

Püao-te-Ata-tü and Mäori Social Work Methods

Äwhina Hollis

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Master of Arts

At the University of Otago, Dunedin,
New Zealand.

20 December 2005

Abstract

This research project critically engages with Māori social workers in order to develop an understanding of their practice methods and to ascertain whether they have changed since the 1980s. This will include a particular focus on the influences of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report (1986) on Māori practice methods and the perspectives of Māori social workers within social service organisations. Kaupapa Māori research and Qualitative methods inform this research project. Eight Māori social workers are interviewed and their discourses are examined in relation to the changing cultural, political and economic environment in the 1980's. The findings show that Māori social work methods are underpinned by tikanga Māori and that these have not changed significantly since the 1980's. The Pūao-te-Ata-tū report was also found to be highly influential to Māori social work in general, however it did not have a direct effect on the practice methods of Māori social workers. The research project concludes with recommendations from both the participants and the researcher. These recommendations lay emphasis on the importance of educational institutions and social service organisations implementing the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report and tikanga as a means of improving services for Māori.

Preface

*Tēnā rā koutou i raro i ngā manaakitanga o te Atua.
 Tuatahi, e te hunga kua whetūrangitia e hinga mai nā, e hinga atu nei, e ngā mate,
 haere koutou, haere koutou, haere koutou.
 E ngā kanohi ora o rātou kua wehe atu, tēnā koutou katoa.*

*Ko Hikurangi te Maunga
 Ko Waiapu te Awa
 Ko Horouta te Waka
 Ko Taharora te Marae
 Ko te Whānau a Rakairoa te Hapū
 Ko Ngāti Porou te Iwi*

*Ko Puketapu te Maunga
 Ko Ngaruroro te Awa
 Ko Takitimu te Waka
 Ko Omahu te Marae
 Ko Ngāti Hinemanu te Hapū
 Ko Ngāti Kahungunu te Iwi*

*Ko Hans raua ko Maryanne ōku Mātua
 Ko Rangituhia toku Tungane
 Ko Chris taku Hoa Rangatira
 E noho ana māua ki Otepoti.*

This research project is greatly influenced by my age, gender, whānau, culture and capabilities as the researcher. The above pepeha introduces my two main iwi affiliations, the others being Whakatōhea and Te Whānau-a-Apanui. My whakapapa also includes Irish, Italian, Scottish and English ancestry. I am not a long-term practitioner, but a ‘mokopuna’ in relation to Māori social workers. For this reason, this research project is undertaken from the point of view of a mokopuna who hopes that the wealth of knowledge of her participants is in some ways beneficial, both for other young Māori social workers beginning in this area and for others interested in the development of iwi and cultural social services.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the debt I owe to the social workers that participated in this research project. It would not have been possible without your support, so to you, I send many thanks. I would also like to show my appreciation for the staff at the Community and Family Studies Department, especially to Anaru Eketone who has been a much-respected mentor throughout my years of training. To Christopher English, your positive influence, guidance and support has had a lasting effect on more than just my grammar and spelling (no puns intended!) Finally, thanks mum and dad for your constant love and care, this is for you.

Table of Contents

Title page	i
Abstract	ii
Preface	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Introduction: Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori social work methods	1
Chapter One: An Historical Overview	6
Introduction	6
Māori Social Development in New Zealand	6
Pūao-te-Ata-tū	13
Further Iwi and Cultural Social Policy	17
Conclusion	20
Chapter Two: Theoretical and Literature Review	21
Introduction	21
What is Constructivism?	21
Themes of Constructivism	22
Constructivism and the New Zealand Context	23
Constructivism and Other Theories	24
What is Kaupapa Māori Theory?	25
Themes of Kaupapa Māori Theory	26
Kaupapa Māori Theory in a Social Work Context	28
Kaupapa Māori Theory and Other Theories	28
Tikanga and Māori Social Work Practice Methods	29
Contemporary Māori Methods of Social Work Practice	33
Summary	36
Chapter Three: Methodology	37
Introduction	37
Definitions	38
A Qualitative Approach	41
Kaupapa Māori Research put into Practice	42
Insider – Outsider Discourse	45
The Methodological Process	47
Consultation	48
Selecting Participants	49
My Position as a Researcher	53
Questionnaire	54
Interviews	56
Analysis	58

Problems, Ethics: Identity, Resources	58
Solutions	59
Chapter Four: Themes from the Narratives	60
Traditional Māori Concepts and Practices Used by Māori Social Workers	61
Surrounding Influences That Have Caused Changes To Māori Methods of Practice	65
Descriptions of Social Service Organisations before Pūao-te-Ata-tū	67
Māori Methods Before and After Pūao-te-Ata-tū	70
Improving Support for Māori Social Work Methods	71
How to Better Support Māori Social Workers and Māori Methods of Practice	77
Tūturu Māori	81
Chapter Five: An Analysis of Themes from the Narratives	85
Traditional Concepts Used by Māori Social Workers:	
Theme One	86
Other Issues	88
Surrounding Influences: Theme Two	91
Social Services Before Pūao-te-Ata-tū: Theme Three	92
Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Changing Methods of Practice:	
Theme Four	93
Māori Methods Since Pūao-te-Ata-tū: Theme Five	94
How to Better Support Māori Social Workers: Theme Six	95
Research Questions and Implications for Māori Social Workers	97
Discussion	99
Chapter Six: Conclusions	102
The Participant's Recommendations	102
The Researcher's Conclusions	105
Research Question One	106
Research Question Two	106
Research Question Three	107
Research Question Four	107
To Māori Social Workers...	107
To Social Service Organisations...	108
To Education Institutes...	108
To Policy Makers...	108
Further Questions	109
Selected Bibliography	110
Appendix One: Letter to Participants	126
Appendix Two: Consent Form	127
Appendix Three: Questionnaire	128
Appendix Four: Letter from Māori Consultation Committee	129

Introduction: Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori Social Work Methods

Social work is a profession, a community of people who share a common goal of always seeking new ways to assist people... at certain times the profession has to attend very closely to the needs of the individual, and at other times to the social order. If you only talk about what can be achieved by changing the structure then you are going to miss the individual. The two are inseparable and must go hand in hand.

- (Hancock, 1994:9).

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was a report, presented by the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective in 1986, to the then Minister of Social Welfare, the Honourable Ann Hercus. The aim of this report was to recommend to the Ministry of Social Welfare the ways in which they could better support Māori clients and address the social needs of the Māori¹ people. Pūao-te-Ata-tū was the first official government document that acknowledged Māori social work methods and recommended their use.

This research project critically engages with Māori social workers² in order to develop an understanding of their practice methods and the ways in which the Pūao-te-Ata-tū policy document has affected them. The epigraph at the beginning of this chapter explains the dual focus of this research. As Hancock (1994) states, social workers cannot separate the individual from the social context, and vice versa. Hence, this research highlights the Pūao-te-Ata-tū social report and measures its impact at an individual level.

Western theorists and writers have consistently defined and advocated individually focused methods appropriate to the field of philanthropic work. Social work in a Western context stems from an altruistic philosophy based on a humanitarian

¹ 'Māori' the generic term is used in this research project, as opposed to the term 'Tangata Whenua' or stating the specific iwi (Terms and definitions used in this project will be further discussed in Chapter Three).

² The term 'social worker' is used in this research to describe a person working for a social service organisation, in the state, private or voluntary sector whose role within the organisation is as a social worker, youth worker, or community worker.

approach. According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica (Webster, 2004 CD-ROM) this involves dispensing or receiving aid from funds set aside for humanitarian purposes. More recent post-modern methods have developed and have greatly influenced the emergence of indigenous theories into social policy. However, it should be noted that indigenous theoretical thought did not originate from Western post-modern developments; indigenous theory has existed as long as the people themselves have existed.

In the New Zealand setting the first pioneers and early missionaries brought with them a set of values, processes, principles, philosophies and practice honed as it were in the cultural milieu of Mother England, the Empire, the Charity Organisation Society and the Church Missionary Society. These early practitioners were products of their time, as we today are products of both our time and theirs (Hakiaha, 1997:12).

The journey of indigenous paradigms through colonisation, assimilation and the more recent 'Paternalistic Emancipation' has left indigenous methods in the spotlight of social researchers and theorists. Hokowhitu (2004:xxiv) describes how the portrayal of Māori concepts in Pākehā discourse can have a negative affect on society's view of the Māori people. He states, "The inclusion of Māori words into philosophies to give an air of biculturalism, while insidiously misrepresenting Māori culture to Māori and students has a lasting and negative effect." Consequently a key question is: have Māori methods been affected beyond recognition or do they still hold the fundamentals of the theories of the past? This research will attempt to argue that Māori methods of altruism have remained the same throughout the years of cultural unrest, regardless of Western philosophical changes and developments.

This researcher agrees with Henare (1999:40) who states, "The lessons of the past and the values imbued in cultural practices constitute a general corpus of Māori knowledge, particularly sacred knowledge, which serves as a guide for the future." Therefore, the Māori knowledge instilled in social work systems will be examined and used to channel the path of this research.

The analysis of interpersonal (Micro) methods will not be from the 'traditional' Western perspective of the Planned Change Process, where interaction between the client and worker is divided into three stages: the beginning (assessment), the middle (intervention) and the end (termination) (Shannon and Young, 2004:20). The omission

of a Western practice-method structure is founded on the belief that Māori and indigenous methods are not necessarily based on this three-stage structure. Rather than defining Māori processes and concepts in relation to non-Māori methods, this research maintains the use of Māori terminology and structures so that the essence of the results is not enveloped by Western discourse.

Ruwhiu (1995:21) proposes three concepts/tools of engagement that are more relevant as a means of assessing Māori social work methods than those from a Western perspective:

Whakapapa [Know where you come from, not only physically and spiritually, but also ideologically and how that influences who you are]. Whakawhitiwhiti kōrero [Be prepared to enter into dialectical debate and discussion], Manaakitanga me ngā mahi a ringa [Know when to ‘Work’ the ‘Talk’], and so on.

Therefore, when approaching Māori social workers and inquiring about their methods it is preferable to keep these tools in mind as a structure instead of the Planned Change Process (Shannon and Young, 2004:20).

There are six chapters in this research project: **Chapter One** is an historical overview, introducing the reader to the context in which this project takes place. In accordance with a Constructivist approach (later discussed), this research considers the wider context of Māori social workers by examining the New Zealand cultural and political environment. This involves studying the cultural, political and economic climate changes in relation to Māori social workers in the 1980’s. This includes Pūao-Ata-tū and further iwi/cultural policy.

Chapter Two consists of a Literature and Theoretical Review, including an examination of Māori social work methods. This chapter contains two parts. The first part includes a discussion of a ‘Constructivist’ approach and ‘Kaupapa Māori theory’, both of which will later be used to analyse the collected data presented in Chapter Five. Following a discussion of Kaupapa Māori theory there is an examination of a particular range of Māori methods and practice models. This examination begins with an analysis of traditional concepts and the ways ‘tikanga Māori’ relate to social work. This is followed by a discussion of contemporary developments. Chapter Two is then summarised and the research questions that guide this project are presented here, as they were developed from the literature and theoretical review.

The Methodology in **Chapter Three** opens in a similar way to Chapter Two. It begins with a discussion of particular words and common terms, such as definitions of ‘methods’, ‘social work’ and ‘concepts.’ The researcher discusses the critical approach and explains the purpose of this research. Two theoretical approaches used to describe research strategies inform the research methods of this project. Firstly, Kaupapa Māori theory is discussed in relation to the methods undertaken in this research. In this chapter, Kaupapa Māori theory is concerned with both the step-by-step processes used by the researcher and the ways in which it affected the research. Ultimately this discussion ranges from the choice of research processes at the interviews to the ways in which the information is presented in this research.

Secondly, a qualitative methodological focus informs this research. The various characteristics of a qualitative approach, such as depth interviews and participant observations inform the processes undertaken by the researcher. Following this description of the methodological background, Chapter Three discusses the exact processes followed in this research. It was evident that the participants brought life to the research project that only existed on paper up until this point. Finally, the particular problems that arose in relation to research methods will be discussed together with suggested solutions.

Chapter Four entails the interview results, (from the eight Māori social workers) and the discussion of themes and issues that arose in the interviews. The participants provided an abundance of information; so much in fact that it was decided selected extracts would be used instead of whole transcripts. Participants were given a pseudonym derived from the Māori alphabet and their information has been presented in accordance with the structure of the questionnaire.

Chapter Five is an analysis of the interview findings. There were a number of significant themes that arose in the interviews and these are discussed in more depth in this chapter. This chapter analyses the themes in relation to the theoretical underpinnings of the research, that is Kaupapa Māori theory and Constructivism. The themes are also related to the topics in Chapter Two’s literature review; Māori methods, change in the 1980’s political climate, and iwi and cultural policy.

Chapter Six addresses the research questions developed in Chapter Two. Both the researcher and the participants suggest ways that improvements could potentially be

made to better support Māori social workers and their methods of practice. The chapter discusses the issues that arose from the interviews, such as the need for sustainable social policy, and proposes ways of developing resources, networks and associated areas. Chapter Six attempts an optimistic ending to this research by acknowledging the positive changes and hard work of a number of people within the community that have not yet had their stories heard.

Finally, this chapter suggests a relatively simple method of approach for improving the use and the effect of Māori social work methods, and brings the reader back to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This research advocates not only the acknowledgement of Pūao-te-Ata-tū at all levels (Macro, Micro and Meso) but also the implementation of it in a form that is sustainable but still open to change. A fundamental issue with the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report is summarised in the words of one participant: *“Why write a brilliant report if you do not implement it.”*

Chapter One: An Historical Overview

Introduction

In order to set the context for this research project, the following chapter is an introduction to the historical events that influenced the formation of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report and Māori social work methods. It begins by discussing Māori social development in the years leading up to the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report. There is then a thorough discussion of Pūao-te-Ata-tū followed by further social policies that impacted on Māori social work. This enables the reader to develop an understanding of the focus of this project, being on Māori social development and social services, particularly as provided by government agencies.

Māori Social Development in New Zealand

Before looking at the 1980's, one needs to analyse the changes through the 1930's, 1940's until the 1970's in order to briefly introduce the significance of the changes in the 1980's. According to King (2003:469) Māori leaders, such as Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck developed a 'cultural revival programme' in the 1930's that would seek to keep Māori living in rural areas, separate from urban-based Pākehā. Ngata's aim was to protect and reassert mana Māori in traditional rohe. His goal was to keep Māori in areas they were accustomed to, as he was concerned that Māori were not "adequately prepared to resist the 'temptations' of town life - alcohol, unsupervised access to members of the opposite sex, potential contact with a Pākehā criminal underclass". King states that following World War II these aims would prove difficult to uphold, as Māori demographics would change significantly (2003:470).

King (2003:471) states that the generations following that of Ngata and Buck challenged the notion that the best way of preserving whānau ways of life was through agriculture. From the 1940's onward, through exposure to different ways of life and the extra responsibilities of World War II, men such as Arapeta Awatere, James Henare, Rangi Royal, Charles Bennett, Bill Herewini, Moana Raureti, Harry Dansey and John

Rangihau returned with altered hopes and expectations for themselves and the future of their people (ibid).

One major change for the Department of Native Affairs in 1945 was the establishment of approximately 500 tribal committees formed to consider issues of Education, Health and employment (Orange, 2000:24). However Orange states that Peter Fraser (the then Prime Minister and initiator of the committees) had the unrealistic assumption that the tribal committees could harness the energies of the War effort and develop into a measure of self-government. She states that the power given to tribal groups was only at a local level and was divorced from any responsibility for the development of a sound economic base for Māori (ibid).

