zealand social workers and continuing education* (Doctoral dissertation, Dakin University, Burwood, Australia). Retrieved from <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30032402>
- Beddoe, L. (2007). Change, complexity, and challenge in social work education in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Australian Social Work*, 60(1), 46-55.
- Bell, H. (2006). *Exiting the matrix. Colonisation, decolonisation and social work in Aotearoa. Voices of Ngāti Raukawa ki Te Tonga kaimahi whānau*. (Master's Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/662>
- Biasiny-Tule. (2006). Rangatahi in the twenty-first century: a new century, a Māori millennium. In M. Mulholland (Ed.), *State of the Māori nation twenty-first century issues in New Zealand* (pp. 169-178). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.
- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199-219.
- Bradley, J. (1995a). Before you tango with our whānau you better know what makes us tick: an indigenous approach to social work. *Te Komako Social Work Review*, 7(1), 27-29.
- Bradley, J. (1995b). The resolve to devolve: Māori and social services. *Social Work Now*, 1, 29-35.

- Brash, D. (2004, January). *Nationhood*. Speech presented at Orewa Rotary Club, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0401/S00220.htm>.
- Brewin, M., & Coggan, C. (1999). *Process and impact evaluation of the implementation phase of the Ngāti Porou Community Injury Prevention Project*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Brewin, M., & Coggan, C. (2004). Evaluation of the Ngāti Porou community injury prevention project. *Ethnicity & Health*, 9(1), 5-15.
- Buck, P. (1949). *The coming of the Maori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Maori Purposes Fund Board.
- Campbell-Knowles, T. M. (2012). *Hei aha ngā whakaaro o Ngāti Ruanui mō te Whānau Ora?* (Doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/4101>
- Chapple, S. (2000). Maori socio-economic disparity. *Political Science*, 52(2), 101-115.
- Cheyne, C., O'Brien, M., & Belgrave, M. (2008). *Social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand: a critical introduction* (4th ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Cribb, J. (2009). Focus on families: New Zealand families of yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (35), 4-16.
- Duncan, G. (2008). Book Review [Review of the book *Public policy and ethnicity: the politics of ethnic boundary making* edited by E. Rata and R. Openshaw]. *Sites: a journal of social anthropology and cultural studies*, 4(1), 193-197.
- Durie, M. (2003a). *Ngā kāhui pou launching Māori futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Durie, M. (2003b). Providing health services to indigenous peoples: A combination of conventional services and indigenous programmes is needed. *British Medical Journal*, 327(7412), 408.

- Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: The Politics of Self Determination*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1985). A Maori perspective of health. *Social science & medicine*, 20(5), 483-486.
- Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori directed practice. *Mai Review*, 3(1), 1-11.
- Ellison-Loschmann, L., & Pearce, N. (2006). Improving access to health care among New Zealand's Māori population. *Journal Information*, 96(4), 612-617.
- Engel, R., & Schutt, R. (2005). *Science, Society, and Social Work Research. The Practice of Research in Social Work*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- English, A. (2005). *Puao-te-ata-tu and Maori social work methods*. (Master's Thesis, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://otago.ourarchive.ac.nz/handle/10523/175>
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism* (Vol. 6). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity press.
- Fain, K.T. *Rūnanga: Manuka kawē ake*. (Master's Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/955>
- Fitzgerald, E. (2004). Development since the 1984 Hui Taumata. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, and D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata Tangata: The Changing Ethnic Contours of New Zealand* (pp. 43-58). Melbourne, Australia: Dunmore Press.
- Goldstein, J., & Morning, A. J. (2002). Back in the box: The dilemma of using multiple-race data for single-race laws. In J. Perlmann and M. Waters (Eds.), *The new race question: How the census counts multiracial individuals* (pp. 119-37). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gould, J. (1996). Socio-economic differences between Māori iwi. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 105(2), 165-183.

- Harris, D. R., & Sim, J. J. (2002). Who is multiracial? Assessing the complexity of lived race. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 614-627.
- Henry, E., & Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Māori: Locating indigenous ontology, epistemology and methodology in the academy. *Organization*, 8(2), 234-242.
- Humpage, L. (2005). Tackling Indigenous disadvantage in the twenty-first century: “social inclusion” and Māori in New Zealand. In R. Eversole, J. McNeish and A. D. Cimadamore (Eds.), *Indigenous Peoples and Poverty: An International Perspective* (pp. 158-184). London, United Kingdom: Zed Books.
- Humpage, L. (2006). An ‘inclusive’ society: a ‘leap forward’ for Māori in New Zealand? *Critical Social Policy*, 26(1), 220-242.
- Irwin, K. (1994) Māori research methods and practices. *Sites: a journal of social anthropology and cultural studies*, (28), 25-43.
- Kelsey, J. (1990). Economic libertarianism versus Māori self-determination: Āotearoa/New Zealand in Crisis. *Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 18(3), 239-240.
- Key, J. (2010). *Budget 2010-Whanau Ora launches with \$134.3m* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/budget-2010-whanau-ora-launches-1343m>
- King, M., Smith, A., & Gracey, M. (2009). Indigenous health part 2: the underlying causes of the health gap. *The Lancet*, 374(9683), 76-85.
- Kukutai, T. (2011). Building ethnic boundaries in New Zealand: representations of Māori identity in the Census. In P. Axelsson and P. Skold (Eds.), *Indigenous peoples and demography: the complex relation between identity and statistics* (pp. 33-54). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Kukutai, T. (2004). The problem of defining an ethnic group for public policy: Who is Māori and why does it matter. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, (23), 86-108.
- Larner, W. (2006). Brokering citizenship claims: neo-liberalism, biculturalism and multiculturalism in Āotearoa/New Zealand. In A. Dobrowolsky and E. Tastsoglou

- (Eds.), *Women, migration and citizenship: making local, national and transnational connections* (pp.131-148). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Maaka, R., & Fleras, A. (2000). Engaging with indigeneity: Tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa. In D. Ivison, P. Patton and W.Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples*. Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *Mai Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Mahuika, A. T. (1973). *Nga wahine kai-hautu o Ngati Porou = the female leaders of Ngati Porou*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia).
- Māori Language Act, No 176. (1987). Retrieved from <http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1987/0176/latest/DLM124116.html?src=qs>
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- O'Leary, J & Sandberg, J (2010 December). How societal context shapes the practice of managing diversity. In *24th Annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference: Managing for Unknowable Futures*. Paper presented at the 24th ANZAM Conference, Adelaide, Australia.
- McCormack, F. (2011). Levels of indigeneity: the Māori and neoliberalism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 17(2), 281-300.
- McKenzie, D., Whiu, T., Matahaere-Atariki, D. And Goldsmith, K. (2008). Co-production in a Maori context. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (33), 32-46.
- McLaren, K. (2002). *Building strength. A review of research on how to achieve good outcomes for young people in their families, peer groups, schools, careers and communities*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Youth Affairs.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao-te-ata-tu: The report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee*

on a Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Social Welfare.

Nash, M., & Munford, R. (2001). Unresolved struggles: educating social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Social work education*, 20(1), 21-34.

New Zealand First Party (2000). *Better economics but socially “racial apartheid”* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0006/S00307.htm>

Office of Treaty Settlements. (2013). *Claims progress*. Retrieved 30 November 2013, from www.ots.govt.nz

O'Regan, T., & Mahuika, A. (1993). Modern day developments within Māori society and the role of the Social Policy Agency as a provider of quality policy advice. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, (1), 31-43.

O'Sullivan, D. (2008). Needs, rights, and “one law for all”. Contemporary Debates in New Zealand Māori politics. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 41(4), 973-986.

Owen, V. (2001). Whanake rangatahi: programmes and services to address Māori youth offending. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, (16), 175-190.

Pakura, S. (2004). The importance of intersectoral collaboration between Child, Youth and Family and Mental Health Services. *Social Work Review*, (16), 2-4.