According to Walker, by 1951 19% of the Māori population was living in urban areas (1990:197). Walker states that one of the consequences of urbanisation is that the metropolitan society increases one's knowledge of how a culture can become alienated and how a people can become assimilated (1990:209). According to Bradley, the fact that the majority of Māori people were living out of their hapū or tribal area, did not affect the way in which they identified. He states that a great number of urban Māori were identifying with their iwi rather than with the generic term "Māori." This included many people who were born out of the area they whakapapa to and had never yet visited (1997:3).

One occurrence that had a significant impact on Māori development, an initiative of the Native Department, later known as the Department of Māori Affairs, was the employment of Māori Welfare Officers. According to Craig (1958) Monty Wikiriwhi and Charles Bennet, former members of the Māori Battalion, were early Māori Welfare Officers, in the 1950's. Monty Wikiriwhi, a former intelligence officer worked with the Māori community through his Welfare position while also being president of the 28th Māori Battalion Association. Charles Bennet was appointed controller of Māori welfare in 1956 and Secretary in 1963, and wrote comprehensively on the role of Māori welfare officers. He also proposed guiding principles for tribal committees, executives and people working in the area of Māori development. He recommended three areas as focus points for Māori development: improved education, employment and housing (ibid). According to Te Ao Hou, it was "a long statement, if fully printed here, it would occupy almost an entire issue of Te Ao Hou" resulting in it

being inaccessible through this publication (The Ministry of Māori Affairs, 1956-1963). According to Jamison and Royal (2003) the employment of Māori in significant roles within the Department meant that the welfare officers had a relatively large amount of autonomy to support its people while working under the guise of the state.

In 1960 the Hunn Report, commissioned but not actioned by the Labour Government under Walter Nash, represented the first official recognition that Māori urbanisation was occurring and that the way in which they were unprepared was causing problems in New Zealand towns and cities. J. K. Hunn, the then Secretary of Māori Affairs made the report for the Department of Māori Affairs, hence 'the Hunn Report' (King, 2003:482; Bateman, 2005:417).

The report stated, "If Māori do not accept equality at the highest educational level they would debar themselves of their own volition, from entry to many walks of life" (Bateman, 2005:417). Butterworth and Young (1990) state that the report called for an accounting of Māori assets and how they could be used for the betterment of Māori. Bateman states that this report paved the way to progress in housing, health and employment, however these developments were not results of the report itself, as King (2003:482) states, the then Prime Minister Walter Nash was "a notorious procrastinator and simply put the report away in a draw". It is perhaps Nash's lack of action and the wording of the report that encouraged Māori protest.

The recommendations of this report were not supported by many Māori spokespersons because of the assumptions and intention that the ideal future of New Zealand would consist of the blending of the Māori and Pākehā cultures (ibid). This was evident in McRae's statement when she writes, "Pākehā legislators knew little of the nature of the local Māori organisation which they approved, and did not write legislation that was in accordance with its spirit" (McRae, 1993:287). One positive initiative to come out of the report was the setting up of the Māori Education Foundation and the extension of trade training schemes for Māori (Metge, 2001:34; King, 2003:482). This meant that many Māori could be trained in various apprenticeships, in some cases receiving hostel accommodation and pre-employment courses, especially those who were new to city life. This was a progressive move for Māori of the generation, however, it was not continued in the 1980's and 1990's and the

next generation were not always able to build on their parents' success (Keenan, 1995:11; Metge, 2001:32; Gifford, 2003:2, King, 2003:483).

The assumption of the Hunn Report and many Pākehā, including the politicians at the time, that integration in fact meant assimilation (assimilation which required Māori to become Pākehā) led to a rise in Māori remonstrance (King, 2003:484). The 1970's were witness to a dramatic upsurge in Māori activism, which had a profound effect on New Zealand society (Harris, 2004:60). Walker, Harris and King also discuss how protests occurred long before the 1970's or the 1980's, through groups such as the Māori Organisation On Human Rights (MOOHR), Te Hokioi, Ngā Tamatoa and other Māori who were generally discussing how the Crown had breached rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. This led to events that were later called the Māori renaissance (Walker, 1990:212; King, 2003:483; Harris, 2004:60).

Even in the early 1970's Māori had not yet received acknowledgement from the government of their rights within New Zealand society. After James Carroll (1899) and Apirana Ngata (1928) were the first Māori Ministers of Māori Affairs (under the title of Minister of Native Affairs) it was not until the 1970's that there was another Māori Minister of Māori Affairs. Since the 1970's the Labour party has consistently employed a Māori member of their party to this position as the Minister of Māori Affairs, however the National Party has not always done this.

In 1975, Dame Whina Cooper launched a Māori land March movement and called the organisation 'Te Roopu o te Matakite,' arguing that 'not one more acre of Māori land' be taken (Walker, 1990:214; Nash, 2001:39). Two years later, in 1977, Joe Hawke led the Orakei Māori Action Group on an occupation of Bastion Point, to stop the subdivision of land that was wrongfully taken by the state. Eva Rickard and the Tainui Awhiro people held multiple occupations of their land that had been taken during World War II to make an emergency airstrip. This land consisted of the people's marae, land and most importantly, urupā. Following the war, the land had been leased to the Raglan Gold Club rather than being returned to its people (ibid).

According to Walker (1990:212), King (2003:483) and Harris (2004:60) these protest groups as well as many others (the Waitangi Action Committee (WAC), He Taua, the Māori peoples Liberation Movement and the Black Women's Movement), worked together, often supporting each other's causes in order to be heard. These

groups made Waitangi Day and the Treaty of Waitangi focal points for protest (ibid). A common sight on the streets of New Zealand was political graffiti such as the statement below:

“The Cheaty of Waitangi”³

Due to the shifting aspirations of the Māori populace, organisations such as church-based groups, councils, committees, urban authorities and educational trusts were formed (Durie, 1998:227). All these initiative had the well being of Māori in mind, even though the fundamental beliefs and perspectives of the people involved were varied. Organisations such as these were viewed through a critical eye by Māori and by the state because they came from a group that were either non-Māori, having little understanding of tikanga, or were third sector organisations, or voluntary (Bradley, J. 1995:27).

Bateman (2005:611) relates that social welfare was formerly known as ‘Social Security’ and was a characteristic of the philosophy of the Welfare state. He states that social services became “bogged down” with bureaucracy during the 1970’s and the 1980’s leading to a shift towards less sympathy for those members of society who were economically disadvantaged (Bateman, 2005:612).

According to G. Smith (2003:2) the 1980’s produced a range of societal change for Māori, some of which are still making an impact in the 21st Century. He states that when considering these changes as a ‘cultural revolution’ one must not espouse the interpretation that the revolution was founded on “the stunning language revolution” (use of Māori terminology by government organisations). He states these were outward visual signs of a more profound revolution.

The real revolution of the 1980’s was a shift in mindset of large numbers of Māori people – a shift away from waiting for things to be done to them, to doing things for themselves (Smith, 2003:2).

Kaye (2001:4) adds there was also a shift in mindset of the general New Zealand population that was influenced by the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand. In July 1977 the Commonwealth placed a ban known as ‘the Gleneagles Agreement’ on all

³ An example of Graffiti in the early 1980’s (cited in Walker, 1990:221).

sporting contact with South Africa because of its immoral apartheid system. Mourie (2005:5) states the New Zealand Rugby Football Union were determined to proceed with the long-planned tour and that the then Prime Minister Robert Muldoon was using the tour as a “political football.” Muldoon permitted the tour to go ahead, which resulted in Twenty-one Nations protesting this breach of the Gleneagles Agreement as well as protests in many areas of New Zealand (ibid).

For many of those against [the tour], the issue was about the immoral white rule in South Africa, but for others, the tour was also a timely reminder of New Zealand’s own unresolved colonial past (M. Kaye 2001:5)

Māori political groups used the change in the mindset of the general public to turn the focus on to institutional racism within New Zealand.

In the early 1980’s, according to Shirley (1979:101), there was little understanding from the state with regards to Māori systems and customs. “Welfare agencies... had no understanding of Māori society, its values or its aspirations, and little appreciation of its support networks.” This is a general description of social service in the 1980’s that portrays predominantly monocultural characteristics (Shirley, 1979:101; New Zealand Official Yearbooks, 1984-1992; Rimene, 1994:100; Durie, 1997:2; King, 2003:499).

In support of the notion that social service organisation in the early 1980’s were predominantly monocultural, it is noted that there is no discussion of Māori people in the Social Services section of the New Zealand Official Yearbook until the year 1990. Before that date the discussion of Māori community service and iwi development is sectioned under the “Māori population” section, which is later called the “Māori Society” section (New Zealand Official Yearbooks, 1984-1992). However in 1992 a description of Mātua Whāngai and other initiatives features under the social services section rather than under that called the ‘Māori population’.

Levine (2001:163) describes the 1980s as being significant when assessing change in relation to Māori developmental initiatives. As a result of complex political negotiation and “an actively protesting, growing and overwhelmingly urban Māori population” the New Zealand government began to address grievances and Māori aspirations through bicultural policy implementation (Kelsey, 1990; 1991; Levine, 2001:163).

According to Durie (2003:123), from 1984 onward, the process of dismantling the welfare state was begun. He states that the effect on Māori was immense, “almost overnight Māori unemployment sky-rocketed to more than 20%”(ibid). However, Durie states that while the demise of the Welfare state had negative effects on Māori, the free-market environment had unexpected benefits for them. The Hui Taumata in 1984 introduced “closing the gaps” policies, which prescribed a decade of positive Māori development (Kawharu, 2001:2; Durie, 2003:123). This iwi development was incorporated into the fourth Labour Governments Māori policy alongside devolution (Durie, 1998:224).

In 1985 the Department of Māori Affairs, Social Welfare and Justice launched the Mātua Whāngai Programme nationally as an alternative means of addressing social issues encountered by Māori young people and their families (Bradley, 1995). (This will be discussed further in the discussion of the Child Young Persons and their Families Act, 1989).

Under section 13 of the department of Social Welfare Act (1985), the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare was established. This committee called a number of hui all over the country to discuss a common concern that Social Welfare had ceased to function neutrally and was not supportive of Māori aspirations (Keenan, 1995:11).

One could argue that as a government committee it was never neutral because it was fundamentally mono-cultural in organisational structure and practice, however the advising committee was not a mono-cultural arm of the Department of Social Welfare. The state’s role in caring for neglected and dependent children had in Worrell’s terms reflected the “Pākehā monocultural philosophy that has undergirded the law and welfare services in New Zealand.” Keenan adds, “The Department was a racist and hierarchical institution,” a notion that was supported by The Women’s Anti-Racist Action Group, which consisted of a group of Welfare Department staff formed in 1985. Dreardon (1997:6) adds that the continued lack of knowledge regarding Whānau, hapū and iwi by Social Workers has been an historic issue for Māori and has been an area where the social service organisations need to continue to develop.

It was uncommon, even in the 1980’s, for the state to consult directly with Māori communities, excluding the Department of Māori Affairs; other state sectors

would merely consult the Māori Affairs department on aspects of its work rather than consult prior to policy drafting. Nonetheless, the Ministerial Advisory committee, made up of respected and well-known members of the Social Services and the Māori community travelled the country, acknowledging the hostility between the state and Māori and taking on board suggestions that radically different approaches would be needed if the Department were to ever address the needs of the Māori client group. The consultation undertaken by the committee was the largest ever, only overtaken by the immense size of the He Tirohanga Rangapu consultation of Koro Wetere and the Department of Māori Affairs two years later, in 1987 (Durie, 1998:224).⁴

Pūao-te-Ata-tū

In 1986, the Ministerial Advisory on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare produced a report named Pūao-te-Ata-tū (day break). The report was requested by the Minister of Social Welfare, Anne Hercus, in order to develop an understanding of aspects of the Social Welfare Department that are failing to address the needs of the Māori people. The report consisted of findings that came out of the discussion at the previously stated hui.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū contained statistical data, related to the disproportionately high numbers of Māori in the welfare system, statistics regarding infant mortalities as well as commentary from the hui discussions. There were also thirteen recommendations from the report, which discussed areas the Committee felt were not adequately addressing the needs of Māori (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective, 1986:9).

The development of Pākehā institutions, in the 1950's especially, those of "Responsible" Government, transformed our own transformation. The Māori experience, since those institutions became dominant, has been one of recurring cycles of conflict and tension against a backdrop of ongoing deprivation. This has drained the Māori spiritually and physically. It finds expression today in our atrocious levels of social dependency (ibid).

⁴ He Tirohanga Rangapu was a discussion paper proposing the demise of the Department of Māori Affairs with many of its functions being subsumed by iwi. "They [iwi] are strong, sophisticated systems of cooperation and community effort and as such it has been advocated that they provide an appropriate means of delivering government programmes to Māori people" (cited in Durie, 1998:224).

The first recommendation provided a social policy objective, which should be endorsed by the government for the development of all Social Welfare policy in New Zealand. The objective was for the Department to attack all forms of cultural racism. This involved the development of a society where the values of all groups are of central importance, not only that of the dominant group. To do this, the report suggested the Department provide leadership and programmes which encourage this, and incorporate values, cultures and beliefs of the Māori people in all policies developed in the future of New Zealand.

It was also recommended that the Department “attacks and eliminates deprivation and alienation” (ibid). The proposed ways of doing so included, allocating equitable shares of resources and sharing power and authority over the use of resources as well as through ensuring legislation is passed which recognises social, cultural and economic values of all cultures, especially Māori, and develops strategies, which harness the potential of all people to advance.

Today we are faced with a burgeoning support for tribal authorities and they are changing themselves to meet a wider range of responsibilities among our people. They are asserting their authority with increasing vigour. A respect for those enduring demands that Māoris should control Māoridom and make the decisions for themselves must be an essential ingredient of any conclusions we come to about future directions in Social Welfare. This report embraces both the past and the present so that we can sharpen our vision of the future (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective, 1986:70).

The third recommendation suggested that the Social Security Commission be abolished and replaced with the Social Welfare Commission that would, among other things, consult with tribal authorities in a National hui at least annually. It was also hoped that a number of amendments be made to The Social Welfare Act 1971; The Social Security Act, 1964 and The Children and Young Person Act 1974 to include the acceptance of tikanga Māori and seek to support Māori methods of practice and culture. Recommendations of ways the Department could support Māori were; the acceptance of a “Māori custom marriage,” the benefit supplement being available for children who are transferred from their parents to grandparents or other relatives, including orphans and that the Whānau, hapū and iwi be consulted and have a voice throughout the process.

Recommendation Six highlighted the importance of tribal committees being involved in the nominations to Management Committees and for children to be able to

visit tribal areas to gain knowledge of the history and nature of the area they are from. The Seventh recommendation stated: “the Mātua Whāngai programme in respect of children, shall return to its original focus of nurturing children within the family group.” It stated that additional funding is needed and that reimbursement grants for volunteers be increased to a realistic level.

The additional recommendations described ways the Departments could work together to improve skills and work experience for young people in order to harness their social and cultural skills for employment opportunities. When hiring staff for the organisations, a person with knowledge of Māoritanga should be on the interviewing panel so that staff are hired who have the necessary skills to relate to the Māori community. Also, it was recommended that the department provide additional training. This included the Department taking steps to improve the training of its staff through training courses and ensuring that the appropriate people are teaching those courses. The Department should also adequately make provisions for the staff that have to cover for other staff away on programmes and also for the people offering the programmes. This related specifically to Māori who are not employed by the department but who offer assistance with Māori clients.

According to Durie (1998:224), a significant outcome of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was the Mātua Whāngai programme that sought to keep Māori children within the whānau environment rather than under department control. He states that it was an important attempt by the state to recognise the significance of Māori values and customs. While it was poorly resourced, it did endeavour to address the significance of the whānau, hapū and iwi structure for the nurturance of children.