Pere, R. (1988). Te wheke: whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. *Women and education in Aotearoa*, (1), 6-19.

Perlmann, J., & Waters, M. C. (2002). *The new race question: How the census counts multiracial individuals*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M., & Lee, J. (2004). A literature review on Kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy *Report for ITP New Zealand by The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education*. Wellington, New Zealand: ITP New Zealand.

- Pipi, K., Cram, F., Hawke, R., Hawke, S., Huriwai, T. M., Mataki, T. & Tuuta, C. (2004). A research ethic for studying Māori and iwi provider success. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, (23), 141-154.
- Powick, K. (2002). *Ngā take matatika mō te mahi rangahau Māori. Māori research ethics: A literature review of the ethical issues and implications of kaupapa Māori research and research involving Māori for researchers, supervisors and ethics committees*. Hamilton, New Zealand: School of Education, University of Waikato.
- Puketapu, B. T. T. (2000). *Māori organisation and contemporary Māori development: strengthening the conceptual plait*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/913>
- Ringold, D. (2005). *Accounting for diversity: Policy design and Māori development in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Fellowships Office, Fulbright New Zealand.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988). *The April Report* (Vols. I - IV). Wellington, New Zealand: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. R. (2011). *Essential research methods for social work*. Belmont: Thompson Brooks
- Ruwhiu, L. (1995). Home fires burn so brightly with theoretical flames. *Te Komako Social Work Review*, 8(1), 121-124.
- Selby, R. (1995). "Watch out for the quicksand: ethics and practice." *Te Komako Social Work Review* 7(1): 19-20.
- Smith, L.T. (2012). Researching in the margins: issues for Māori researchers-A discussion paper. *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 2(1), 5-25.
- Smith, L.T. (2011). Opening keynote: Story-ing the development of kaupapa Māori—a review of sorts. In J. Hutchings, H. Potter and K. Taupo (Eds.), *Kei Tua o Te Pae hui*

proceedings – The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century.
Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Smith, L. T. (2007a). Getting the story right–telling the story well: indigenous activism–indigenous research. In A. Mead and S. Ratuva (Eds.), *Pacific genes & life patents: Pacific indigenous experiences & analysis of the commodification & ownership of life* (pp. 74-81). Wellington, New Zealand: Call of the Earth Llamado de la Tierra, United Nations University-Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Smith, L. T. (2007b). The native and the neoliberal down under: Neoliberalism and ‘endangered authenticities’. In M. de la Cadena and O. Starn (Eds.), *Indigenous experience today* (pp. 333-352). Oxford, United Kingdom: Berg Publishers.
- Smith, L. T. (2000). Kaupapa Māori Research. In M. Battistte (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision*. (pp. 225-247). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). Chapter 9: Responding to the imperatives of an indigenous agenda: a case study of Māori. *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples* (pp. 163-182). Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1997). Decolonising intellectual identity: Māori/woman/academic. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Cultural politics and the university in Āotearoa/New Zealand*. (pp. 182-210). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Soutar, M. (2012). East Coast Region - Māori Settlement. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/interactive/33351/marae-in-the-waiapu-river-valley>
- Staniforth, B. L. (2010). Past, present and future perspectives on the role of counselling in social work in Āotearoa New Zealand (Doctoral dissertation Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/1276>
- State-Owned Enterprises Act, No 124. (1986). Retrieved from <http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1986/0124/latest/DLM97377.html?src=qs>

- Statistics New Zealand (n.d.). Rural areas with low urban influence. In *New Zealand: An Urban/Rural Profile*. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Geographic-areas/urban-rural-profile/rural-areas-low-urban-influence/people.aspx
- Swan, J., Lillis, S., & Simmons, D. (2006). Investigating the accuracy of ethnicity data in New Zealand hospital records: still room for improvement. *New Zealand Medical Journal* 119(1239), Retrieved from <http://journal.nzma.org.nz/journal/119-1239/2103/>
- Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives. (2010). *Whānau Ora: Report of the Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1999). Māori Women and Research: Researching Ourselves. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Māori and psychology: research and practice. The proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Māori and Psychology Research Unit* (pp. 58-66). Hamilton, New Zealand: Māori & Psychology Research Unit.
- Te Momo, F. (2004). A Māori third way: what does it mean to New Zealand today? *Te Komako Social Work Review*, Winter, 5-10.
- Te Runanganui o Ngati Porou. (2013a). *Annual Report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Runanganui o Ngati Porou.
- Te Runanga o Ngati Porou. (2013b). *History of Ngati Porou*. Retrieved 30 September, 2013, from <http://www.ngatiporou.com/Matauranga/history/default.asp>
- Te Runanga o Ngati Porou. (2002). *Annual Report*. Gisborne, New Zealand: Te Runanga o Ngati Porou.
- Te Runanga o Ngati Porou. (2001). *Annual Report*. Gisborne, New Zealand: Te Runanga o Ngati Porou.
- Treaty of Waitangi Act, No 114. (1975). Retrieved from <http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1986/0124/latest/DLM97377.html?src=qs>

- Treaty of Waitangi (State Enterprises) Act, No 105. (1988). Retrieved from <http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1988/0105/latest/DLM132561.html?src=qs>
- Trevett, C. (2012). Winston Peters: Whānau Ora a 'bro-ocracy'. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10809318
- Turia, T. (2013). *Whānau Ora model of governance announced today* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/whanau-ora-model-governance-announced-today>
- Turia, T. (2010). *Whānau Ora an investment in families* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/whanau-ora-investment-families>
- United Nations General Assembly (2007) *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*, 2 October 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html>
- van Heugten, K. (2011). Registration and social work education: A golden opportunity or a Trojan horse? *Journal of Social Work*, 11(2), 174-190.
- Walker, H. (1995). Where is Puao-te-ata-tu and the Department of Social Welfare? *Te Komako Social Work Review* 7(1), 14-16.
- Walker, P. (2004). Partnership models within a Maori social-service provider. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 13(2), 158-169.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou struggle without end* (Revised ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books
- Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(4), 331-344.
- Walsh-Tapiata, W. (1997). *Raukawa Social Services; origins and future directions*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand).

Ware, F. J. R. (2009). *Youth development, Mauī styles: Kia tipu te rito o te pā harakeke, Tikanga and āhuatanga as a basis for a positive Māori youth development approach*. (Master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/1152>

Warren, K. T. R. F. (2004). *Rūnanga: Manuka kawē ake*. (Master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/955>

Weaver, H. N. (1999). Indigenous people and the social work profession: Defining culturally competent services. *Social Work*, 44(3), 217-225.

Webster, S. (2002). Māori Retribalization and Treaty Rights to the New Zealand Fisheries. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 14(2), 341-376.

Appendices

1. **Massey University Human Ethics Application 11/72¹⁵ including;**
 - Letters of invitation**
 - Information sheets**
 - Consent forms**
 - Interview schedule**
 - Focus group question schedule**
 - Transcriber's confidentiality agreement**
 - Authority for the release of written transcripts**
2. **Research Assistant Confidentiality Agreement**
3. **Glossary of Māori Terms**

¹⁵ *Note: as outlined in Chapter three, the focus of the project was amended after an initial application was approved. Changes to the application were approved by the relevant Ethics Committee rather than an entirely new application being submitted. Because of this, the final approved version of the application included here is not the original signed copy*

Human Ethics Application

FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED RESEARCH/TEACHING/EVALUATION INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

SECTION A

1 **Project Title** Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
Projected start date for data collection 1 June 2012 **Projected end date** 30 June 2012

2 **Applicant Details** (Select the appropriate box and complete details)

ACADEMIC STAFF APPLICATION (excluding staff who are also students)

Full Name of Staff Applicant/s

School/Department/Institute

Campus (mark one only)

Albany ☐

Palmerston North ☐

Wellington ☐

Telephone

Email Address

STUDENT APPLICATION

Full Name of Student Applicant Taimania Rickard

Employer (if applicable)

Telephone 06 867 9936

Email Address Taimania_rickard@hotmail.com

Postal Address

92 Iranui Rd Gisborne 4010

Full Name of Supervisor(s)

Rachael Selby, Awhina English

School/Department/Institute

School of Health and Social Services

Campus (mark one only)

Albany ☐

Palmerston North ☒

Wellington ☐

Telephone

Email Address

GENERAL STAFF APPLICATION

Full Name of Applicant

Section

Campus (mark one only)

Albany ☐

Palmerston North ☐

Wellington ☐

Telephone

Email Address

Full Name of Line Manager

Section

Telephone

Email Address

3 **Type of Project** (provide detail as appropriate)

Staff Research/Evaluation:

Academic Staff

General Staff

Evaluation

Student Research:

Specify Qualification

Specify Credit Value of Research

(e.g. 30, 60, 90, 120, 240, 360)

If other, please specify:

MA
120

4 Summary of Project

Please outline in no more than 200 words in lay language why you have chosen this project, what you intend to do and the methods you will use.