Keenan (1995:11) summarises the thirteen recommendations, stating that at the heart of the report was the question of whether the Social Welfare Department would commit to a programme of reform, basically founded on the partnership principle of the Treaty of Waitangi. While the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report highlighted areas the Department could improve upon, it also distinguished areas where the Department was institutionally causing harm (Bradley, 1997:3). Bradley says the report found the state responsible for institutional child abuse (ibid). Nash (2001:39) adds that the report found the Department of Social Welfare guilty of institutional, cultural and personal racism. Implicit in the report was the conviction that Māori had been deprived of

satisfactory policy, services and resources to encourage Māori development and advancement of child based Whānau, hapū and iwi (ibid).

Changes were demanded by Māori to both policy and practice. Following a decade of debate a workable policy was successfully produced where Māori concepts of child Welfare and family well-being became the norm and were no longer seen as the alternative. The policy became the Child Young Person and Their Families Act, 1989 (Bradley, 1997:3).

The impact of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was immense, especially taking into consideration that the Labour Government at the time was seeking to give greater recognition to the Treaty of Waitangi (Durie 1998:223). Given that Māori had previously regarded the Mātua Whāngai initiative with some hostility (Keenan 1995:11) the programme was a priority for discussion at the hui around the country. Here, the Committee and Māori sought to find an agreeable form of implementation.

According to Rimene (1994:103) the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report adequately addressed the social position of Māori, while analysing the relationship between Māori and the state. However, she gives a critical description of the report in relation to the then Department of Social Welfare (DSW). She states,

It showed that institutional racism was, and, in the opinion of this research, still is, ingrained in DSW... Pūao-te-Ata-tū made recommendations, which have not been implemented. DSW, on the other hand, claims to be implementing Pūao-te-Ata-tū (Rimene, 1994:103-104).

This indictment highlights the need to address the implementation of the report. Margaret Bazley, the Director-General of Social Welfare in 1994, acknowledged that the Department of Social Welfare had an initial surge of bicultural development that had not been sustained. She explains how future initiatives would maintain the application of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the State Sector Act of 1988, not necessarily the recommendation of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report (Department of Social Welfare, 1994:1-2).

Shannon (1991:73) describes the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report as ‘proposing’ a major reorganisation of the control of the Department of Social Welfare, and highlights the recommendation that more autonomy was to be given to local communities, consisting

of Māori and Pākehā in equal proportions. He continues that, “[this] resulted only in emasculated, ‘advisory’ District Executive Committees, since abolished as a waste of money – as indeed they were” (Shannon, 1991:105). Shannon summarises the dilemma of Pūao-te-Ata-tū merely being a ‘report’ with ‘recommendations’ when he states, “this was perhaps the classic case of a positive development being perverted by the inability of current power holders to cede power” (1991:105), a state of affairs which inevitably inhibits the hopes and expectation of Māori who supported this report.

Nash’s evaluation is that Pūao-te-Ata-tū ‘influenced’ the following Acts and legislation, such as the Child Young Persons and their Families Act (1989) rather than the Act being the recommendation of the report put into action (2001:28). Thus, through the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū the Children Young Persons and Their Families Act put into place the Mātua Whāngai programme and further social policy reports and legislation reflected the hopes of iwi and Māori social workers.

Further Iwi and Cultural Social Policy:

The purpose of the Children Young Persons and Their Families Act was to, “Advance the well-being of children and young persons as members of families, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family groups” and also to, “Make provisions for families, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family groups to receive assistance in caring for their children and young people” (Bradley, 1997:3).

The aim was for the Act to have regard for the needs, values and beliefs of particular ethnic groups and for workers to be “sensitive to the cultural perspectives and aspirations of different racial groups in the community” in a way that “assists parents, families, whānau, hapū, iwi and family groups to discharge their responsibilities to prevent their children and young persons suffering harm, ill-treatment, abuse, neglect or deprivation” (ibid). The Act initiated the separation of youth offending and care and protection into two disconnected organisations. Connolly states that the emphasis was now on family solutions rather than professional solutions to family problems (2001:223).

Bradley (1997:18) states that the Act was consistent with a theme of reduction being implemented by the state that was wanting to reduce their involvement and

responsibility relating to child well-being. Bradley points out that the Act does not define ‘well-being’ and that this can impact on the implementation of its objectives. However he provides the definition given by the April Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy:

Well-being is:

Dignity and self-determination; participation and belonging; development of potential; distribution of resources; tolerance and respect for cultural diversity (The Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988:449).

In 1984-87 the fourth Labour Government in its first term of office established a Royal Commission to examine the policies relating to the ensuring of a fair and just society (Cheyne et al., 1997:47) In 1988 the Royal Commission on Social Policy (RCSP) raised the issue of disparities between Māori and non-Māori and produced six policy objectives for addressing Māori families (Kawharu, M. 2001:1).

The Commission produced a report titled “Nga Kohinga mai no nga Putea I Whakairia ki nga Tahuu o nga Whare Tupuna,” which drew together the views expressed to the commission at meetings held at Marae throughout the country. It involved 369 submissions from various individuals and rōpū. A summary of Māori social policy objectives is given by Durie-Hall and Metge (1992):

1. The recognition of Māori family forms, not in isolation but as an integral part of hapū and iwi.
2. The replacement of policies that undermine Māori.
3. Māori participation in legal management of family matters, undertaking tikanga Māori.
4. Their ability to look after their own while providing hospitality to others and their unity in group cohesion.
5. Maintenance and enhancement of links between Māori Te Ao Tūroa and their tūrangawaewae.
6. Recognition and protection of the status of taonga-tuku-iho.

- (Durie-Hall and Metge 1992:58).

The April Report of the RCSP continued to insist that the well-being of an individual reflects the well-being of the network of kinship one belongs to, that one cannot isolate the child from the family or treat an individual as a separate entity from those with whom they live (RCSP, 1988:449). According to Kawharu the April Report emphasised the importance of whakawhanaungatanga, mana whenua and marae as significant elements of being Māori, which are thus significant for social functioning (2001:3). Therefore, it supports the inclusion of whānau, hapū and iwi into the Children Young Persons and their Families Act of 1989.

According to Bradley (1997:4) funding from the closing down of child welfare institutions was to be put towards iwi development, seeing as the Act sought to enhance the wellbeing of hapū and iwi. However, the establishment of Iwi Social Services was made extremely complex and so difficult that eight years later there were only two established Iwi Social Services and no approved Cultural Social Services. Instead, there was an abundance of Community Service organisations that did not have the guidelines to adhere to (in relation to working with Māori clients) before establishment and who received the funding that was intended for iwi developments (ibid).

For these community groups there was no mandate or recognition required from an iwi governing body or local papakāinga and no regular reports had to be made to local papakāinga iwi. These Community organisations were merely required to record the ethnicity of clients' hapū and iwi and the staff were supposed to reflect the culture and ethnicity of their client group. It is unclear how this is monitored or by whom. This is a prime example of how the Act has positive objectives but does not provide adequate resources to achieve them (ibid).

Bradley concludes that Pūao-te-Ata-tū, especially recommendation Four contributed significantly to the review of the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act and that the views expressed in the report are expressed in the Act's principles and objectives. He states that as a policy it adequately promotes Māori social wellbeing and is consistent with Māori goals and values. However, he agrees that the administration of the Act itself is questionable and needs to be reviewed (1997:5).

Conclusion

This chapter introduces the reader to the topic: Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori social work methods. It does so by discussing Māori social development and the ways in which this impacted on the creation of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report and other iwi/cultural policies. This overview described some of the many conflicting issues that arose between Māori and the state that effected Māori in state organisations. Thus, it leads into the discussion of Māori social workers in the 1980's, their experiences and the methods they use.

Chapter Two: Theoretical and Literature Review

*Ngä hiahia kia titiro ki te timata,
a, ka kite ai tatou te mutunga⁵*

Introduction

This theoretical and literature review focuses on Māori social work methods in order to develop an understanding of the experiences of Māori social and community workers. The topic, at first, appears to be straightforward. However as it is examined, it is shown to be a complicated and relatively undocumented body of knowledge. This chapter begins with a discussion of two perspectives; Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori theory followed by a portrayal of traditional and contemporary Māori social work methods.

Politicians and social policy commentators have discussed the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report from its 1986 appearance but less frequently from the mid 1990's onwards. In light of the previous historical overview, Pūao-te-Ata-tū's importance as a document has been stressed by Māori academics, social workers and theorists. However, in order to focus on its influence on Māori social work methods, one must have a theoretical approach and discuss both contemporary and traditional methods.

What is Constructivism?

Constructivism is the first theoretical approach used by the researcher to describe and analyse this research material. Bruner (1990:54) describes the Constructivist theory as an “active process in which individuals, social or cultural groups construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current or past knowledge.” Learning and developing can be considered a constructive process where the individual or group builds “internal illustrations” of knowledge and personal or community interpretations of experiences (Huitt, 2003:4).

⁵ You must understand the beginning if you wish to see the end (Brougham and Reed, 2004).

Crotty (1998:42) gives a straightforward definition of Constructivism when he states, “all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world.” He continues to add that these ‘meaningful realities’ are developed and transmitted within the social context.

Huitt (2004:5) promotes this theoretical approach by stating that its fundamental character contends that all we know of the world are human interpretations of our experiences of the world. Conceptual growth comes from the sharing of various perspectives and the simultaneous changing of our internal representations in response to those experiences as well as through cumulative experience (ibid). Crotty (1998:42) calls it “the construction of meaningful reality” because meaning is not discovered but is constructed.

The verb “to construct” comes from the Latin “*con struere*”, which means to arrange or give structure (Webster’s Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2004 CDRom). It is these ongoing structuring (organising) processes that are the conceptual foundation of constructivism (Mahoney, 2004:2). Philosophers such as Lao Tzu, (6th century BC), Buddha (560 – 477 BC), Heraclitus, (540 – 475 BC), Giambattista Vico (1668 – 1744), Immanuel Kant, (1724 – 1804), Arthur Schopenhauer, (1788 – 1860), and Hans Vaihinger, (1852 – 1933) are some of the earlier proponents of some form of constructivism (ibid). Some theorists emphasise fantasy and myth in human adaptation, others accentuate the power of patterns in our thinking. According to Mahoney, the rapid growth of constructivism throughout the second half of the 20th century has sometimes made constructivism seem like a recent development, when in fact it has existed for thousands of years (2004:3).

Themes of Constructivism:

When addressing the question, “What is Constructivism?” five basic themes have been developed to encompass the range of ways theorists describe Constructivism (Mahoney, 2004:3). These themes are (1) active agency, (2) order, (3) self, (4) social-symbolic relatedness, and (5) lifespan development. The first theme considers the different languages and terminological preferences that Constructivist theorists propose to adequately describe the way human experience involves constant active agency. This

distinguishes constructivism from forms of determinism⁶, which sees individuals as ‘passive pawns’ under the influence of larger forces. Theme two relates to the argument that much human activity revolves around ‘order’ through processes – “the organisational patterning of experiences and meaning-making processes” (ibid).

The third theme encompasses the idea that the individual organisation of personal activity is fundamentally self-referential and reflexive. This acknowledges personal identity and character, stemming from a unique personality and phenomenological sense of self. However Mahoney follows on to acknowledge, “The self is not an isolated island... persons exist and grow in living webs of relationships.” This leads to the fourth theme of constructivism, which states that the person cannot be understood apart from their social systems. The final point relates to the constructivist view that all of this active, meaningful and socially-embedded self-organisation reflects an ongoing developmental flow in which order and disorder are essential and co-exist in a lifelong quest for balance (ibid).

Constructivism and the New Zealand Context:

If the essence of constructivism is considering ‘culture and context’ when interpreting what occurs in society and constructing knowledge based on this understanding, then the next question relates to how constructivism as a theory can be applied to the New Zealand context (McMahon, 1997; Derry, 1999).

Shannon and Young (2004:11) describe Macro or Structural level theories that attempt to explain substantive problems and include constructivism under an overarching theory called ‘Alternative Theory’. They state that constructivism together with associationist, post-modern and post-structural theories provide the basis for an alternative theoretical approach to social and political explanation and action. This theoretical approach is labelled ‘alternative’ in relation to three traditional theories of explanation – socialist theory, industrial society/social democratic theory and neo-liberal or conservative theory. Shannon and Young state, “The major contemporary

⁶ Determinism is another dominant paradigm (as are Positivism and Objectivism) that states all events, including moral choices, are completely determined by previously existing influences. These ‘causes’ preclude the concept of ‘free will’ and the possibility that humans could have acted otherwise. The theory holds that the universe is utterly rational because complete knowledge of any given situation assures that prior knowledge of its future is also possible. Constructivism was less popular as a theory of explanation in the 1800 and 1900’s because of the determinist belief that one’s future was predetermined from birth (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2004 CDROM).

social movements associated with the environment, feminism, globalisation and racism challenge conventional theories,” Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori theory in this sense are also challenges to conventional theories. Therefore, alternative theory stems from the constructivist inclusion of culture and context in the analytical process, while also considering issues of gender, class, age, ability and the environment.

When analysing the construction of knowledge in relation to one’s social situation and cultural context, an appropriate knowledge of social work and community development must include an ample view of peoples’ unique capabilities and meaningful ways of achieving goals. “Too often it has been an explanation of human behaviour based on a very crude and mechanical idea of cause... however the social sciences and social science theories deal with people, not objects and because of that they cannot be the same as natural science” (Shannon and Young, 2004:56). Shannon and Young describe two themes of a constructivist approach as:

- Active Human Agency – a view of the human being, which sees people as creative, setting goals and striving to reach those goals.
- A criterion of ‘useful’ knowledge – utility as a mean of goal achievement – What works and why?

(Shannon and Young, 2004:56).

Placing the individual within the social context allows social workers to think ‘trialectically,’ where not only one’s knowledge and skills are taken into account but also one’s relationships within the wider society (Kelly and Sewell, 1991:3; Walker, 2003:2003:2).

Therefore, Constructivism in a practical sense can allow social workers to maintain a holistic view of the individual or family, validating the clients’ knowledge and interpreting it in relation to the wider community. Thus Constructivism supports Merv Hancock’s comments that the needs of the individual are inseparable from social needs.

Constructivism and Other Theories:

This constructivist viewpoint can work in collaboration with other theoretical perspectives as a theory of explanation and understanding. Through the

acknowledgement of the social context this theory allows for a critical assessment of the social circumstance of clients within a New Zealand community. This includes recognition of cultural diversity (as well as gender, class, age and ability) and the appreciation of indigenous theories such as Kaupapa Māori theory. Just as Constructivism explains the creation of explanatory theory through everyday practices, Kaupapa Māori theory has developed as an explanation of the application of Māori customs in a research context and is therefore a Constructivist theory in itself.

What is Kaupapa Māori Theory?

According to Smith (1997:27) Kaupapa Māori theory (KM) is an ever-evolving praxis that developed out of Māori communities as a way of interpreting, resisting and transforming the negative results of colonisation. It stemmed from a general concern within the Māori community that the underachievement of Māori students was increasing and that the Māori language, knowledge and culture were suffering from ongoing erosion (Smith, 1997:27). Smith gives her personal perspective of Kaupapa Māori theory and states that her interest in the theory is not so much in the detail of the methodology (See Chapter Three) but in the underlying theory and assumptions upon which the methods are based. Smith states:

One of the key initiatives that Māori have taken is a strategic investment in theoretical tools to assist their transformation... this latter initiative has been focused but not exclusively, in the area of Kaupapa Māori theory (1997:5).

This theory of explanation relates to the New Zealand context, the Māori people and the way they have functioned within this environment. It is a theory of change that not only provides an explanation for how it developed but also discusses interventions relating to social work, education and many other areas within this society. The focus of this theory is on Māori having the power and control over research and interaction with Māori. This power is put into practice using Māori cultural practices where the needs of Māori are the focus and outcomes of the research project or writing (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999; Kiro 2000; Glover, 2002; Smith, 2003; Walsh-Tapiata, 2003; Walker, S. et al. 2005).

Themes of Kaupapa Māori Theory:

Smith (1997:38) describes three significant components of this theory: concientisation, resistance and praxis. Concientisation, or otherwise called “revealing the reality,” relates to the critical analysis and deconstruction of hegemonies and practices that “entrench Pākehā dominant social, economic, gender, cultural and political privilege” (ibid). Bishop (1996:13) relates that Kaupapa Māori theory addresses what the French post-structuralist Michel Foucault terms “the productive function of power-knowledge,” which is to “regulate populations by describing, defining and delivering the forms of normality and educability.”⁷ Foucault argues that ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ are produced from power struggles, which are used to legitimise the workings of power (Danaker, et al. 2000:164). Bishop states that Kaupapa Māori can be interpreted as the deconstruction of those hegemonies, which characteristically disempower Māori by controlling and defining their knowledge within a society with unequal power relations (1996:13).

The deconstruction of hegemonies correlates with critical theory, which promotes the development of a critical consciousness. Kiro (2000:31) relates that although Kaupapa Māori theory is an assertion of Māori perspectives, it is founded in the Liberation Theology of Paulo Friere⁸. She states that Kaupapa Māori theory is embedded in critical theory and emancipatory ways of thinking because they explicitly focus on power relations within society. “To this extent Kaupapa Māori theory acts as a politicising agent for concientisation and emancipation in a manner consistent with Friere’s analysis” (ibid). In this sense, Kaupapa Māori theory is about deconstruction and reconstruction at a political level. Therefore, this theory is located at a structural level rather than at the individual.

Concientisation allows for the focus of Māori writers and researchers to be on Māori, as opposed to the approach of ‘de-colonisation’ that puts the coloniser as the centre of attention (Smith, 2003:2). This is relevant when Māori social workers use

⁷ Foucault describes the mission of the modernist as being to describe truth, objectivity, linearity and inevitable progress through the human sciences, which has resulted in the description of “normality” for some and marginalisation for others. This marginalisation has resulted from the pursuit of definitions and experiences of unity, generally through “grand narratives” of normalisation, interpretative potentialities or oppressions (Foucault, M., 1978).

⁸ Paulo Friere (1921-1997) a Brazilian Educationalist, was particularly well-known for his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Friere recommends five main themes from his theory, firstly, dialogue and working with others rather than ‘on’ them the values imbedded in praxis, the community and social capital, concientisation and the value of lived experience (Taylor, 1993).

this theoretical explanation to promote Māori well-being in a proactive, positive style rather than in a reactionary manner. Māori social workers can combine their Micro/interpersonal approaches with Kaupapa Māori theory in order to have an holistic approach to social change.

According to Gramsci (1971:10) hegemony⁹ is a way of thinking that occurs when oppressed groups take on a dominant group's thinking and ideas uncritically and as 'common-sense', even when these ideas may be part of the body of knowledge that is oppressing them. Smith (2003:3) states that concientisation is a counter strategy to hegemony. Through the concientisation of indigenous peoples, the validation of praxis and perspectives of Māori people can lead to the proactive development of methods rather than continually justifying one's perspectives and actions.

Another theme of Kaupapa Māori theory is "resistance" or "oppositional actions." This theme relates to the actions of an individual or group, either reactionary or proactively against hegemony. This involves the development of a group with shared conceptions and knowledge in order to renew a sense of collective political beliefs. Smith provides two areas in which this resistance can be manifested (1997:38). Firstly, groups should collectively respond and react to the dominant structures of oppression through what he calls 'reactive activities.' Secondly, groups should collectively act to transform existing conditions through proactive activities (regardless of dominant structures). He states that this process involves a critical appraisal of the political surroundings and an identification of flaws in the theory and academic work of the past. It also promotes the development of indigenous theorising, not exclusively Kaupapa Māori theory, but indigenous theory in general (2003:5).

Smith's third theme of Kaupapa Māori theory is 'praxis.' This entails 'reflective change.' which fundamentally means researchers use their critique of hegemony by putting it into action towards positive change, while remaining thoughtful as to how their actions effect their environment. This results in both reflective action and reflexive action. The theme also relates to people being active by responding to social

⁹ By hegemony, Gramsci meant the permeation *throughout* society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that has the effect of supporting the status quo in power relations. Hegemony in this sense might be defined as an 'organising principle' that is diffused by the process of socialisation into every area of daily life. To the extent that this prevailing consciousness is internalised by the population it becomes part of What is generally called 'common sense' so that the philosophy, culture and morality of the ruling elite comes to appear as the natural order of things (Boggs 1976:39).

needs. Smith states “praxis is not merely about the development of a critique of what has gone wrong, it is concerned to develop meaningful change by interviewing and making a difference” (1997:38).

Kaupapa Māori Theory in a Social Work Context:

Kaupapa Māori theory can be applied to many areas of Māori society, including the social services. Smith (1999:120) describes aspects of Kaupapa Māori services that function under tikanga Māori. She relates these aspects to research and the ways researchers should act. These are guidelines that can be related to any interaction in a Māori environment. They are:

- Aroha ki te Tangata (a respect for people).
- Kanohi kitea (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face).
- Titiro, Whakarongo, kōrero (look, listen and speak).
- Manaaki¹⁰ ki te Tangata (share and host people, be generous).
- Kia tūpato (be cautious).
- Kaua e takahia te mana o te Tangata (do not trample over the mana of people).
- Kaua e mahaki (don't flaunt your knowledge) (sic).

These customs can be compared to Māori models of practice, while acknowledging that the three factors of this theory; concientisation, resistance and praxis are not necessarily linear. For example: one's praxis can contain elements of resistance but may be without concientisation.

Henare (1999:40) relates that Māori, like other indigenous people, concentrate on principles rather than techniques, “it sets a distinctive and contextual framework for articulating spiritual and general principles that have been tried and tested over countless generations.” Thus there is a need to remain inclusive when describing Māori methods and to not isolate the principles from the theories and the theories from the methods.

Kaupapa Māori Theory and Other Theories:

As previously stated, Kaupapa Māori theory correlates with Critical theory and is specific to Māori indigenous people. It also occupies a space in Western theory

¹⁰ The double vowel ‘aa’ is used instead of the macron ‘ā’ for the word ‘Manaaki’ in accordance with Williams (1997) and Ryan (1997) who both use macrons for most extended vowels but not for this particular word.

created by post-modernism, which states that each person's reality is true to them, regardless of whether they are of the majority or the minority group of a particular society. This research argues that Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori theory are fundamentally linked. Eketone (2005:6) supports this notion when he states,

Based on this approach to knowledge, it follows that Māori and indeed iwi, will have also constructed their own reality based on their own world-view and values, adapting to change as those changes were considered useful and could be incorporated into that world-view.

Bishop (2003:223) states that in Kaupapa Māori theory, the interaction and relationships that develop between peoples are patterns that draw on Māori 'ways of knowing' and cultural aspirations, rather than those imposed from another culture. Therefore, these customs and patterns are constructions of what are 'normal' and developed ways of doing things for Māori people. Therefore, Kaupapa Māori theory can be used to interpret knowledge. It can also prescribe methods of interaction in collaboration with post-modern theories and theories of constructivism that can enable the ongoing development of tikanga and Māori social work practice methods.

Tikanga and Māori Social Work Practise Methods

Māori traditional concepts have been used as a foundation for the development, implementation and evaluation of current practice models/programmes within social service organisations. The previous theoretical perspectives described how one's understanding of reality is a social construction of their world, and how Māori theoretical explanation is a construction of a Māori praxis, resistance and concientisation. The following analysis shows how Māori in the social work field have both developed their understanding of reality and then modelled their methods around a Māori praxis.

Social work models have developed out of an acknowledgement that there was an absence of procedures and forums that encourage whānau and their communities to support each other through state services such as Education and Welfare (Pitama, 2003:3). Thus, social workers and academics have developed models and 'best practices,' blending ancient and modern data into coherent narratives (Hemara, W., 2000:2). Hemara states, "Our tipuna had created robust and effective means of

transmitting knowledge and... they had definite ideas about how their offspring should be prepared for the world” (2000:2). Therefore, through this respect for the knowledge created by *tīpuna* Māori, models were constructed out of Māori social workers and academics’ understandings of their world.

Hakiaha (1997:12) supports this notion by describing how Māoridom in pre-European times consisted of an *iwi*, *hapū*, and *whānau* structure and was fraught with their respective legends, myths and proverbs. These legends, myths and proverbs were used to govern and influence the people in their everyday lives, producing common values and intrinsic practices. Hakiaha says these belief systems are the foundation of a Māori paradigm in a contemporary setting as well as in classical times (*ibid*).

Tikanga Māori and an understanding of the social structure of pre-European days provide the guidelines for a successful and imperative approach to working with Māori families (Makareti, 1986:129; Ruwhiu, 1995:21; Pere, 1997:6-56; Ruwhiu, 2001:61). Tikanga Māori are the guiding principles of the traditional social structure and enable the interpretation of Māori values and belief systems. According to Ka’ai and Higgins, *tapu*, *noa* and *mana* are the three primary concepts of the Māori and are part of the interpretation of all Māori concepts (2004:13). Other contemporary models have been developed to combine these concepts of *tapu*, *noa* and *mana* with others such as *whanaungatanga*, *aroha* and *manaakitanga* (Durie, 1985:483; Bradley, 1995:27; Hakiaha, 1997:12; McFarlane-Nathan, 1997:22; Pere, 1997:6; Stanley, 2000:34;).

Walker states that the *whānau* provided its own workforce for subsistence activities and that it was self-sufficient in all areas except in defending itself against an attack (1990:63). This led to the need for the *hapū* unit. Māori learnt their roles and responsibilities as a member of the *whānau* and *hapū* and were taught the importance of fulfilling this role in order to maintain social cohesion. Makareti states, “the Māori... was absorbed in his *whānau*, just as the *whānau* was absorbed in the *hapū* and in the *iwi*” (1986:38). This process, supported by *tikanga* such as *tapu*, *noa* and *mana*, was a holistic, socially conscious worldview as opposed to individualistic perspective. Here men, women and children had specific roles and worked together as a group, whether it be food gathering, building, cooking, making tools, weapons or garments. Grandparents would care for and educate their *mokopuna*, thus creating a three

generational family as opposed to a nuclear family type (Makareti, 1986:38; Walker, 1990: 63; Reily, 2004:14).

According to Te Awēkotuku (1991:11) Māori society was fundamentally tribal, where each iwi was a “nation unto itself”, with unique and distinctive leadership systems, economic and customary practices. However, Reily (2004:64) would perhaps exchange the use of the word iwi with hapū, as he states in pre-colonial times, iwi did not function as groups interacting communally, but rather as an abstract concept linking hapū from various areas to a common ancestor. Kawharu supports this portrayal of hapū, when in a discussion on the constitution of Māori Congress he states, “congress must not derogate the right of hapū to deal with the Crown on hapū defined issues or allow the Crown only to deal with the tribe. As the Treaty itself affirms, rangatiratanga resides in the hapū not in the tribe” (2003:45).

This led to the demise of the “one people”¹¹ myth and eventually policies had to acknowledge the significance of the iwi as opposed to the all-encompassing term ‘Māori’ as well as the acknowledgement that all New Zealanders are not ‘one people’ but rather diverse groups of different cultures. This distinction is imperative when interpreting government legislation such as the Child Youth and Family Act, 1989 (later discussed), which puts the child in the care of the Whānau, hapū or iwi over a government institution. In order to place a child in a positive, loving environment one must have a sound understanding of the importance of Whānau over hapū and hapū over iwi.

Ehara taku toa i te toa takatahi engari he toa takatini¹².

This proverb emphasises the community and family as being important to the person, rather than the individual focus on their needs alone. This way of life resulted in the established Māori concept of whakawhanaungatanga or the practice of whanaungatanga, which encourages the communal focus. Whānau, meaning family, whanaunga meaning relation, whanaungatanga meaning being family-like and

¹¹ *He iwi kotahi tatou.* (We are now one people). A saying attributed to Governor Hobson when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed (Brougham and Reed, 2004:148).

¹² My valour is not of the individual, but that of the multitude. No one can survive alone (Brougham and Reed, 2004:135)

whakawhanaungatanga: to establish a familial connection. In McCully's terms, whanaungatanga is one of the most fundamental values that holds any Māori community together and can be described as the manner in which people are related genealogically (Mutu, 2003:162).

A fundamental aspect of most Māori encounters, whakawhanaungatanga can also be described as an act of creating familiarity, a family connection or closeness. Rangihau (1992) links the concepts within Whānaungatanga as being essential components of identity within Māori. According to McNatty:

Whanaungatanga has taken on a new meaning in the modern milieu. It is sometimes seen as a process of getting to know each other... Sometimes it is used as the foundation of a selection interview (whānau interviews). It is sometimes used to describe the camaraderie between fellow rugby players, or to describe the 'glue' that connects people to each other. Sometimes it is held up as the essential component that makes a program or intervention operate (2001:1).

Durie (1998) associated the term "hapūtanga" with whanaungatanga as constructions that are highly relevant to his discussion on developmental processes utilised by Māori. Bishop (1996) describes the term whakawhanaungatanga when he relates it to establishing collaboration processes in research. As a whānau can acknowledge their genealogical ties with another whānau from a particular hapū, so too can hapū identify with each other within an iwi.

Salmond describes how the process of whakawhanaungatanga can be acknowledged and tested out, both formally and informally when Māori interact in everyday life (1975). To practice whanaungatanga can be the recognition of familial ties or linkages, or the forging of a common ground between two people. It can be translated as kinship bonds, relationships, or the forming of intimate emotions. Walker describes the common occurrence that perhaps encouraged the act of whanaungatanga, where traditionally all adults living in the same vicinity (whānau or hapū area) were considered '*in loco parentis*' to children and would care and protect them while their genealogical parents were working (Walker, 1990:63). Today, Māori practice whakawhanaungatanga, either consciously or subconsciously in the way one inquires "Nō hea koe?" or "Nō hea tou iwi?" usually before one asks: "What is your name?"

Another such concept of relevance to social work is aroha. Aroha (love, respect, compassion) has been described by Pere (1997:6) as fundamental to tikanga Māori and

is essential to the practice of manaaki and whanaungatanga. She states aroha is essential to the development of close relationships and underpins all meaningful interactions.

The pressures of urban living can sometimes make this concept more difficult to uphold. Where there is aroha however, individual differences and cultural diversity are to be found enriching and exciting. Each person respecting and caring for the other engenders a climate of goodwill and support (Pere, 1997:6).

Although it is not the intention to describe Māori concepts to the reader, it is acknowledged that both aroha and whanaungatanga are ancient concepts that are further developed by the following contemporary Māori theorists.

Contemporary Māori Methods of Social Work practice:

Through the traditional concepts mentioned above, contemporary models arose that sought to address Māori community and individual needs. Led by Elizabeth Murchie (1984), a significant model to arise was a four-sided health construct, widely known as ‘the Māori health perspective’ (Durie, 1985:483. Durie, 1998:68). This model was later called ‘Whare Tapa Whā’ (a four sided house) and is a construct of contemporary Māori thinking. Dr Mason Durie presented the model at the Rahui Tane Hostel in Hamilton in August 1982 and later at Palmerston North Hospital in December that year. In the twenty or so years since, this explanatory model has been accepted and often referred to by social workers and writers alike (Peratiaki et al. 2004:1; Marshall, 2001:2).