I originally chose the project outlined below in January of 2011 when it was expected that *Whānau Ora* would be implemented that year. However following the 2011 election, the implementation of *Whānau Ora* has stalled and because of this, it is necessary to change the focus of this project. The aim of this project is now to examine the current policies and practices regarding social service provision within an iwi organisation that is a member of a *Whānau Ora* Collective. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These include; what services are currently offered by the organisation; what policies and practices are currently in place; how those policies and practices are reviewed and by whom; the methods of obtaining feedback from service users and how this feedback is used and staff expectations and preparations regarding the future implementation of *Whānau Ora*. This project will use up to five qualitative, in depth interviews with senior staff members involved with social services as well as two focus groups with up to five social service workers in each. It is planned that this research will be a helpful reference point for further research and evaluation in the future implementation of *Whānau Ora*.

(The aim of this project is to investigate how the implementation of Whānau Ora will impact upon the delivery and development of social services within an iwi based organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. According to Te Puni Kōkiri, 'Whānau Ora is an inclusive approach to providing services and opportunities to families across New Zealand. It empowers families as a whole, rather than focusing separately on individual family members and their problems'. Whānau Ora as a specific policy is largely undefined and it would be a valuable exercise to see how an organisation shapes the idea of Whānau Ora as they implement it. There is a significant body of literature relating to Maori policy and Maori social services that has informed the development of Whānau Ora. However, there is little literature regarding the implementation of Whānau Ora. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These are: the potential impact of Whānau Ora, the extent to which social service practice will or will not change as a result of Whānau Ora, the opportunities that Whānau Ora provides for improved service delivery, the challenges that Whānau Ora presents and ideas for overcoming these challenges. This project will use up to five qualitative in depth interviews with senior staff members involved in the development of the Whānau Ora Collective as well as two focus groups with up to five social service workers involved in the practical implementation of the Whānau Ora contract.)

5 List the Attachments to your Application

Appendix one: Screening questionnaire to determine approval procedure

Appendix two: Letter to organisations requesting approval to seek staff participation

Appendix three: Information sheet for interviewees and information sheet for focus group participants

Appendix four: Consent form for interviewees and consent form for focus group participants

Appendix five: Interview Schedule

Appendix six: Focus group question schedule

Appendix seven: Transcribers confidentiality agreement

Appendix eight: Authority for the release of written transcripts

SECTION B: PROJECT INFORMATION

General

6 I/We wish the protocol to be heard in a closed meeting (Part II). Yes ☐ No ☒

7 Does this project have any links to previously submitted MUHEC or HDEC application(s)? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, list the MUHEC or HDEC application number/s (if assigned) and relationship/s.

8 Is approval from other Ethics Committees being sought for the project? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, list the other Ethics Committees.

9 For staff research, is the applicant the only researcher? Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, list the names and addresses of all members of the research team.

Project Details

10 State concisely the aims of the project.

To examine the current policies and practices regarding social services in an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective.

11 Give a brief background to the project to place it in perspective and to allow the project's significance to be assessed.

Outlined below is an explanation of the background to the original research that was planned. In 2010 it was expected that the initial implementation of *Whānau Ora* would take place in 2011, driven by the newly formed Whānau Ora Collectives. However due to the political environment, the implementation of *Whānau Ora*, except for projects related to the Whānau Ora, innovation, integration and engagement fund has not yet started. Because of this, the focus of the research has come off the implementation of *Whānau Ora* and moved to pre-*Whānau Ora* policies and practices with the hope of providing a good foundation of information that can be used in the implementation stage if and when it occurs. The research will examine current policies and practices with reference to the organisations expectations about the future implementation of *Whānau Ora*. The planned research will take place with the same organisation that was approached for the original research.

(In early 2010 the Taskforce on Whānau Centred Initiatives completed its report outlining a new and inclusive approach to social services that was directed at whānau/families in need. Later in 2010 a number of 'Whānau Ora Collectives' were established to develop and eventually deliver whānau centred services. For the most part, the exact shape and direction of Whānau Ora is largely undefined and these collectives and the organisations that comprise them have an important role to play in how Whānau Ora as a policy will look in the future. Therefore, it would be valuable to complete research within one of these organisations as they work through the initial stages of developing and implementing Whānau Ora. The project idea was suggested to the researcher by a key person within one such organisation shortly after the establishment of the collectives. Furthermore, the organisation that will be asked to participate in the project is the iwi authority for the researcher's own iwi.)

12 Outline the research procedures to be used, including approach/procedures for collecting data. Use a flow chart if necessary.

1. Collect background information
2. Complete draft literature review
3. File application for ethics approval
4. Make initial contact with organisation to arrange meeting to discuss project
5. A) Follow up initial contact with formal request in writing. B) Amendments made to research focus and ethics application due to policy delay
6. Send new research proposal to organisation
7. Present project to Board of Trustees if necessary
8. Identify potential participants
9. Pass on information sheets to potential participants
10. Willing participants make contact with researcher
11. Obtain consent forms from willing participants
12. Arrange interview and focus group times
13. Conduct interviews and focus groups
14. Follow up participants if necessary to expand on and/or clarify answers
15. Transcribe interviews
16. Participants to review transcripts
17. Collate and analyse data
18. Write up findings
19. Submit report
20. Disseminate summary of findings to participants and organisations and make full report available for viewing

13 Where will the project be conducted? Include information about the physical location/setting.

The project will be conducted in the Gisborne and East Coast area. Interviews and focus groups will be conducted at venues of the participants' choice and agreed upon by participants and researcher. It is anticipated that the majority of interviews and focus groups will take place at participants' workplaces.

14 If the study is based overseas:

- i) Specify which countries are involved;
- ii) Outline how overseas country requirements (if any) have been complied with;
- iii) Have the University's Policy & Procedures for Course Related Student Travel Overseas been met?
(Note: Overseas travel undertaken by students – refer to item 5.10 in the document "Additional Information" on the MUHEC website.)

15 Describe the experience of the researcher and/or supervisor to undertake this type of project?

Educational Qualifications: BA/BBS in Social Policy and Economics from Massey University

BA(Hons) in Social Policy from Massey University

Completed a small scale research project on Policy and Practice in Maori Youth Mentoring as part of Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Degree in 2010. Was a recipient of the Purehuroa Iwi Research Award and used this to complete an evaluation project from December 2010 to February 2011 for a youth justice programme run by an iwi organisation.

The researcher has worked in both community and iwi based organisations in both paid and voluntary positions over the past 5-6 years

Raised in a Maori family with strong ties to whānau and iwi

Sound understanding of tikanga Māori and moderate competence in Te Reo Māori

16 Describe the process that has been used to discuss and analyse the ethical issues present in this project.

Many of the ethical issues that are present in this project were also present in research projects completed in 2010, those issues were reviewed by going through ethics applications for those projects as well as relooking at the final reports attached to those projects.