A brief description of the four dimensions of the Whare Tapa Whā Model is:

- Taha Wairua – Spiritual focus, the capacity for faith and wider communion,
- Taha Hinengaro – Mental focus, the capacity to communicate, to think and to feel,
- Taha Tinana – Physical focus, the capacity for physical growth and development,
- Taha Whānau – Extended Family focus, the capacity to belong, to care and to share (Durie, 1998:68).

Māori theorists and social work practitioners are rapidly increasing the body of knowledge surrounding contemporary social work methods. They are closely related to the vast array of Educational methods and in many cases are intertwined. Some such methods are: the Kura Kaupapa model, Ha Whakaora model, Tiramaroa model, He Purerangi model, Koranga model and He Aratohu model (Pitama, 2003:22-31).

The Poutama model of practice provides an example of intervention strategies for using a tikanga framework. Te Ahu Poata-Smith (1996:45) describes the underpinning values of the Poutama model as being respect and responsibility. He states that this model is fundamentally holistic in its application and includes a spiritual dimension in one's practice. He concludes that this model ideally allows autonomy for decision making for tangata whenua.

Stanley (2000:36) also discusses cultural issues in relation to Māori and social service organisations and provides a Poutama framework that can be used by social workers with clients and families in the area of child protection. She identifies six characteristics of a culturally appropriate worker in relation to working with whānau. This includes someone who has been brought up within his or her own culture, whānau, hapū and iwi and who can describe cultural symbols, (that is, has adequate knowledge of tikanga Māori). The worker should also be able to access elder knowledge, believe in wairuatanga, carry the mana of their whānau and is familiar with the dynamics of the area in which they work, such as tukino tamariki (ill treatment of children) (ibid).

The Poutama model, according to Stanley, consists of seven stages when working with Whānau. The process begins with whakawhanaungatanga, honouring relationships, to tikanga that gives respect to the knowledge of the client and family. The third aspect is the understanding of the whānau type through recognition of roles, particularly that of the kaumātua. The cultural realities of the child and their family are then considered and the seventh aspect is cultural relativism. Finally there is a confirmation of signs that may or may not confirm the initial assessment (2000:38).

Baker and Huata (2000) provide an alternative discussion on the Poutama model that combines it with the Powhiri model, where the powhiri allows people to come together in a place where they can comfortably interact. They present eight stages of the model beginning with a karakia and a mihi; the group can then be instilled in whakawhanaungatanga. Puakitanga is the next stage, in which the reason for being

there is discussed and this is then ‘tamed’ by the whakarata stage. Whakarite brings order and is where the group decides on outcomes and whakamana entails the implementation of the outcomes, giving effect to decisions made. The final stage is whakamutunga, which is the official end to the ceremonies.

Dreardon (1997:6) takes the model further as she combines the Poutama with the Awhiowhio that depicts the stairway to the twelve heavens, representing empowerment and portraying action. She states, “I used a conceptual view in incorporating “whakawhanaungatanga,” (birth, the collective, collective birth) to create a framework ‘Awhiowhio Poutama’ within an ‘ecological contextual approach”. The use of traditional concepts, combined with traditional symbols of ‘strength,’ (spiral Eel on the bow of a canoe) and ‘moving forward’ (birds head) and the Poutama (stairway) itself creates a model that not only provides guidelines for practice but also enables Māori social workers to support their Māori clients using tools they can identify with.

Each contemporary model contains principles from traditional Māori society, continuing the use and understanding of these methods and promoting a better understanding of their importance. Durie, (1986) describes how the spiral, or the circle, is fundamental to maintaining a harmonious society in a Māori setting,

When we use old ways we sit around the hall looking to an empty space in at the centre and confronting one another. We emulate the circle. When we discuss the topic... we talk around it... it is rude to come too quickly to the point... slowly, gradually... taking on board everyone’s thoughts en route, but circling inwards until eventually a consensus point is reached... the koro says... that the authority is in ourselves to make our own decisions affecting our own affairs, our own future and our own children... the decisions we make must be made in a way that upholds group harmony.

The major contemporary Māori models of practice shown here are only a small proportion of the many new Māori initiatives being produced to improve the skills and processes of Māori social workers. Each model has at its core tikanga Māori, such as whakawhanaungatanga and an element of wairuatanga, whether it is the acknowledgement of one’s taha wairua or the action of saying a karakia. Each model ensures that the practices and processes of decision-making, described by Durie are still applied by social workers in a contemporary setting. These welfare models were a way of giving names to what Māori social workers already did.

The development of these models is a reflection of the many changes within New Zealand society. These changes, which were previously discussed, have allowed Māori to practice their methods within state social services and have resulted in the vast array of Māori initiative, all with the common goal of Māori development.

Summary

This Theoretical and Literature review has been a discussion of Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori theory, which allows a better understand of the development of Māori social worker in terms of their theoretical approach for working with people. These theories also relate to the discussion of tikanga and Māori social work practice methods, contemporary methods and Māori social development. The literature on Māori social work methods and social development enables one to form a better understanding of the practices of Māori social workers. The examination of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and other significant reports in Chapter One also gives one an understanding of the social policy initiative that evidently affected Māori social workers.

The discussion of this topic fails to discuss certain areas of interest that are deemed important to the researcher and to this research topic. Therefore, four research questions have been developed, stemming from the literature review, that will guide the approach this project will take. The questions are developed in a way that are not only aimed at finding out aspects of ‘Māori social work’ that were missing in this chapter, but are also aimed at contributing something beneficial to the development of Māori social work in general. The research questions are as follows:

1. What are the underpinnings of Māori social work methods?
2. How have they changed since the 1980's?
3. What impact has the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report had on Māori social work?
4. What else has influenced the experiences of Māori social workers?

These research questions will guide the development of this research project and will be discussed later in the analysis and conclusion sections of this project.

Chapter Three: Methodology

*Kāore i hangaia te kupenga
Hei hopu ika anake;
Engari i hangaia kia oioi
i roto i te nekeneke i te tai.*

*For the net is fashioned
Not only to catch fish;
But to flow smoothly with
The current of the sea¹³.*

Introduction

Research methods are tools used to investigate and interpret information. They are guidelines that indicate for the researcher the proper ways to approach the interest group. Not only do research methods ideally provide the appropriate process to test one's hypothesis, but they take into consideration the protocols of the people being researched. While the researcher is immersed in her/his research, one must consider that the process is as important as the end result, thus, the adequate use of methods allow the researcher to "*flow smoothly with the current of the sea*" and explore the area of interest without upsetting the "tides" of the subject researched.

This chapter describes the methodology undertaken in this research project. Thus far, Chapter One and Two have set the scene for Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori social work methods. This chapter explains the researcher's approach to the topic, why the previous issues were addressed, and the manner in which the topic continues in this research. Jan Fook (1996:xiii) states that any approach to understanding social work should necessarily integrate theories, research and practice, "A process of reflection on practice might thus involve the potential for theory development, research enquiry and practice development." This chapter describes the research approach by assessing theories relevant to social work research and then continues with the intention of contributing some form of practice development.

¹³ Source unknown, Cited in Smith, Linda (2004) Decolonising Methodologies.

This chapter begins by discussing the terms and definitions, giving a general introduction to the process. The theoretical mode will then be discussed regarding the two theories chosen for this research: Qualitative Analysis and Kaupapa Māori Research theory. Following this, the research project is then described from the beginning stages, through the application of theories in the interviews to the final stages of the “write-up” and conclusions. This will consist of a discussion of the consultation process, selection of participants, the researchers position, the forming of the questionnaire and problem solving techniques. “Research needs to be accompanied by accounts of how it was really done” (Walford, cited in Holliday, 2002:7) therefore, this chapter both describes how this project came together and combines this with a discussion and analysis of research theory and methodological approaches.

When beginning this project I had in mind that “*I must do something beneficial for Māori.*” However, when I was more familiar with the topic it became clear that the only way to be sure the project is beneficial is for it to be driven by Māori in the area of social services. This research project was driven by members of the Māori community, predominantly by Māori social workers and by supporting Whānau. The participants in this project came out of these networks and have been the foundation of this project.

Definitions

Social science researchers (as well as social workers) have often reverted to the use of definitions to validate their choice of methodological processes (Holliday, 2002:50. Sarantakos, 1993:31. Crotty, 1998:3. Morton-Williams, J., cited in Walker, R., 1993:280). Even though definitions can be critiqued as being “constructed within discourses for ideological (power) reasons,” in that they apply intellectual boundaries to the knowledge, they can also enable a researcher to express the uniqueness of their approach (Foucault, 1980, cited in Walker, 2003:2).

Silverman describes the process of defining one’s terms when conducting social science research as a “potentially tiresome business” but states that it is necessary in order to fully understand the use of the terms (2004:3). Crotty (1998:1) agrees when he states,

There is much talk of their philosophical underpinnings, but how the methodologies and methods relate to more theoretical elements is often left unclear. To add to the confusion, the terminology is far from consistent in research literature and social science texts. One frequently finds the same term used in a number of different, sometimes even contradictory ways.

For these reasons, the major terms used in this research will be defined in relation to definitions used by other social science researchers.

One of the first terms described is perhaps one of the most complicated terms in this project and that is ‘models.’ This term is of common usage in both social science research and social work and is a key focus of this research. In a social research context the term ‘model’ can be referred to as “An overall framework for looking at reality” (Silverman, D., 2004:3). This could also be described as the ontology and epistemology of a research project, also corresponding with the term ‘paradigm’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1994:34; Silverman, 2004:4). A model is also a significant term in relation to social work practice and is described as the theoretical views of the worker, the approach undertaken, day-to-day processes, skills used when interacting with people and the fundamental principles behind the actions (Lynn, 1996:141).

For the purposes of this research topic the term ‘model’ will be used in a social work sense and in relation to social research the term ‘paradigm’¹⁴ will be favoured. Sarantakos state that there is no sociological agreement on the usage of the term paradigm, however he states that most sociologists (as do social researchers and social workers) understand the term ‘paradigm’ as meaning the ‘world view’ or general perspective (1993:31).

Yegidis and Weinbach (2002:26) ‘label’ the people who provide data for research projects as ‘research subjects,’ ‘research partners’ and ‘research participants,’ They state that the term ‘subjects,’ although it is the more commonly used term, is critiqued as being dehumanising and in many ways condescending to those that provide the data. The term ‘partner’ is described as being used where the researcher and the volunteers are equally as important to the project. Although the researcher for this project claims the volunteers are equally as important, the term ‘participants’ is

¹⁴ Sarantakos (1993:31) defines paradigms as a set of propositions that explain how the world is perceived. Examples of this range from Positivism to Phenomenology and Critical sociology, Marxism and Feminism.

preferred for this case. This is because the researcher acknowledges their importance as well as identifying their rights to participate in the project and ability to withdraw from participating if they wish to do so.

The term [participants] is consistent with both the inductive and the deductive methods of acquiring knowledge in social work research. It also suggests an awareness that these individuals are entitled to both respect and attention to their rights (Yegidis and Weinbach, 2002:26).

Another term that is used in the research questionnaire (later discussed) and can also be confused with research terminologies is ‘concepts.’ In this project the term is used in relation to ‘traditional concepts’ that Māori social workers use in their every day practice. Although it may seem a complicated process determining the difference between the ‘concepts’ of the researcher and the ‘concepts’ of the social worker, if the researcher follows the definition of Silverman (2004:4), the meaning for the two areas are the same, “concepts are clearly specified ideas derived from a particular model [or paradigm.]” This researcher continues to argue that the concepts used by the researcher and participants stems from the same paradigm and are fundamentally the same ‘methods’ or ‘concepts,’ applied to different situations (the researcher applying her concepts to research and the social worker to his or her work). However, one might argue that for social workers, these ‘concepts’ are rightly termed ‘practices’ because, in a practical sense, social researchers discuss the ‘concepts’ while the practitioners put them into action (Fook, 1996:xiv).

This leads into a discussion of the theoretical approaches undertaken in this research project. Fook states that instead of questioning the ways in which practitioners do or do not use theory/methods, a reflective researcher will assess the relationships between theories and practices, opening the way for alternative paradigms to develop that are potentially more congruent with the actual experiences of social workers (1996:xiii). This research attempts to apply ‘reflective methods’ in line with Qualitative and Kaupapa Māori research, in order to interpret the theories that have influenced the researcher’s actions. Therefore, in order to fully understand the motivation behind this project, one must comprehend the researcher’s chosen theoretical approaches for this methodological process.

A Qualitative Approach

A qualitative methodological approach has been selected for this research project because qualitative research contains a series of techniques that have been described by social researchers and theorists as ideally suited to descriptive social science research. These techniques are generally intended to determine “what things ‘exist’ [rather] than to determine how many such things there are” (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975; Hodges, 1981; Smith and Manning, 1982; Van Maanen, 1983; Walker, R, 1993:3).

The general characteristics of a qualitative research style are that it seeks to construct an understanding of a social reality and cultural meaning, while focusing on interactive processes or events (Walker, 1993:93). This approach values authenticity and often contains explicit morals and principles. There are usually few case studies and the researcher is often involved in the group being researched (Walker, 1993:45; Guba and Lincoln, 1994:34; Newman and Kreuger, 2003:16).

Newman and Kreuger (2003:16) compare qualitative research to quantitative research and state that each has their distinct logic or approach to social research, however there is much overlap between the type of data and the style of research. Sarantakos states that qualitative research is a term used to describe any research that is not quantitative (1997:44) Quantitative analysis in contrast claims to measure objective fact without any trace of values, while focusing on variables in the data. With quantitative analysis the context within which the cases exist are not taken account of, instead the cases are analysed using statistical methods where the researcher is not involved in the group being researched (ibid).

According to Yegidis and Weinbach (2002:16) during the 1980’s and the 1990’s there was much debate regarding the relative merits of the two types of research. They state that some researchers favoured the more traditional quantitative research, while others felt the more recent qualitative research techniques were worth advocating for. Yegidis and Weinbach state,

Neither [Quantitative or Qualitative] is inherently superior. They frequently are complementary – both can generate valuable, needed knowledge for the practitioner... also both can produce results that are of little value if rules and procedures are not followed.

Therefore, qualitative methods of intensive interviewing, participant observation and focus groups are preferred here over the quantitative methods of experimentation and survey research (Engel and Schutt, 2005: 274).

The ways in which qualitative methods were used will be further discussed in the section on the processes of the research. By using few cases and being context and value laden this researcher is able to understand the experiences of Māori social workers from their point of view. These cases are not assumed to represent the stories of all Māori social workers, and the researcher acknowledges that qualitative methods are not the only way to research this group.

For this project, however, there was a strict time limit and a limit on the amount of data one could collect without data going to waste. There was also a limit on available Māori social workers that were known to the researcher at the beginning of this process who fit the criteria for selection. For these reasons the process closely follows the rules and processes of a qualitative approach. The second rules and process guidelines that the researcher abided by were that of Kaupapa Māori Research theory. The researcher found that these theories could be used together, providing the ideal means to gather the information sought for this project.

Kaupapa Māori Research put into Practice

Kaupapa Māori research methods have been identified as the ideal approach when researching Māori social workers' practice methods. Kaupapa Māori methods are deemed relevant when considering the effects of iwi and cultural policy on Māori people. Power imbalances, cultural values and the gender, class, ability or disability of a people cannot be ignored when researching and defining in the social services. Razack (2002:12) states,

Skin colour, class, sexual orientation, age or ability... these markers of identity affect the ways in which social issues emerge and the concomitant ways in which provision of services is affected.

Kaupapa Māori research methods allows for one's cultural norms to be taken into consideration and respected by the researcher (Smith, 1994:1).