Ethical analysis with supervisors regarding ethical issues and this particular ethics application.

Reading texts and research projects that outline ethical issues for similar projects.

Participants

17 Describe the intended participants.

Past or current staff members of Te Runanga o Ngati Porou who have had or do have an active role to play in the development and delivery of social services by Te Runanga o Ngati Porou. Participants to be interviewed will be those who have had or do hold leadership positions within the organisation. Those taking part in focus groups will be social and community workers responsible for the day to day delivery of social services by the organisation.

(Past or current staff members of Te Runanga o Ngati Porou who have had or do have an active role to play in the development and delivery of Whānau Ora within the organisation. Participants to be interviewed will be those who have held or do hold leadership positions within the organisation. Those taking part in focus groups will be social and community workers responsible for the day to day delivery of the Whānau Ora contract.)

18 How many participants will be involved?

Up to 15

What is the reason for selecting this number?

Up to five in depth interviews will provide information rich data. This is also the approximate number of people who have or do hold a leadership position within the organisation that is specifically related to social services. The focus groups are planned for two locations, one in Gisborne and one in Ruatorea. Five is a manageable group number and is a realistic number of participants that may be available for the study.

19 Describe how potential participants will be identified and recruited?

Potential participants will be those who have had or do have an active role to play in the development and delivery of Social services by the organisation. Within the proposed organisation for this research there are approximately four senior staff members that have been or are involved in the process of creating a Whānau Ora collective and contract. It is expected that these same staff members will have or do have an active role to play in the current development and delivery of social services; however, further discussion with the organisation will need to take place to clarify this. In addition to this there are a number of community and social workers in the organisation that are responsible for the day to day delivery of social services to the community. Personal contact has been made with the organisation as well as a formal written request. Because of the delay in the implementation of Whānau Ora, further personal and written contact has and will take place with the organisation to finalise the project and potential participants. Once permission is gained, both personal contact and formal written contact will be made with potential interview participants. In the case of focus groups, written requests will be sent to managers with information sheets and consent forms for potential participants.

(Potential participants will be those who have had or do have an active role to play in the initiation and implementation of Whānau Ora within their organisation. Within the proposed organisation for this research there are approximately four senior staff members that have been or are involved in the process of developing a Whānau Ora collective and now in implementing the Whānau Ora contract. In addition to this there are a number of community and social workers in the organisation that are responsible for implementing Whānau Ora at the practice level. Personal contact will be made with the organisation and a formal written request will also be written. Once permission is gained both personal contact and formal written contact will be made with potential interview participants. In the case of focus groups, written requests will be sent to managers with information sheets included for potential participants.)

20	Does the project involve recruitment through advertising?	Yes	☐	No	☒
21	Does the project require permission of an organisation (e.g. an educational institution, an academic unit of Massey University or a business) to access participants or information? If yes, list the organisation(s). Te Runanga o Ngati Porou (soon to be Te Runanganui o Ngati Porou)	Yes	☒	No	☐
22	Who will make the initial approach to potential participants? The Researcher by personal communication and by letter				
23	Describe criteria (if used) to select participants from the pool of potential participants. All potential participants who wish to do so will be given the opportunity to participate				
24	How much time will participants have to give to the project? Approximately one hour for interviews and focus groups with a potential one hour follow up and one hour of transcript reading for interviewees.				

Data Collection

25	Does the project include the use of participant questionnaire/s? <i>(If yes, attach a copy of the Questionnaire/s to the application form and include this in your list of attachments (Q5))</i> If yes: i) indicate whether the participants will be anonymous (i.e. their identity unknown to the researcher). ii) describe how the questionnaire will be distributed and collected. <i>(If distributing electronically through Massey IT, attach a copy of the draft request letter to the Director, Information Technology Services to the application form. Include this in your list of attachments (Q5) – refer to the policy on “Research Use of IT Infrastructure”).</i>	Yes	☐	No	☒
26	Does the project involve observation of participants? If yes, please describe.	Yes	☐	No	☒
27	Does the project include the use of focus group/s? If yes, describe the location of the focus group and time length, including whether it will be in work time. Because the participants work for the same organisation it is anticipated that the focus group will take place during work hours provided that the organisation and the participants agree. If this is not an option the focus group will likely take place at a time that is convenient for participants.	Yes	☒	No	☐
28	Does the project include the use of participant interview/s? If yes, describe the location of the interview and time length, including whether it will be in work time. The interview will take approximately one hour and will take place at a location agreed upon by the participant and the researcher, most likely the participant’s workplace	Yes	☒	No	☐
29	Does the project involve sound recording?	Yes	☒	No	☐
30	Does the project involve image recording, e.g. photo or video? If yes, please describe.	Yes	☐	No	☒
31	If recording is used, will the record be transcribed?	Yes	☒	No	☐

If yes, state who will do the transcribing.

The researcher and a transcriber if necessary

- 32 Does the project involve any other method of data collection not covered in Qs 25-31? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, describe the method used.

- 33 Does the project require permission to access databases? Yes ☐ No ☒

- 34 Who will carry out the data collection?

The researcher

SECTION C: BENEFITS / RISK OF HARM (Refer Code Section 3, Para 10)

- 35 What are the possible benefits (if any) of the project to individual participants, groups, communities and institutions?

The participants may benefit from the opportunity to discuss their practice in the context of an anticipated move to *Whānau Ora*. Participants will be contributing to the body of research data regarding Maori social services and possibly to the new body of research data regarding *Whānau Ora*. The organisation may benefit from increased discussion regarding both their provision of social services and the implementation of *Whānau Ora* at a critical time for the policy. There is also potential benefit for service users and their *whānau* if this research can be used to improve or enhance practice and overall implementation of social services. There may also be benefit to other researchers who can use this research as a source for their own research.

- 36 What discomfort (physical, psychological, social), incapacity or other risk of harm are individual participants likely to experience as a result of participation?

Because social work generally involves the sharing of confidential information, there may be a chance that some of this information will be passed on to the researcher. However, I anticipate little risk to the project as focus group and interview questions will not focus on specific cases or clients. Because participants will be asked about the anticipated challenges of implementing *Whānau Ora* there may be instances where participants may be critical of the policy, the *Whānau Ora* collective to which they belong or their own organisation.

- 37 Describe the strategies you will use to deal with any of the situations identified in Q36.

Participants may choose not to answer questions and can pull out if uncomfortable.
Participants will be given the opportunity to review transcripts and remove or add comments.
Participants will have the option of remaining unnamed in the final report.
Focus group participants will be required to sign confidentiality agreements.
I will also use my people skills and *tikanga* as tools for dealing with any personal issues that may arise.

- 38 What is the risk of harm (if any) of the project to the researcher?

Little risk anticipated. However if participants pull out of the research at a late stage or are slow to respond to the invitation to participate, this may increase stress on the researcher.

- 39 Describe the strategies you will use to deal with any of the situations identified in Q38.

I have access to support systems if necessary such as family support and counselling services.

- 40 What discomfort (physical, psychological, social) incapacity or other risk of harm are groups/communities and institutions likely to experience as a result of this research?

Participants may lose work time due to participation in the research.
There is potential for participants to be critical of their organisation, however, this research is not intended as a criticism of the organisation or organisational policy.

- 41 **Describe the strategies you will use to deal with any of the situations identified in Q40.**
 The organisation can choose not to be named in the research.
 Research questions will focus primarily on the organisation in relation to social services and not other aspects of the organisations operations.
 Permission will be sought from the organisation before potential participants are approached
- 42 **Is ethnicity data being collected as part of the project?** Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes, will the data be used as a basis for analysis? If so, justify this use in terms of the number of participants.
If no, justify this approach, given that in some research an analysis based on ethnicity may yield results of value to Maori and to other groups.
 This project has a Kaupapa Maori and qualitative approach. It will therefore, analyse data that focuses specifically on Maori (Participants and whānau). As a Maori researcher, I have chosen this approach in order to enhance the body of knowledge around Maori social services and Whānau Ora. Furthermore, while iwi social services are not exclusively for iwi members or Maori they are targeted at Maori whānau and individuals. The research will not be making broad generalisations about Maori but will be focused on a particular community of interest as a case study.
- 43 **If participants are children/students in a pre-school/school/tertiary setting, describe the arrangements you will make for children/students who are present but not taking part in the research.**

SECTION D: INFORMED & VOLUNTARY CONSENT (Refer Code Section 3, Para 11)

- 44 **By whom and how, will information about the research be given to potential participants?**
 Participants will initially be approached via letter but personal follow up by the researcher will occur in most instances, this is due to participants in previous studies saying that they would rather have been approached personally by the researcher rather than by letter.
- 45 **Will consent to participate be given in writing?** Yes ☒ No ☐
(Attach copies of Consent Form/s to the application form)
If no, justify the use of oral consent.
- 46 **Will participants include persons under the age of 16?** Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes: i) indicate the age group and competency for giving consent.
 ii) indicate if the researcher will be obtaining the consent of parent(s)/caregiver(s). Yes ☐ No ☐
- 47 **Will participants include persons whose capacity to give informed consent may be compromised?** Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes, describe the consent process you will use.
- 48 **Will the participants be proficient in English?** Yes ☒ No ☐
If no, all documentation for participants (Information Sheets/Consent Forms/Questionnaire etc) must be translated into the participants' first-language.

(Attach copies of the translated Information Sheet/Consent Form etc to the application form)

SECTION E: PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY ISSUES (Refer Code Section 3, Para 12)

49 Will any information be obtained from any source other than the participant? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, describe how and from whom.

The researcher may ask for permission to view organisational documents relating to policy and practice in social services or other relevant information not publically available. Such information may include policy documents, aggregated statistics and government contracts relating specifically to social services. This will not include personnel files or personal information beyond workplace contact details such as work email addresses and telephone numbers most of which is available to the public.

50 Will any information that identifies participants be given to any person outside the research team? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, indicate why and how.

51 Will the participants be anonymous (i.e. their identity unknown to the researcher?) Yes ☐ No ☒

If no, explain how confidentiality of the participants' identities will be maintained in the treatment and use of the data.

Participants will not be named in the report without their express consent. Should participants wish not to be named every effort will be made to remove identifying characteristics from the report.

52 Will an institution (e.g. school) to which participants belong be named or be able to be identified? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, explain how you have made the institution aware of this?

The organisation has already been approached through the Board of Trustees and the CEO and the request was passed on to the relevant senior manager. Further discussion will be taking place with this senior manager where all information regarding identification and privacy will be finalised.

(The organisation will be asked permission through the Board of Trustees and the CEO. If the organisation does not wish to be named every effort will be made to remove identifying characteristics from the report. If the organisation does not wish to be named, participants will also have to remain unnamed and identifying characteristics of participants will need to be edited out of the final report.)

53 Outline how and where:

i) the data will be stored, and

Hard copies will be kept in a locked file drawer at the researcher's home. Electronic records will be kept on a specially purchased flash drive and on the researcher's personal computer that cannot be accessed without a password.

ii) Consent Forms will be stored.

Consent forms will be stored in a locked cabinet or box inside a garage on the researcher's property.

54 i) Who will have access to the data/Consent Forms?

Only the researcher will have access to consent forms.

ii) How will the data/Consent Forms be protected from unauthorised access?

All data and consent forms will be stored on the researcher's property. Cabinets will be locked and access to electronic data will require passwords.

- 55 How long will the data from the study be kept, who will be responsible for its safe keeping and eventual disposal? (Note that health information relating to an identifiable individual must be retained for at least 10 years, or in the case of a child, 10 years from the age of 16).

The data held by the researcher will be destroyed following the examination of the final thesis. The organisation however, will be given the option of retaining data for their own records provided that participants give consent.

SECTION F: DECEPTION (Refer Code Section 3, Para 13)

- 56 Is deception involved at any stage of the project? Yes ☐ No ☒
- If yes, justify its use and describe the debriefing procedures.

SECTION G: CONFLICT OF ROLE/INTEREST (Refer Code Section 3, Para 14)

- 57 Is the project to be funded in any way from sources external to Massey University? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes: i) state the source.

ii) does the source of the funding present any conflict of interest with regard to the research topic?

- 58 Does the researcher/s have a financial interest in the outcome of the project? Yes ☐ No ☒
- If yes, explain how the conflict of interest situation will be dealt with.

- 59 Describe any professional or other relationship between the researcher and the participants? (e.g. employer/employee, lecturer/student, practitioner/patient, researcher/family member). Indicate how any resulting conflict of role will be dealt with.

The researcher has previously worked within the organisation and has also completed research for the organisation. Some of the participants are well known to the researcher while others are not. Because the relevant organisation is an iwi organisation and the researcher is a member of this iwi it is likely that potential participants will feel a sense of obligation to participate. It will be made clear that participation is voluntary and that participants can pull out of the research at any time. Because of the nature of iwi and of iwi organisations, collective obligation is not something that will be out of the ordinary for most or all participants and it will be expected that the researcher also fulfils certain obligations toward the organisation.

SECTION H: COMPENSATION TO PARTICIPANTS (Refer Code Section 4, Para 23)

- 60 Will any payments or other compensation be given to participants? Yes ☒ No ☐
- If yes, describe what, how and why.

As a part of kaupapa Maori research, a non-monetary koha (gift) will be gifted to participants. Tea, coffee and food will also be provided during interviews and focus groups as part of the manaakitanga (hospitality) process.

SECTION I: TREATY OF WAITANGI (Refer Code Section 2)

- 61 Are Maori the primary focus of the project? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes: Answer Q62 – 65

If no, outline: i) what Maori involvement there may be, and

ii) how this will be managed.

62	Is the researcher competent in te reo Maori and tikanga Maori?	Yes	x	No	
----	---	-----	---	----	--

If no, outline the processes in place for the provision of cultural advice.

The researcher has a moderate understanding of Te Reo Maori. Therefore, the researcher will be 'competent' enough to understand and interpret the majority of Maori words used in interviews and focus groups. Furthermore, the researcher is comfortable asking participants for clarification of terms and language they may use. All potential participants speak fluent English and for the most part English is their first language. There are a number of native/qualified speakers of Te Reo within the organisation that can be approached for assistance if necessary. In terms of tikanga Maori, the researcher has a good level of knowledge in this area. However, there are people both within and outside to organisation that can be approached to provide assistance or advice.

63	Identify the group/s with whom consultation has taken place or is planned and describe the consultation process.
----	---

Initial consultation has already occurred and has led to a change in the focus of the research more in line with the organisations current circumstances. Further discussion is planned with relevant members of the organisation to confirm the new research plan.

(Consultation will take place within the organisation that will hopefully provide the participants for this study. An informal approach will first be made to either the CEO or the chairman of the board of trustees to establish interest from the organisation in the project. A formal written request for permission will then be sent to the organisation. If necessary the researcher will present the intended study at a Board of Trustees meeting and address concerns that the organisation may have.)

64	Describe any ongoing involvement of the group/s consulted in the project.
----	--

The organisation will be involved throughout the project as it is planned that all participants will be from the same organisation.

65	Describe how information resulting from the project will be shared with the group/s consulted?
----	---

A summary of the findings will initially be made available to the organisation. Furthermore, a copy of the final thesis will be given to the organisation for their records. If desired, the researcher can also present findings to the Board of Trustees and other interested parties.

SECTION J: CULTURAL ISSUES (Refer Code Section 3, Para 15)

66	Other than those issues covered in Section I, are there any aspects of the project that might raise specific cultural issues?	Yes		No	X
----	--	-----	--	----	---

If yes, explain. Otherwise, proceed to Section K.