A number of theorists discuss the use of Kaupapa Māori methodologies, each description being unique due to their background, iwi, ethnicity, and worldview.

Researchers and theorists describe Māori Kaupapa Research methods as being tools for critically analysing the unequal power relations present in New Zealand Society (Smith, 1994:3; Bishop, 1996:214; Walker, 2003:3;). There are a number of varying descriptions of Kaupapa Māori research, where some commentators state that one should not attempt to define it because as a paradigm it is a form of resistance, agency and methodological strategy (Bishop 1996; Smith 1999; Gibbs 2001; Walker, et al. 2005).

As a paradigm, Kaupapa Māori research is by Māori, for Māori and with Māori (Bevan-Brown, 1998:231; Smith, 1999). Eketone (2005:9) states that one of the common characteristics of this research method is that it does not tell you exactly *how* to use Kaupapa Māori research. He states that this has resulted in a number of criticisms of the theory and suggests, “it is probably that what non-Māori researchers want is a checklist and a list of “do’s and don’ts” (ibid). Eketone discusses Linda Smith’s comment that Kaupapa Māori approaches do not list “codes of conduct for researchers, but tend to be prescribed for Māori in cultural terms” (See Chapter Two) (Smith, 1999:119; Eketone, 2005:9).

Bevan-Brown (1998:231) also provides ten guidelines for Kaupapa Māori researchers that are underpinned by Māori customs and philosophy. These guidelines are perhaps the closest this researcher has come to finding the “checklist” described by Eketone, but are in many ways more complex descriptions than those of Linda Smith. These are:

1. Māori research must be conducted within a Māori cultural framework. This means it must stem from a Māori world view, be based on Māori epistemology and incorporate Māori concepts, knowledge, skills, experiences, attitudes, processes, practices, customs, reo, values and beliefs.
2. Research must be undertaken by people who have the necessary cultural skills, (such as Te Reo) and they must conduct Māori research in terms of these Māori research expertise.
3. Māori research should be focused on areas of importance and concern to Māori people.
4. Māori research should result in some positive outcomes for Māori.

5. As much as possible, Māori research should involve the people being researched as active participants at all stages of the research process.
6. Māori research should empower those being researched.
7. Māori research should be controlled by Māori.
8. People involved in conducting Māori research should be accountable to the people they research in particular and to the Māori community in general.
9. Māori research should be of a high quality and assessed by culturally appropriate methods.
10. The methods, measures and procedures used in Māori research must take full cognisance of Māori culture and preferences: Hui, Narrative, Collaborative, Whānau and Whakapapa (sic).

(Bevan-Brown, 1998:231-245).

Once again the commentator does not depict exactly *how* the researcher should begin, but describes the relationship between the theoretical approach and the practice of it. Bevan-Brown's checklist is rather extreme and utopian but sets standards for researchers to strive towards. This researcher used these cultural terms to guide the process of this research project. However, to guide the research practice, tikanga Māori was seen by the researcher as the ideal tools for *how* to act.

Ruwhiu states that tikanga could be described as the legal system in which all dealings within Māoridom operate (2001:60). Tikanga has been described as the overarching protection or the cultural paradigm in which researchers, organisations, social workers or anyone who identifies with Kaupapa Māori should function. Therefore, tikanga should occur throughout a research project with Māori people and will be the '*how*' of this research project.

In relation to Māori Kaupapa Research, Walker identifies the importance of taking customs, philosophy and face-to-face communication into consideration for cross-cultural relations (2003:2). He describes the principle of tuakana (elder sibling) and teina (younger sibling) as being paramount when researching within a Māori social structure. As a researcher he considers himself a teina to the participants, changing the power dynamic in a culturally critical way. In this sense, Walker is becoming a 'not

knower' as opposed to an 'expert and classifier,' acknowledging that knowledge is tapu. (2003:2).

This researcher acknowledged Walker's approach but through taking one's age and social work experience into consideration does not label herself the teina but becomes the mokopuna.¹⁵ The approach implies that the participants are the kaumätua through life experience and many years of social work experience. The position of the researcher (later discussed) emphasises her position as the mokopuna, thus acknowledging that the researcher is not an expert in being a Māori social worker and by no means has practiced since the 1980's. The knowledge contained in this research is not a commodity, its ownership will always be with the participants and its use in this instance is at their discretion.

Pihama (2002) states that one of the key aspects of Kaupapa Māori research is Tino Rangatiratanga, which she describes as sovereignty, self-determination, governance, autonomy and independence. Bishop adds that it is about power and control residing within the boundaries of Māori cultural realities and practices (1996:214). Finally, theorists describe a fundamental characteristic of this research approach as being the focus on the needs of Māori people and making sure the outcomes of the research is beneficial to Māori (Smith, 1994:8; Kiro 2000:26). Again, the ways this researcher has interpreted this theory into the processes will be discussed in collaboration with that of qualitative methods in the following section. Before this is discussed, there will be an analysis of an issue that relates to research with indigenous peoples and research using qualitative methods, insider and outsider discourse.

Insider – Outsider Discourse

Tsianian and McCarthy (2002:1) state that research on indigenous peoples needs to maintain a critical theoretical approach that considers their position as 'colonised' and maintains notions of decolonisation. "The constructs used by scholars across the physical, natural, and social sciences to evaluate research quality – as objective, reliable, valid, generalisable, randomised, accurate, authentic – are not value-free or

¹⁵ Through labelling herself as the mokopuna she is acknowledging her status in relation to the participants. The researcher is the pepi or kotiro and the participants are the kaumatua (this is also influenced by whakawhanaungatanga and familial relationships between the two).

apolitical. They all require the application of human judgement, which is inevitably affected by cultural norms and values” (Westmeyer, 1981).

Consequently, the use of these constructs to assess research focused on minority, marginalised populations require an indigenous theoretical approach. Tsianian and McCarthy state that such assessments must be based not only on Western notions of scientific quality but also, “on a separate set of criteria prescribed in the interest of sovereignty” (2002:1). In relation to the Māori people and the New Zealand context, Kaupapa Māori theory and research methods have been developed in order to not only take cultural norms and values into consideration but to have them as the guiding system.

Kiro (2000:26) agrees by suggesting that Māori need to shape their own research agenda, along with other indigenous peoples, in order to hear the discourses that have been suppressed. Kiro likens Kaupapa Māori research to feminist research ideologies that validate insider knowledge as more accurate. Māori research believes only an insider can understand the nuances of the social phenomenon affecting the participants in the research (Kiro, 2000:26). This is not to say that non-Māori do not play a significant role in researching indigenous groups.

Gibbs (2001:673) describes how she, as a non-indigenous researcher has developed a strategy for undertaking cross-cultural collaborative research. She states that attempts to acquire academic legitimacy for research that addresses the concerns of indigenous peoples has been a slow process. Therefore, an approach that allows for power-sharing is an ideal beginning. Maintaining a ‘power-sharing’ relationship between the researcher and the researched (or between Māori and non-Māori) would ideally involve the handing-over of power to the researched in relation to cultural norms and the forming of relationships.

“The relationship between the researcher and the researched will mirror the form of relationships in the research participants’ culture” (Gibbs 2001:678). Therefore, the participant has more power and understanding of the processes and is more likely to open up to the researcher in a trusting relationship.

Building research relationships in accordance with the Whānau provides an “ethical code” for the conduct of relationships within a “research Whānau.” Māori values and ways of giving and gaining respect and trust are thereby invoked

in the research process. As a result, the role of the researcher is less likely to be impositional and therefore more productive.

This would obviously demand a thorough understanding of tikanga Māori by the researcher, as well as an ability to put into practice tikanga Māori and interact comfortably in a Māori environment.

Issues of whether the non-Māori researcher remains an 'outsider' through this method of research are questionable. Gibbs states that instead of being in the position of 'speaking for' the 'other,' of 'empowering others' or 'emancipating others' she is moving into a position of 'partnership,' where the product has been developed collaboratively. However, in an academic field, the final responsibility for the research rests with the author, and with responsibility follows power. It is the opinion of this writer that if the aim of cross-cultural research is to have a 'partnership' between Māori and non-Māori, or the researcher and the researched, then the final stages of the research project, including the write-up, need to contain elements of equality and partnership. Therefore, even though this project does not fall within the 'cross-cultural framework' the participants have their 'voices heard' throughout this process, including the write-up stage.

This research project is undertaken from an insider's perspective. It is acknowledged that the position of the researcher is an insider as an indigenous person, but also an outsider in that she is far from being a long-term practitioner. Therefore, as previously stated, the researcher self-identifies as a mokopuna to the participants in terms of age and social work experience.

The Methodological Process

Social work researchers describe the beginning of a project as being the formation of a topic, often stemming from an area of their employment as social workers or educators (Gleed, 1996: 11; Sadique, 1996:21; Cleak 1996:31). Gleed describes the research process as a process that uses the same problem-solving methods as everyday social work practice (1996:4). Rabbits and Fook (1996:169) state that specifying the purpose and the audience defines the style and presentation of any document. This researcher began the formation of a topic by discussing options with various social work academics, mentors and whānau in order to develop an

understanding of areas that were perceived as “needed” by Māori and also “undiscovered territory” in an academic sense.

The researcher (discussed later) guided the topic towards Māori social workers, as this is an area of interest to her as well as the topics of history, policy and Tino Rangatiratanga. As a recent graduate of a professional social work qualification the researcher noted that there was often much talk in class about the significance of Pūao-te-Ata-tū for Māori and non-Māori social workers. However, after completing a placement where there were no Māori social workers within that particular organisation, but an abundance of Māori clients, the researcher wondered what had happened to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This influenced the formation of the topic ‘Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori social work methods.’

A Whānau Komiti Tautoko¹⁶ was established, primarily as a support for the researcher but also to provide advice and to be a ‘bridge’ between the researcher (currently living in Dunedin) and social workers within the wider community. The researcher acknowledged that in order to connect with Māori social workers a wide range of networks were needed, not only in the South Island but also in the North; therefore it was the role of the Whānau Komiti Tautoko to maintain these connections in the North Island (where the researcher is from).

Taylor (1993:123) emphasises the importance of selecting a supervisor/supervisors that one respects so that the communication channel remains open for the entire research process. This researcher was particularly aware of this factor and selected a supervisor that was also a tuakana to his colleagues, highly knowledgeable in relation to this topic, and also a mentor, being aware that the flow of communication would be vital to the clarity of this project. Once the support networks were in place the research process began, beginning with consultation and ethical approval.

Consultation

In accordance with University policy, Māori consultation and ethical approval were the first steps in the research process. Māori consultation consisted of discussing

¹⁶ This Komiti consisted of the researchers’ whānau who had an interest in the area of social work and Māori Kaupapa research.

a list of basic topics relating to research, such as “potential areas that are of interest to or of concern for Māori” topics that the researcher had already grappled with. One then merely emailed the responses to the Māori consultation committee. The process was straightforward, however, there was always the underlying possibility that permission from this committee may not be granted. It was granted at last and the committee communicated its support through a detailed and encouraging letter (Appendix Four).

Secondly, Ethical Approval was a similar process, but this time instead of responding to a handful of questions, there were approximately twenty pages of forms to complete. Thankfully, through the help of many proofreaders, the ethical approval was given without any changes needed. The process was daunting and at many stages made the researcher comprehend what experienced researchers call the “trials and tribulations” of being a researcher (Taylor, 1993:123; Sadique, 1996:22; Healy, 1996:70). The next process was the selection of participants.

Selecting Participants

The researcher, in collaboration with supervisors and the Whānau Komiti decided on whom they would approach to participate in the research project. It was decided that the amount of participants would be limited to eight to ensure the project was a manageable size. Ideally, the project would have consisted of Māori social workers from all decades, as well as non-Māori participants for a more thorough view of these issues. However, it was decided that the most important ‘stories’ are those of the long-term practitioners whereas the other groups of social workers could be researched in a future project. These eight social workers would identify as Māori (of any iwi) and more specifically as Māori social workers.¹⁷ Therefore the participants would fit into the following categories:

- Māori,
- Social workers,
- Practicing since the early 1980’s,
- Currently practicing as social workers.

¹⁷ As previously stated the term ‘social worker’ is used to describe individuals working in social service organisations in various roles.

It was also hoped that Māori social workers would be found that had been practicing as social workers before the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report was released in 1986. This caused a few issues because most participants would not self-define as ‘social workers’ at that stage. This also depended on the organisation they worked for and how the organisation defined their roles.

The previous chapter (Chapter One) describes the lack of documentation on the role of Māori within social service organisations in the early 1980’s and the way Māori worked in developmental roles within other such organisations such as the Ministry of Māori Affairs. This explains why there was a dilemma about the definitions of the participants’ roles and positions of employment.

The majority of participants were employed by State social service organisations prior to the 1986 report. Some participants were already employed as social workers before Pūao-te-Ata-tū, however most participants were employed in other positions. These participants were often working for the organisation in other roles, such as administration or as ‘benefit officers,’ but changed roles after the report promoted the employment of Māori social workers. They were then officially employed as social workers when Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released in the mid-1980’s.

Other participants began their involvement in social services as clients and started volunteering at community social services in the early 1980’s. These participants had long careers in voluntary organisations. Some participants are still currently practicing and others now work in government organisation or in teaching roles.

It was necessary to judge each case individually when selecting participants because each person had a different view of their role. These participants were no longer practicing social workers but had a wealth of knowledge gained from more than thirty years of practice. As this research shows, Māori social or community work in the seventies and eighties was generally not labelled ‘social workers,’ which results in an unnamed group of community workers.

Even though the journeys of each worker differed substantially, for the sake of this research there was a need for consistency. Therefore, the social workers needed to fully comprehend the terms ‘social work methods’ and adequately describe tikanga Māori from their own experiences. This will be evident in Chapter Four. It was also required that they recognise the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report and can describe its impact in

1986. Therefore, eight Māori social workers was a suitable and preferable sample, including those living and working in any area of New Zealand, for statutory, voluntary and private social service organisations.

Babbie (2004:225) discusses the importance of careful selection when approaching the group of interest. He states that there are two major ways of selecting participants, the first being a derivative of ‘probability theory’¹⁸ that involves interviewing a random selection of participants from a list of the entire population being sampled. An example of this is randomly choosing Māori social workers from a list of all those who have worked in social service organisations for 20 or more years. This type of selection consists of a large variety of approaches and is ideal for large-scale representative samples for social research (Sarantakos, 1993:126). This approach has not been used as it is deemed impossible to access a list of all Māori social workers who have been practicing since this time because of the various interpretations of ‘social worker.’

The second approach that is more typical of social research is non-probability sampling, where participants are selected in four ways:

- Reliance on Available Subjects – This approach consists of the researcher approaching people at random. Variables are uncontrollable with this method and researchers must be careful not to generalise with their results.
- Purposive or Judgemental Sampling – this approach also does not represent the entire population under consideration but consists of approaching individuals or groups that are easily visible to the researcher. One aspect of this is that although some members of the sample group are visible, it is impossible to survey all members of the group (such as all Māori social workers).
- Snowball sampling – this non-probability sampling method is common to field research. This is where each person interviewed is asked to suggest additional people for interviewing.
- Quota sampling – like probability sampling this method addresses the issue of representativeness, although the two methods differ substantially. This begins with a matrix or table where the area being researched is represented on the table

¹⁸ Probability theory provides a guarantee that the ‘sample’ or participants are representative of the larger population (Babbie, 2004:186).

by cells with accurate statistical information (for example, the total population of Māori social workers who have practiced since the 1980's). Participants are then contacted that 'fit' the cell group and information is compared on the matrix (Sarantakos, 1993:126).

Out of these four approaches two have been undertaken for this research project. Firstly, 'Purposive sampling' was put into practice as it was decided that the sample group would not be representative of the general population and the results will reflect their opinions only.

Qualitative researchers have to make choices at some stage as to the kind of people they will include in their study, particularly since the number of subjects in these studies is very small (Sarantakos, 1993:140).

This sampling technique recommends approaching a member of the desired group that the researcher judges will be useful or representative (Babbie, 2004:183). This project demanded participants who had a lot to contribute to the research issues; therefore some bias was needed when selecting participants who could express their understanding of the topic. However, this bias was not necessary because each participant that was approached could adequately provide information in their own words, their opinions on the topic being irrelevant to their selection. Through recommendations from supervisors and the Whānau Komiti Tautoko a group of participants were approached either by the researcher or the Whānau Komiti¹⁹ itself.

The second type of sampling process that was not initiated by the researcher but by participants themselves was 'Snowball Sampling.' This approach is usually initiated by the researcher asking participants to recommend other people to be interviewed, however in the case of this research many of the participants offered additional people and even organised the interviewing process. This enabled the researcher to find sufficient participants and to hold discussion groups²⁰ as well as individual interviews.

¹⁹ Because of the researcher's age and status as a mokopuna, in some circumstances it seemed more appropriate for the participant to be approached by a member of the Komiti with whom they were already familiar.

²⁰ Hui or discussion groups are preferred by the researcher (as long as participants are comfortable in this situation) as this enables participants to share and contribute information in a short amount of time, to produce varied opinions and to draw conclusions and decisions while trying to achieve a consensus (Sarantakos, (1993:249). This method is also preferred by the researcher, as it is consistent with Kaupapa

This depended on the area in which the participants lived. For example if they lived in an isolated rural area it was difficult to form a discussion group, therefore individual interviews were necessary.

In relation to Kaupapa Māori research, part of the process of whanaungatanga has been gaining the consent of the participants. A common trend when initially making contact with individuals was their immense willingness to be helpful and supportive of the research. Participants that were contacted through whānau connections quickly agreed to be involved, in many cases without question of what the research was about or what it entailed. A common trend was that participants, when asked to participate, would know people that they thought were more suitable for the project than themselves, thus the snowballing effect occurred through the use of whakawhanaungatanga by the researcher and participants.

In relation to Māori knowledge and tikanga around sharing knowledge, there were a number of issues that needed to be taken into account. It was decided that the research should include Māori from any iwi, rather than to base the research on a particular hapū. In Dunedin, where the researcher was based, there were few Māori social workers who have been practicing since the 1980's. This meant that participants were scarce and were sought in all areas of New Zealand. Eventually, participants were accessed through the researchers' own whānau, hapū and iwi and social work connections, regardless of which iwi they identified with. However, participants who accepted being involved were not from a wide variety of iwi, they were mostly all from the same iwi as the researcher. This could be a result of the way the participants were contacted (through whānau) or could have been coincidental as most of the participants were strangers to the researcher at the beginning of this project.

My Position as Researcher

Bevan-Brown states that Kaupapa Māori Research needs to be done by Māori and Pākehā with expertise in that area (1998:231). How does one define as an "expert"? According to Webster's Dictionary of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (2004) an expert is "one with the special skill or knowledge representing mastery of a particular subject". However, this researcher prefers to identify as a mokopuna rather than as an

Māori research, which encourages the use of Māori processes such as hui, karakia and kai (Smith, (2004:56).

expert and acknowledges that this work will not represent that of an expert but that of a student.

The significance of Bevan-Brown's point is that it is important for people to be self-aware and for Māori knowledge to be handled and treated with the respect it deserves. An expert has the skills to manage and understand the substance and significance of the knowledge, knowing how it should be treated, gathered and shared (Te Awekotuku 1991:12).

It was more appropriate for this researcher to take the mokopuna position rather than that of a teina. As a young person, unmarried, without children and without the experience that years of social work practice and life in general gives you, the researcher was relatively "new" to the research process, topic and the knowledge handled in this project. Therefore, the researcher acknowledged that the experts for this project were the Māori social workers themselves, the supervisors and the Whānau Komiti Tautoko.

Stokes states that a researcher who is not only comfortable in both cultures, but can also stand back and put both sets of cultural values (and the real and potential conflicts) in perspective, will come closest to evaluating Māori research needs (1985:10). With a strong knowledge of one's whakapapa, Māori and Pākehā, the researcher interpreted information using an understanding of cultural values generated through tikanga and cultural paradigms. The researcher was comfortable in every situation, both with participants already known to the researcher and also in new situations. The researcher used the kaumātua – mokopuna technique in interviews by allowing the participants to guide the interview process themselves by way of the questionnaire.

Questionnaire

Black (1996:24) states that research questions that are too vague do not provide sufficient direction for the research effort and often it is rare that everyone involved in the research is content with the answers provided. While it was acknowledged that the questionnaire is vital for the direction of the interview, it was also hoped that the interview would follow the train of thought of the participant and that each interview structure would be unique because each participant is unique.

Six open-ended questions were drafted early on in the decision-making process, specifically for the perusal of the Ethical approval committee. These six questions were as follows:

1. When you work with Māori clients and whānau what traditional concepts have you used?
2. What are some surrounding influences that have caused changes to the Māori methods you use?
3. What was it like for you working in a Social Service Organisation in the 1980's before the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report came out?
4. Can you describe Māori methods of practice you used before Pūao-te-Ata-tū and after Pūao-te-Ata-tū, and whether they have changed?
5. Have you noticed an improvement in support for Māori methods of practice since Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out?
6. Are there any changes you think could be made to better support Māori social workers to use their methods for the benefit of Māori?

There were a number of areas of this questionnaire that the researcher would have liked to have changed, such as instead of the term 'traditional concepts' it would have been more appropriate for the researcher to ask about 'practices' that reflect tikanga Māori because social workers implement these concepts.

It was vital, however, that the interview process not only follow this structure but also include a mihi whakatau for the researcher and participants to become familiar with each other and in some cases a karakia was said, if it was deemed appropriate by the participant.

Through practice interviews with Māori social workers (who are currently academics) it was decided that after a mihi the first question or statement would be regarding how the participant became involved with social work. This was vital for the interview process as it set the scene for an historical account or 'story-telling' style of interview that the researcher hoped would enable the participant to control the interview journey.

Interviews

The researcher and the Whānau Komiti Tautoko set up interviews with people they knew, in locations ranging from Dunedin to Te Puia Springs. The trial interviews indicated they would be approximately 45 – 120 minutes in total, however the mihi was not taken into consideration and the interviews took anything from an hour and a half to more than two hours in length for multiple reasons. Social research writers state that this is usual of qualitative interviews in that there tends to be relatively little structure to the interviews (Black, 1993:165; Walker, 1993:4; Yegidis and Weinbach, 2002:132). They state that digression by participants is expected and generally regarded as useful because this leads to topics that often are more productive than those the social worker/researcher may have chosen.

In some cases the researcher and participants were unfamiliar with each other and spent extra time getting to know each other. In other cases the researcher was close to the participant, as either a relative or a friend, and spent time catching up and discussing personal perspectives from both sides. There was also extra time spent following the interview where the researcher and participants had a ‘cuppa’ and kai. This was a useful way to unwind together after the discussion and to build the relationship between the researcher and participants. It is also a significant part of Kaupapa Māori research.

Yegidis and Weinbach (2002:130) state that there are similarities between a qualitative interview and a social work interview in that they both rely heavily on verbal and nonverbal methods of gathering data and both require the establishment of some level of relationship with those people being interviewed. As previously stated, the researcher hoped to establish an environment where the participants could control the discussion and experienced the use of social work skills of group facilitation and interview techniques by both the researcher and participants.

The interviews were in most cases ‘one-on-one’ interviews where there was one participant and the researcher, known also as ‘depth interviews’ and ‘intensive interviewing’ (Walker, 1993:4; Yegidis and Weinbach, 2002:130; Engel and Schutt, 2005:274). This was because participants were predominantly located in different areas of the country and it was greatly difficult to hold a hui or ‘focus groups’ in an area that was convenient for all participants. Some participant also felt that they could more

openly share information to one other person as opposed to a group of people unknown to them.

A situation arose where a group of the participants resided in one particular area and worked together in a close-knit group. Therefore, it was decided by the group that a hui would be ideal for these individuals. This was an ideal forum for a group of participants who were familiar with each other and were able to 'speak their minds' freely and openly. The group was very close and could communicate well with each other and because they had worked together for a significant time they were comfortable to talk openly in front of each other. In many ways they were supporting each other by being there and helping each other think of more comments and ideas.

The process of the interviews consisted of tikanga, kai, karakia, and detailed discussion. This discussion was ideal as it related to the journey from what it was like before Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released to what it is like for the participant today. The role of the researcher during the interviews was not so much that of a facilitator but that of a listener (Black, 1993:5). The researcher used the opportunity as any young person would, as a chance to listen and learn.

Unfortunately the first interview, (a group discussion that was a completely successful contribution), was not recorded correctly due to a fault with the recording equipment and the inexperience of the researcher. Yegidis and Weinbach (2002:166) state, "Participants may provide truthful and accurate data, but if they are forgotten, distorted, misinterpreted, or recorded in error by the interviewer, data quality will be low". This was perhaps the most devastating part of the entire research process because the data, received by six participants was unable to be used, a disheartening realisation at the end of the first interview undertaken. However, the participants themselves received the news in their stride and patiently offered to repeat the interview process the following week. Ka mau te wehi! If it were not for this generous offer of their time and understanding this project would not have the substance that they contributed. Four single interviews were then undertaken that were problem-free due to the lessons learned in the first interview.

Analysis

Sarantakos (1993:298) states that the analysis of data in a qualitative research process is ongoing, it flows through the data collection process so that areas are sorted, analysed, reshuffled and analysed again until the entire research area is “saturated.” This analysis will by no means be a complete saturation of the research topic, however it will attempt to thoroughly analyse the participants’ contributions. Also, this researcher anticipates that further analysis of the data will take place, thus creating further research projects on this topic.

The researcher has also chosen to use Sarantakos’ method of qualitative analysis of interviews after collection, which separates the interpretation of data from the presentation of it as to avoid any distortion of the participants’ stories. This method has four simple steps. They are (1) transcription, (2) individual analysis, (3) generalisation, identifying differences and similarities, developing typologies (4) control, going back to the interview documentation and verifying information (Sarantakos, 1993:300).

The researcher transformed this method into one that works collaboratively with Māori Kaupapa research, where participants have a thorough involvement in the process. The first step involved transcribing the interviews, which was undertaken by the researcher as it was seen as a thorough way to identify themes and begin the analytical process. Then each interview transcript was given back to the participants so that changes could be made and permission given again for its use. Finally, participants were contacted about the final stages and informed about when they would receive their own copy of the final document.

Problems, Ethics

Identity

Before the project began, the researcher became aware of the issue (not often discussed) of hostilities and misapprehensions between specific tribal groups. Te Awekotuku states that these issues can be as profound, as alienating and as significant as those between Māori and Tauīwi (1993:11). It was acknowledged that regardless of being Māori, the researcher is not as aware of the kawa of some hapū and whānau compared to the knowledge that comes from one’s own hapū. One must take into account that Māori are not a homogenous group and that regional variation result in

vastly different discourses. There are many tikanga that are the same throughout Aotearoa, but the details and practices often differ from one tribal area to another (Moko Mead, 2003:8). Although there was no limits placed on which tribes the participants would be from, for one reason or another all participants (except for one) belonged to the same iwi as the researcher by mere chance or coincidence. Perhaps this was related to the above tensions, however it is more likely a result of the researcher and Whānau Komiti making the most of their connections and networks.

Te Awekotuku states that if tribal research is restricted to research only from that tribe, then this evolves a form of active separatism, moving in ever decreasing circles (1993:11). However, it is acknowledged that there is a place for iwi autonomy and control over one's own knowledge and research; a generic approach is preferred for this project. Where there are so few Māori with this sort of story to tell, there should be a sharing of knowledge across the board.

Resources

As shown in the previous chapter, there is some writing on the topic of Māori social work methods, little on the history of Māori in the social work area and even less on how Pūao-te-Ata-tū has affected their practice. This caused many problems for the researcher who was trying to develop an understanding of Māori in social services before meeting participants. However this issue is one that will be addressed as soon as more researchers interview and document the stories of people like the participants in this research.

Solutions and Conclusions

Many of the solutions to the problems that arose in this research came from supervision and support by the Whānau Komiti Tautoko. They also came from the way in which participants were incredibly flexible and willing to meet within the limited time the researcher was in their areas. They were also incredibly generous with their time when they were asked to check over their interviews, which together consisted of almost 50,000 words. In conclusion, in order to gather an abundance of useful information one must use all the resources and past stories of researchers so that their mistakes are not repeated.

Chapter Four: Themes from the Narratives.

*Waiho i te toipoto,
kaua i te toiroa.*²⁰

This Chapter discusses the themes that arose from the interviews with Māori social workers. Interviews were held with eight participants, all of whom have practiced or are currently working in a social service organisation. Their roles differ and in some cases have changed over the years. They vary from having once been a client themselves, having foster children living in their homes, and to working on the income and budget side of the clients lives. They have also been social workers at CYFS, in mental health, at hospitals and in community based organisations. Participants were Cultural Advisors, played significant roles in the establishment of Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Kohanga Reo and in some cases were on the Trust Boards of a number of social services.

Generally drawing on life experience and knowledge of Māoritanga, participants openly and willingly got involved in this research, in all cases giving up more time than was initially intended for their contribution to this research project. The information produced in this chapter reflects their approaches to not only working with people but also to every aspect of their lives.

Six questions were asked (see Chapter Three) and the responses by each participant will be presented in the form of the questionnaire for consistency's sake. Each direct quotation will be in italics for the ease of the reader and the participants will be given pseudonyms: called respectively, participant A, E, H, K, M, N, P and R. Each response produced themes, some of which were depicted using different "labels", however, also unmistakably reflecting the characteristics of tikanga Māori and Kaupapa Māori methods. Following the description of the responses to each of the six questions there will be an account of the extra themes that arose from the interviews.

²⁰Let us keep close together, not wide apart (Brougham and Reed, 2004).

Traditional Māori Concepts and Practices Used By Māori Social Workers

The majority of participants responded that the first things they use when working with Māori clients in particular but also non-Māori clients were the Māori rituals of encounter, specifically those involving whakapapa and whakawhanaungatanga. In order to work effectively with the client and family, it became evident that the social worker needs to make a connection with the client as a person before any sort of meaningful intervention can take place. According to participant M: *“When you are working with our people you need to go with whakawhanaungatanga first. You are getting to know them as a person, not getting to know their troubles straight away.”*

The need for Māori social workers to know their own whakapapa, in order to develop whakawhanaungatanga with the client, was paramount to their work. *“It’s about how you identify, you have to know your whakapapa”* (Participant H). Participant N stated each social worker brings particular skills to the job, which reflects how they have been raised, *“each of us brings with us our tūpuna.”* However, participants stated that these concepts have neither increased nor decreased in importance. They remain common, every-day practices. They stated that due to colonisation and urbanisation many Māori have lost the ability to make these connections through a lack of knowledge of their whakapapa and through not being raised in an environment where whakawhanaungatanga is common practice.

A second theme that emerged from every interview was the notion of respect. This concept has been described in two ways; firstly, that there was a general respect that was applied to clients and colleagues as human beings. A second different type of respect applied to their elders, kuia, kaumātua and mentors. Participant P stated, *“When our old Māori people came into the office, they were spoken to in Māori. They were taken aside and recognised for who they were.”* Participants H, N and M add that they tried to treat clients how they would like to be treated themselves. N said, *“You think, well, would I want that person turning up on my door with a warrant to take my children? I don’t think so.”* According to participant N, within the work environment there is a necessary type of respect for workmates that is needed in order to develop whakawhanaungatanga relationships within the team. This helps develop an environment where colleagues can share information about methods and support each other with difficult issues.