67	What ethnic or social group/s (other than Maori) does the project involve?
----	---

68	Does the researcher speak the language of the target population?	Yes		No	
----	---	-----	--	----	--

If no, specify how communication with participants will be managed.

69	Describe the cultural competence of the researcher for carrying out the project.
----	---

(Note that where the researcher is not a member of the cultural group being researched, a cultural advisor may be necessary)

-
- 70 **Identify the group/s with whom consultation has taken place or is planned.**
(Where consultation has already taken place, attach a copy of the supporting documentation to the application form)
-
- 71 **Describe any ongoing involvement of the group/s consulted in the project.**
-
- 72 **Describe how information resulting from the project will be shared with the group/s consulted.**
-
- 73 **If the research is to be conducted overseas, describe the arrangements you will make for local participants to express concerns regarding the research.**
-

SECTION K: SHARING RESEARCH FINDINGS (Refer Code Section 4, Para 26)

- 74 **Describe how information resulting from the project will be shared with participants and disseminated in other forums, e.g. peer review, publications, conferences.**
All participants will be provided with a summary of the findings. Participants will also be provided with the opportunity to view the final thesis. The researcher will make a presentation to all participants together if requested.

SECTION L: INVASIVE PROCEDURES/PHYSIOLOGICAL TESTS (Refer Code Section 4, Para 21)

- 75 **Does the project involve the collection of tissues, blood, other body fluids or physiological tests?** (If yes, complete Section L, otherwise proceed to Section M)
Yes ☐ No ☒
- If yes, are the procedures to be used governed by Standard Operating Procedure(s)? If so, please name the SOP(s). If not, identify the procedure(s) and describe how you will minimise the risks associated with the procedure(s)?
-
- 76 **Describe the material to be taken and the method used to obtain it. Include information about the training of those taking the samples and the safety of all persons involved. If blood is taken, specify the volume and number of collections.**
-
- 77 **Will the material be stored?** Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, describe how, where and for how long.
-
- 78 **Describe how the material will be disposed of (either after the research is completed or at the end of the storage period).**
(Note that the wishes of relevant cultural groups must be taken into account)
-
- 79 **Will material collected for another purpose (e.g. diagnostic use) be used?** Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, did the donors give permission for use of their samples in this project? Yes ☐ No ☐
(Attach evidence of this to the application form).

If no, describe how consent will be obtained. Where the samples have been anonymised and consent cannot be obtained, provide justification for the use of these samples.

80 Will any samples be imported into New Zealand? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, provide evidence of permission of the donors for their material to be used in this research.

81 Will any samples go out of New Zealand? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, state where.

(Note this information must be included in the Information Sheet)

82 Describe any physiological tests/procedures that will be used.

83 Will participants be given a health-screening test prior to participation? (If yes, Yes ☐ No ☐
attach a copy of the health checklist)

Reminder: Attach the completed Screening Questionnaire and other attachments listed in Q5

SECTION M: DECLARATION *(Complete appropriate box)*

ACADEMIC STAFF RESEARCH

Declaration for Academic Staff Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. My Head of Department/School/Institute knows that I am undertaking this research. The information contained in this application is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

Staff Applicant's Signature

Date:

STUDENT RESEARCH

Declaration for Student Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and discussed the ethical analysis with my Supervisor. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants.

The information contained in this application is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

Student Applicant's Signature

Date:

Declaration for Supervisor

I have assisted the student in the ethical analysis of this project. As supervisor of this research I will ensure that the research is carried out according to the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants.

Supervisor's Signature

Date:

Print Name

GENERAL STAFF RESEARCH/EVALUATIONS

Declaration for General Staff Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and discussed the ethical analysis with my Line Manager. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. The information contained in this application is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

General Staff Applicant's Signature

Date:

Declaration for Line Manager

I declare that to the best of my knowledge, this application complies with the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and that I have approved its content and agreed that it can be submitted.

Line Manager's Signature

Date:

Print Name

TEACHING PROGRAMME

Declaration for Paper Controller

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the teaching programme as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. My Head of Department/School/Institute knows that I am undertaking this teaching programme. The information contained in this application is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

Paper Controller's Signature

Date:

Declaration for Head of Department/School/Institute

I declare that to the best of my knowledge, this application complies with the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and that I have approved its content and agreed that it can be submitted.

Head of Dept/School/Inst Signature

Date:

Print Name

Tena koe,

RE: Invitation to participate in Masters Research Project, Taimania Rickard

Following our earlier communication I have amended my research proposal and would like to once again extend an invitation to Te Runanga o Ngati Porou to participate. Outlined below is an explanation of the proposed project with relevant documents attached.

As previously mentioned, as part of my Master of Arts (Social Policy) qualification at Massey University I am completing a thesis. Previously this research was to focus on the implementation of Whānau Ora but due to the current progression of the policy I will now be focusing on current policy and practice in iwi social services. As a key organisation involved with the development and delivery of iwi social services in Te Tairāwhiti, I would like to formally invite Te Runanga o Ngati Porou to be the focus organisation for this research and seek permission to invite relevant staff to participate in interviews and focus groups.

The aim of this project is now to examine the current policies and practices regarding social service provision within an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These include; what services are currently offered by the organisation; what policies and practices are currently in place; how those policies and practices are reviewed and by whom; the methods of obtaining feedback from service users and how this feedback is used and staff expectations and preparations regarding the future implementation of Whānau Ora. It is hoped that this research will provide a place for those involved to constructively discuss their involvement/practice and add to the body of research regarding Māori social services. It is also hoped that this project may pave the way for future research.

Should Te Runanga o Ngati Porou accept this invitation to participate I would like to seek permission to conduct the interviews and focus groups during work hours. I would also like to seek permission to view organisational documents related to social service policy and practice. This may include policy documents, aggregated statistics and government contracts relating specifically to Whānau Ora. This will not include personnel files or personal information beyond workplace contact details such as work email addresses and telephone numbers of research participants. These are both areas that I would like to discuss the details of further with the relevant person or people.

As the next step in this process I would like to speak a relevant person or people to discuss the project in more detail and identify key people to participate in the study. Enclosed with this letter are information sheets intended for potential participants and draft interview and focus group question schedules. Please confirm receipt of this letter by returning a response in the envelope provided or by email to Taimania_rickard@hotmail.com. On receipt of your response I will personally contact TRONP. Please feel free to contact me regarding any aspect of this research project.

I can be reached during the day on 027 6538271 or in the evenings on 06 867 9936. I can also be reached by email at: taimania_rickard@hotmail.com.

My supervisors for this project are Rachael Selby and Awhina English from the School of Health and Social Services at Massey University. Their contact details are as follows:

If you have any queries you would like addressed by a supervisor, please contact Rachael in the first instance.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

Naku noa

Na, Taimania Rickard

Please note that:

- Interviews will be sound recorded and notes taken throughout. Responses in the interview will only be seen or heard by the researcher, and possibly a transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement
- Notes and sound recordings will be stored securely in a locked filing cabinet and in restricted access files on the researcher's personal computer. A copy of the transcripts will be given to participants for approval before they are used as part of the research findings. At the conclusion of the project the recordings and written transcripts will be destroyed unless participants request that they be returned or agree to them being kept in an official archive.
- The organisation not be named in the research unless permission is granted to the researcher to do so. Participants will likewise not be named without their permission. Where participants do not wish to be identified every effort will be made to keep their identity confidential.
- Once the project is complete you will be sent a summary of the research findings. The final research report will also be available for you to view on request. Should you wish it, the organisation will be given a copy of the final thesis.

Staff members are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If staff members decide to participate they have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;

- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- ask for the recording device to be turned off at any time during the interview;
- provide information on the understanding that their names will not be used unless they give permission to the researcher;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.

Committee Approval Statement

“This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 11/72. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Matthews, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz.”

[original letter of invitation]

Tena koe,

**Ko Hikurangi te maunga
Ko Waiapu te awa
Ko Ngati Porou te iwi
Ko Taimania Rickard toku ingoa**

As part of my Master of Arts (Social Policy) qualification at Massey University I am completing a thesis focusing on *Whānau Ora* and the potential impact it will have on the delivery of social services by Iwi and Māori organisations. As a key organisation involved with the development and delivery of *Whānau Ora* I would like to formally invite Te Runanga o Ngati Porou to be the focus organisation for this research and seek permission to invite relevant staff to participate in interviews and focus groups.

The aim of this project is to investigate how the implementation of *Whānau Ora* will impact upon the delivery and development of social services within an iwi based organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. As *Whānau Ora* as a specific policy is largely undefined, I am interested in exploring how an organisation shapes the idea of *Whānau Ora* as they implement it. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These are: the potential impact of *Whānau Ora*, the extent to which social service practice will or will not change as a result of *Whānau Ora*, the opportunities that *Whānau Ora* provides for improved service delivery, the challenges that *Whānau Ora* presents and ideas for overcoming these challenges. It is hoped that this research will provide a place for those involved in Whānau Ora to constructively discuss their involvement/practice and add to the body of research regarding Māori social services. It is also hoped that this project may pave the way for future research.

Should Te Runanga o Ngati Porou accept this invitation to participate I would like to seek permission to conduct the interviews and focus groups during work hours. I would also like to seek permission to view organisational documents related to Whānau Ora. This may include policy documents, aggregated statistics and government contracts relating specifically to Whānau Ora. This will not include personnel files or personal information beyond workplace contact details such as work email addresses and telephone numbers of research participants. These are both areas that I would like to discuss the details of further with the relevant person or people.

As the next step in this process I would like to speak a relevant person or people to discuss the project in more detail and identify key people to participate in the study. Enclosed with this letter are information sheets intended for potential participants and draft interview and focus group question schedules. Please confirm receipt of this letter by returning a response in the envelope provided or by email to Taimania_rickard@hotmail.com. On receipt of your response I will personally contact TRONP. Please feel free to contact me regarding any aspect of this research project.

I can be reached during the day on 027 6538271 or in the evenings on 06 867 9936. I can also be reached by email at: taimania_rickard@hotmail.com.

My supervisors for this project are Rachael Selby and Awhina English from the School of Health and Social Services at Massey University. Their contact details are as follows:

If you have any queries you would like addressed by a supervisor, please contact Rachael in the first instance.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

Naku noa

Na, Taimania Rickard

Please note that:

- Interviews will be sound recorded and notes taken throughout. Responses in the interview will only be seen or heard by the researcher, and possibly a transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement
- Notes and sound recordings will be stored securely in a locked filing cabinet and in restricted access files on the researcher's personal computer. A copy of the transcripts will be given to participants for approval before they are used as part of the research findings. At the conclusion of the project the recordings and written transcripts will be destroyed unless participants request that they be returned or agree to them being kept in an official archive.
- The organisation not be named in the research unless permission is granted to the researcher to do so. Participants will likewise not be named without their permission. Where participants do not wish to be identified every effort will be made to keep their identity confidential.
- Once the project is complete you will be sent a summary of the research findings. The final research report will also be available for you to view on request. Should you wish it, the organisation will be given a copy of the final thesis.

Staff members are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If staff members decide to participate they have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- ask for the recording device to be turned off at any time during the interview;
- provide information on the understanding that their names will not be used unless they give permission to the researcher;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.

Committee Approval Statement

"This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 11/72. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Matthews, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz."

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice

INFORMATION SHEET FOR INTERVIEWS

Tena koe,

Ko Hikurangi te maunga

Ko Waiapu te awa

Ko Ngati Porou te iwi

Ko Taimania Rickard toku ingoa

As part of my Master of Arts (Social Policy) qualification at Massey University I am completing a thesis focusing on policy and practice in iwi social services in anticipation of the implementation of Whānau Ora. You have been identified as a key person involved with the development and delivery of social services and related policy within your organisation and I would like to invite you to take part in this research.

The aim of this project is to examine the current policies and practices regarding social service provision within an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These include; what services are currently offered by the organisation; what policies and practices are currently in place; how those policies and practices are reviewed and by whom; the methods of obtaining feedback from service users and how this feedback is used and staff expectations and preparations regarding the future implementation of Whānau Ora. It is hoped that this research will provide a place for those involved to constructively discuss their involvement/practice and add to the body of research regarding Māori social services. It is also hoped that this project may pave the way for future research.

Should you choose to participate in this research I would like to conduct an interview with you of approximately one hour, at a time and location of your choice. There will also be an option to complete a half hour follow up interview in the week after the initial interview if you want to review or clarify any answers you give. A proposed interview schedule has been included with this information sheet.

Please note that:

- Interviews will be sound recorded and notes taken throughout. Your responses in the interview will only be seen or heard by the researcher, and possibly a transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement
- Notes and sound recordings will be stored securely in a locked filing cabinet. A copy of the transcripts will be given to you for your approval before they are used as part of the research findings. At the conclusion of the project the recordings and written transcripts will be destroyed unless you request that they be returned to you or you agree to them being kept in an official archive.
- You will not be named in the research unless you grant permission to the researcher to do so.

If you do not wish to be identified every effort will be made to keep your identity confidential.

- Once the project is complete you will be sent a summary of the research findings. The final research report will also be available for you to view at your request.

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- ask for the recording device to be turned off at any time during the interview;
- 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 project findings when it is concluded.

Please feel free to contact me regarding any aspect of this research project. If you wish to participate, please sign the enclosed consent form and post it to me in the attached envelope. When your consent form is received I will contact you about an interview time and about any questions you may have.

I can be reached during the day on 027 6538271 or in the evenings on 06 867 9936. I can also be reached by email at: taimania_rickard@hotmail.com.

My supervisors for this project are Rachael Selby and Awhina English from the School of Health and Social Services at Massey University. Their contact details are as follows:

If you have any queries you would like addressed by a supervisor, please contact Rachael in the first instance.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

Naku noa

Na, Taimania Rickard

Committee Approval Statement

"This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 11/72. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Matthews, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz."

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice

INFORMATION SHEET FOR FOCUS GROUPS

Tena koe,

Ko Hikurangi te maunga

Ko Waiapu te awa

Ko Ngati Porou te iwi

Ko Taimania Rickard toku ingoa

As part of my Master of Arts (Social Policy) qualification at Massey University I am completing a thesis focusing on policy and practice in iwi social services in anticipation of the implementation of Whānau Ora. You have been identified as a key person, involved with the development and/or delivery of social services and related policy within your organisation and I would like to invite you to take part in this research.

The aim of this project is to examine the current policies and practices regarding social service provision within an iwi organisation that is a member of a Whānau Ora Collective. This project will focus on a number of key areas. These include; what services are currently offered by the organisation; what policies and practices are currently in place; how those policies and practices are reviewed and by whom; the methods of obtaining feedback from service users and how this feedback is used and staff expectations and preparations regarding the future implementation of Whānau Ora. It is hoped that this research will provide a place for those involved to constructively discuss their involvement/practice and add to the body of research regarding Māori social services. It is also hoped that this project may pave the way for future research.

All community and social workers identified by your organisation as playing an important role in social service provision have been invited to participate. Should you choose to participate in this research I will conduct a focus group with you and your colleagues that also wish to participate. This will take approximately one hour and will take place at a time and location to be confirmed with the group. There will also be an option to complete a half hour follow up interview in the week after the initial focus group if you want to review or clarify any answers you give. A focus group question schedule has been included with this information sheet.

Please note that:

- Notes will be taken throughout the Focus group. Your responses in the focus group will only be seen or heard by the researcher, and possibly a transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement
- Notes will be stored securely in a locked filing cabinet and on the researcher's personal computer. A copy of the notes will be given to you for your information before they are used as part of the research findings. At the conclusion of the project the focus group notes will be destroyed unless you request that they be returned to you or all participants agree to them being kept in an official archive at TRONP. This will be open to discussion as the research progresses.
- All participants will be required to sign an agreement to keep information shared in the focus group by other participants confidential.

- You will not be named in the research unless you grant permission to the researcher to do so.

If you do not wish to be identified every effort will be made to keep your identity confidential.

- Once the project is complete you will be sent a summary of the research findings. The final research report will also be available for you to view at your request.

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during 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 project findings when it is concluded.

Please feel free to contact me regarding any aspect of this research project. If you wish to participate, please sign the enclosed consent form and post it to me in the attached envelope. When your consent form is received I will contact you about the focus group and about any questions you may have.

I can be reached during the day on 027 6538271 or in the evenings on 06 867 9936. I can also be reached by email at: taimania_rickard@hotmail.com.

My supervisors for this project are Rachael Selby and Awhina English from the School of Health and Social Services at Massey University. Their contact details are as follows:

If you have any queries you would like addressed by a supervisor, please contact Rachael in the first instance.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

Naku noa

Na, Taimania Rickard

Committee Approval Statement

"This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 11/72. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Matthews, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz."

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM - INDIVIDUAL

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 agree/do not agree to be named in the final thesis.

I agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded.

I wish/do not wish to have my recordings returned to me.

I wish/do not wish to have data placed in an official archive of Te Runanga o Ngati Porou.

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

Signature:

Date:

Full Name - printed

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT 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 agree not to disclose anything discussed in the Focus Group.

I agree/do not agree to be named in the final thesis.

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

Signature:

Date:

Full Name - printed

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Current policy and practice

- 1. Can you explain to me what your role is in terms of the development and delivery of social services?**

(How long have you been involved with social services within Te Runanga o Ngati Porou? Is the development and delivery of social services a primary or secondary role for you?)

- 2. How is social service policy developed within TRONP?**
- 3. Can you explain the process of developing and delivering an actual service?**
- 4. What makes TRONP social services unique?**
- 5. How are policies reviewed?**
- 6. How are services evaluated?**
- 7. What partnerships are in place between TRONP and other organisations in regards to social service development and delivery?**

Whānau Ora

- 8. Where is TRONP currently at in terms of Whānau Ora?**
- 9. Have there been any policy changes in anticipation of Whānau Ora?**
- 10. Have you noticed any change in the way your organisation delivers social services in anticipation of Whānau Ora?**

(Have your contracts for service changed? Are there any new services offered? Are there any new processes?)

- 11. Has the way your organisation interacts with other organisations changed in anticipation of Whānau Ora? How?**

(Is there more or less information sharing? Resource sharing? Collaboration?)

12. What do you think is the potential impact of Whānau Ora on your organisation and community of interest?

13. What challenges have you or your organisation faced so far in relation to Whānau Ora?

14. Do you anticipate any further challenges?

15. How do you think these challenges can be overcome?

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice

FOCUS GROUP QUESTION SCHEDULE

Social services: policy and practice

1. Whakawhanaungatanga: introductions and explanation of people's roles in regards to Social Services
2. Firstly, what social services do you each provide?
3. Are there any policies, organisational or governmental that inform your practice?
4. How do you gain feedback from service users and how do you use this?
5. How do you evaluate what you do?
6. What are the differences between the services you provide as an iwi provider and what you would consider a 'mainstream' service provider?
7. What makes Ngati Porou social services unique?

Whānau Ora

8. Have you noticed any change in the way your organisation delivers social services in anticipation of Whānau Ora?
9. Has the way your organisation interacts with other organisations changed in anticipation of Whānau Ora? How?
10. In your opinion, what opportunities does Whānau Ora provide for improved practice and service delivery?
11. What challenges have you or your organisation faced so far in relation to Whānau Ora?
12. Do you anticipate any further challenges?
13. How do you think these challenges can be overcome?

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
TRANSCRIBER'S CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I (Full Name - printed) agree to
transcribe the recordings provided to me.

I agree to keep confidential all the information provided to me.

I will not make any copies of the transcripts or keep any record of them, other than those
required for the project.

Signature: **Date:**

Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
AUTHORITY FOR THE RELEASE OF TRANSCRIPTS

I confirm that I have had the opportunity to read and amend the transcript of the interview(s) conducted with me.

I agree that the edited transcript and extracts from this may be used in reports and publications arising from the research.

Signature:

Date:

Full Name - printed

Appendix 2.

**Iwi Social Services: Policy and Practice
RESEARCH ASSISTANT'S CONFIDENTIALITY
AGREEMENT**

I (Full Name - printed) agree to
take notes during focus groups for this project.

I agree to keep confidential all the information provided to me.

I will not make any copies of the notes or keep any record of them, other than those required
for the project.

Signature:

.....

Date:

.....

Appendix 3.

Glossary of Māori terms

Hapū	Section of a large tribe, clan, secondary tribe
Hīnaki	Eel pot
Horouta Whanaunga Collective	Whānau Ora collective comprising iwi and affiliate organisations from Gisborne and the East Coast
Hui	Assembly, group, meeting
Hui Taumata	Māori economic summit
Iwi	Tribe
Kaihautū	Chief Executive
Kaimahi	Worker
Kaiti	Suburb of Gisborne in Ngāti Porou rohe
Karakia	Prayer
Kaupapa	Plan, scheme, proposal
Kaupapa Māori Research	Māori centred approach to research
Koha	Gift
Kōhanga Reo	Language nest – Māori language pre-school
Kura Kaupapa Māori	Māori immersion school
Mahi kai	Gathering food
Mahi rukuruku	Diving (in the ocean)
Mana Atua	Sacred spiritual power from the Atua (God)
Mana moana	Authority over the sea
Mana motuhake Ngāti Porou	Ngāti Porou autonomy
Mana tangata	Authority of people
Mana whenua	Authority associated with possession and occupation of tribal land
Māoritanga	Māori culture, practices and beliefs
Marae	The open area in front of a meeting house. Contemporary usage often includes buildings and area around the Marae
Mātauranga arm	Education and knowledge arm of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou
Mātauranga Ngāti Porou	Ngāti Porou knowledge
Mokopuna	Grandchildren/descendants
Ngāi Tahu	Tribal group with mana whenua over much of the South Island. The descendants of Tahu Pōtiki
Ngāti Porou	Tribal group with mana whenua from Gisborne to East Cape. The descendants of Porourangi.
Ngātis	Colloquial term for Ngāti Porou
Pākeha	European New Zealanders
Pēpeha	Tribal saying
Pōhiri	Formal welcome
Pōtaka	Township north of East Cape
<i>Puao-te-ata-tu.</i>	Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori perspective for the department of social welfare 1988
Rangatahi	Youth

Rohenga Tīpuna	Constituency based on ancestry
Rūnanga	Tribal authority (organisation)
Te Āo Māori	The Māori World
Te Araroa	East Cape town
Te Puni Kōkiri	Ministry of Māori Development
Te Reo Māori	The Māori language
Te Rūnanga o Tūrangānui a Kiwa	Tribal Authority representing tribes of the Gisborne area
Tikanga	Custom, protocol, procedure
Tino rangatiratanga	Self-determination
Tūrangānui	Gisborne. The full name, ‘Tūrangānui a Kiwa’ means the great standing place of Kiwa
Tūrangawaewae	Place where a person has rights of residence and belonging through descent
Uri	Descendants
Waiata	Song
Waikato-Tainui	Iwi with mana whenua in the Waikato area
Wānanga	Place of learning
Whakapapa	Genealogy
Whakatauki	Proverb
Whakatipu	To cause to grow
Whakawhanaungatanga	Process of establishing relationships
Whānau	Family group, extended family, common group
Whānau Ora	Holistic and collaborative approach to social service delivery centred on whānau
Whānau Oranga	Social service unit of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou
Whanaungatanga	Relationship, kinship
Whare Wānanga o Ngāti Porou	Ngāti Porou higher learning institution