All participants stressed the importance of treating kuia and koroua with respect. This involved spending time with them if they were the clients, or involving them in the client's life if they were related, especially if the child-client was their mokopuna. Participants said this also involves using every opportunity to learn from them, thus recognising them as experts in their field.

The use and values of fluency in Te Reo Māori was a theme that was commented on by all participants in various ways. There was a general agreement that knowledge of Te Reo Māori was vital for the understanding of tikanga Māori and for working with Māori people. Participants that were fluent in Te Reo from a young age acknowledged that this tool was fundamental to their ability to connect with Māori clients and whanau. Participant E relates that as a young Social worker he was advised that this skill was something he needed: *“I didn't have fluent Te Reo [and was advised] you have to learn how to do this. So part of my vocation was also in regards to my own cultural rediscovery.”*

Participant A stated that, in her experience, unfortunately many young Māori social workers could not kōrero Māori. She believes this is due to many Māori young people being educated through the Western education system and being qualified but not oriented within their own culture. However, participant E believes Māori young people today are more secure in being Māori and in the use of Te Reo than in his day. Nonetheless, participants agree that the use of Te Reo has helped them to make connections with Māori client and whānau. Participants agreed this had also been a major part of their acceptance within the Māori community, enabling their networking as social workers to become a lot more straightforward.

Kanohi ki te kanohi, being face-to-face with someone, is a fundamental characteristic of traditional methods of practice that the majority of participants use when working with Māori people. Participants stated that while they use concepts such as karakia and whakawhanaungatanga, these concepts are combined with kanohi ki te kanohi. According to Participant K, *“We work alongside them [kuia and koroua] and whakapakiri whanau, so we were all face-to-face.”* There was a general agreement that going to the client and facing them with what you have to say as a social worker is much more effective in breaking down the barriers than simply making a phone call.

Participant N stated that the concept of *kanohi ki te kanohi* is about giving the client respect through going to them and hearing their side of the story, without making assumptions or false conclusions. Participant E also added that the concept of *kanohi ki te kanohi* is more than being face-to-face with someone, it is based on a relationship and in many ways is linked closely with the concept of *whakawhanaungatanga*.

You can't be face-to-face with someone one moment and then after you have done a piece of work say that you are no longer face-to-face. You are actually still in a relationship, it's just that the relationship has changed (Participant E).

Participants related that they felt some of their Pākehā colleagues or supervisors have viewed this concept and many others from a Western perspective and in some cases do not accept them. Participant E stated that *kanohi ki te kanohi* clashes with the Western definition of boundaries for practice. He stated that a lot of the boundaries that were part of being a mainstream professional social worker were “*just bizarre*” from a Māori perspective. “*The nature of those relationships meant that I never took seriously the idea of closure, because I just believed that the nature of the relationship changed*”. This theme was described by all participants as being one that is fundamental to the development of *whakawhanaungatanga* and that these practices need to be maintained throughout the relationship with clients in order to maintain and develop their trust and respect.

Participants described general Māori methods of practice that they use, some in overarching terms such as “*The Marae Model*” and others more specifically naming concepts and basic Māori values. Participant K believed all Māori models come from one's marae and that the concepts are all part of the traditional *whare tūpuna*. He stated that the use of concepts such as *pēpeha* and *whakatauaiki* are about teaching the client “*not just about identity and so forth, it's about teaching them to find healing piki ora.*”

Participant N described his use of *karakia*, *pōwhiri* and *waiata* in order to maintain *tikanga* Māori within the organisational environment. He stated that the use of such methods not only supports Māori and non-Māori social workers but it is a way to ensure that *tikanga* Māori becomes the ‘norm’ within the organisation.

Mondays we start off with a waiata, every Monday morning and have our karakia for the week... we use powhiri to say 'this is our tikanga here and this is how we do things' for everyone, Māori and non-Māori (Participant N).

Participant N related that the use of these methods, particularly karakia, helps Māori social workers to deal with difficult issues that arise on the job. An example of a situation was where social workers had been attending a Family Group Conference (FGC) where a client brought a gun into the meeting. Later, when the group of Māori social workers became aware of the incident they used karakia to support the social workers that were present, so that the issue was properly addressed at work and was not taken home. *"We had a little awahi to one another to help them get through those really rough times"* (Participant N).

Participant H stated that through the use of whakawhanaungatanga she empowers clients by placing them back with whānau, hapū and iwi. M agrees with H in believing that the empowerment of people was fundamental to her being a social worker. *"What kept me there was a love for people, it is not about gaining brownie points for yourself, it is about empowering people"* (Participant M). Participant E supports this view when he stated that the tikanga he uses such as āwhina and tautoko were embedded in the concept of aroha. He stated that aroha is not merely a thought or an emotion; it is an action and is one of the fundamental parts of his approach. He goes as far as saying that the importance of aroha far outweighs *"following the rules."*

There are a number of traditional methods that participant K uses when working with Māori clients and whānau. He listed concepts such as *"momo wairua, awhinatanga, Māoritanga, tautokotanga, mana wairua"* and other such principles of Te Ao Māori. He also stated that the āhuatanga of Māori social workers employment as Kaimahi Māori has to be what leads Māori workers, no matter what type of organisation one works for. On the whole, participants agreed that they draw on Māori processes and concepts reflecting a Māori worldview that has been passed down through generations. As Participant E states:

At the time we did not use Te Whare Tapa Whā or Te Wheke...because at that time those models were not written. They were still dreams in the minds of guys like Mason Durie. So at the time you would just draw on what you thought were Māori ways to view the world.

Participants agreed that contemporary Māori models of practice are greatly needed and each participant supported theorists and writers on Māori models. Some preferred the works of Rose Pere and the model ‘Te Wheke’ and other praised the works of Mason Durie and ‘Te Whare Tapa Whā’. More commonly however, they praised the writers that have come out of *Te Kōmako*²¹ and the arguments produced from this journal. Participants did not claim to use any particular contemporary model; rather they described the use of tikanga and traditional practices as being of primary use for their everyday practice.

Surrounding Influences That Have Caused Changes To Māori Methods Of Practice

There were not many responses to this question, however the few responses were of fundamental importance to participants. One area that was significantly influential to the participants’ practice methods was having the positive influence of a kuia or kaumātua who guided their learning and inspired them to develop their knowledge and use of tikanga Māori.

The majority of participants related that as young social workers they were encouraged or taught by a particular elder or group of elders and more often by a particular kuia with whom they worked. Support from their elders was fundamental to the participants’ development of their Māoritanga and as social workers. Participant K stated, *“I was strongly influenced by my own kaumātua... that’s how I was brought up so it was easy for me to rapport with them, be in their korowai.”*

Participant A reflected upon the importance of having support from elders and respecting them at the same time. She stated that she had the help of a group of kuia who she would go to and they would *“nurture”* her. Participant R also described how he worked with a kuia who was like a mentor for him. He described how spending time with a kuia was actually a fundamental time of learning where he gained knowledge of Māori issues and the history of the area in which they lived. Participant K also experienced this, stating:

²¹ ‘Te Komāko: Social Work Review’ is a Māori Social Work Journal produced by the Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work Association (ANZASW). There is a mainstream journal that is produced more regularly than Te Kōmako that is called ‘The Social Work Review’.

I was buddied up to a kuia and we utilised a number of community linkages, connecting with other kuia and koroua... so that was quite influential for me to be working alongside a kuia who came with a lot of traditional stuff that she brought from the haukāinga.

The majority of participants also spoke of how these kaumātua developed into long-term mentors or support people and played significant roles in their development. Participant E said, *“I have endeavoured to listen to their counsel because they have been critical in my own growth.”*

The political climate of the 1980's was a second influential factor that caused changes to Māori practice methods according to all participants. There was a growing awareness that in order to support Māori clients with their needs, organisations needed to implement Māori approaches, thus they began to employ 'Māori' social workers. Most participants related that they were employed in the area of social services before the 1980's but it was not until Pūao-te-Ata-tū that Māori methods of practice were encouraged. Participant R related, *“Looking back to the 80's when Pūao-te-Ata-tū came into being the environment was becoming really political in relation to services towards Māori”*. According to participants the changes were due to several factors: the Māori land marches, land occupations and protests, such as the 1981 Springbok tour.

A number of these Māori social workers were involved in initiating Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, all of which were fundamental to the concientisation of the time. This influenced the practice methods of Māori social workers. Some participants related that they could now use their practice methods without *“getting into trouble”* and others felt that they no longer needed to *“break the rules”*. Others related that they were forced to suppress their *“Māoriness”* and could now freely apply their methods. Participant K said that he always used Māori methods with Māori and non-Māori clients but chose not to tell anyone what he was doing. Nonetheless, the changing political environment meant that participants could use methods that came naturally to them, as opposed to repressing or disguising their traditional processes.

Descriptions Of Social Service Organisations Before Pūao-te-Ata-tū

The majority of participants started working in social service organisation before Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out, however they were either not specifically social workers or were not able to freely practice their Māori methods. Participant P stated, *“I started in the 70’s and it was just a real Pākehā world... there really wasn’t any notice taken of other people’s customs, not just Māori, everyone was treated the same.”* She said they could not be traditionally inclined with their methods because of the strict regulations of the organisation at the time.

Participants also noted that there were very few Māori social workers and in certain parts of the country there were no Māori social workers at government run social service organisations. They stated that the people in social work positions were predominantly middle-class, non-Māori and did not live in the same community as the clients. According to Participant P, *“Before Pūao-te-Ata-tū you did whanaungatanga but not a great deal, it was a sterile environment”*. Participant A added that in her area there were no Māori social workers because there were no openings in the organisation due to obstacles she refers to as *“blockages.”* Participant P added that Māori methods were not the focus of the job because there was never any flexibility of processes to allow them to be initiated.

Social workers involved in the Justice system related that young people were being *“picked up”* and placed in Care and Protection institutions for minor issues. Participant M stated that in those days minor problems like truancy would result in a child being entered into institutions and in some cases if a child refused to take medication they would be put into *“lock up”*. According to Participant H this process of Care and Protection was detrimental to the child’s development and relationships with his or her family. *“It was damaging and when you discharged them they have lost the link, they have lost the connection”* (Participant H). Although it was not something the Social workers felt comfortable with, it was common practice and an area of their work that some participants struggled with.

Participants stated that the processes of dealing with children and young people before Pūao-te-Ata-tū were alien in relation to traditional Māori concepts of whakawhanaungatanga and kanohi ki te kanohi. It was stated by Participant M that in

some cases you were obliged to take custody orders or guardianship orders when removing a baby from its home. She stated that it was frightening for her in those days, especially when taking babies from their families.

A baby is not going anywhere and you put it with strangers. That was the idea in those days that was what you did, take the kid and put them with strangers and forget about them.

A second theme that emerged from the interviews in relation to social services before Pūao-te-Ata-tū was a perception that policy makers were founding their policies upon Western theories rather than considering what the Māori community wanted. This included a feeling that policy makers were assuming what “a Māori” was like and were not taking a Māori perspective or regional issues into account. According to Participant P, “One thing that was really noticeable was that if you were a ‘white’ looking person you were classed as Pākehā. They didn’t realise that a lot of those white looking people were actually Māori”. She added that before Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released it seemed that policy makers were judging what it was to be Māori based on the views of a minority group of Māori representatives, such as government officials. Participants said that the people advising policy makers were perhaps too detached from the real needs of the community and that the target group was not actually being reached.

I think they were talking to people on Māori committees, some people who had set themselves up to represent Māori. But in reality when you actually go and have a look, it’s not the community that is actually being represented but those few with their own ideas and views (Participant P).

Participant E also disclosed that working for a community-based organisation was difficult for Māori social workers before Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out. He said that one of the complexities of the time was in relation to receiving funding from the Government for working with Māori. Even though at that time 95% of the clientele were Māori and Pacific Islanders he stated that the organisation did not fit the government’s criteria for what a Māori organisation should be. As a Māori social worker, working with Māori clients, being told he was not Māori, by their definition, was exasperating for him. He stated that the decision was made arbitrarily because they did not fit a definition created by the government and by “some North Island model of what it is to be Māori.”

Because of the obvious difficulties for Māori social workers before Pūao-te-Ata-tū, the majority of Participants felt a strong sense of “us and them.” E related, “At the

same time there was the real underground “us and them” thing. There was the department and then there was us.” There were various versions of “them”; in some cases it was in relation to management, and in others it was regarding the government (politicians, policy makers and even government employed social workers). There were also reports that before Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out there was a strong sense of division with regards to Māori and non-Māori.

Participants also reported that there was a general mistrust of Western social work methods and the hegemonic atmosphere they maintained within the organisation. Participant E chose to actively achieve the same ends using methods that were not belonging to a Western framework because of the general feeling that the process was not culturally appropriate for Māori people.

There were a number of comments in relation to the organisational environment in the 1970’s and early 1980’s that participants felt were different from today. Participant P stated that several relatively insignificant changes made the work environment more pleasant for Māori social workers. She stated that, before Pūao-te-Ata-tū, Māori were not permitted to use Te Reo in the workplace and when visitors came to the office they were never officially welcomed or introduced to staff. She also related that at that time a common practice was to hire young people straight out of school and in many cases their age was a disadvantage when working with clients. *“To start with you could finish school and be taken straight on, and as a school leaver you were dealing with peoples’ lives.”* However, Participant P added that over the past 20 years the average age of staff within the workplace has risen by approximately 20 years, which indicated to her that older workers are being hired.

Participants stated that the sharing of information between social services is an area that has changed considerably. P stated that it was easier to discuss clients in the 1970’s than it is today. Before the introduction of the Privacy Act Social workers and Work and Income workers could easily discuss clients if they were concerned about a crisis situation. Participant P stated that this is no longer possible, meaning that without the client’s permission, the social workers are limited to the information the client shares. Not all participants claim this as a fundamental issue.

Māori Methods Before and After Pūao-te-Ata-tū

There was an overall consensus that the principles behind the Māori methods of practice have not changed in the last twenty years. Processes such as whakawhanaungatanga and the use of whakapapa remain the same for the participants and they agree that the practices relating to respect for others and for one's elders have, if not remained the same, then increased since Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released. Participant H stated, in relation to the use of tikanga and Māori methods, that Māori practice methods have not been greatly changed throughout the years:

When you talk about traditional concepts, we do it all the time, whakawhanaungatanga, that's how we work, and we haven't changed our way of working, it has just rubbed off on the other staff, like whanaungatanga.

There was a general consensus that, although they might have not known the 'labels' for what they were doing, practice methods fundamentally have stayed the same. Participant P stated that although one could use one's own methods before, it was not allowed and after Pūao-te-Ata-tū social workers could treat elders with the respect and dignity that they deserve, without "getting a rap on the knuckles for taking an hour to talk to someone," therefore, ones use of this method increased. Participant K related that he has always used a community development approach to social work and to the voluntary work he participates in. He stated that when working with clients he uses whānau concepts that he was taught through maintaining close links with his own whānau, hapū and iwi.

Whakapapa and whakawhanaungatanga were concepts that had been acknowledged by the Government through the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report, "They said 'well if you don't know where you are from and what you are doing then you can't deliver that to our people'" (Participant P). Participants stated that after Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out they could use practices such as whakawhanaungatanga with clients, taking the time to share their whakapapa and to make a connection. Participant P stated that, in relation to financial support for clients, it was not until Pūao-te-Ata-tū came in that a Māori way of raising children was accepted. She stated that the Mātua Whāngai initiative resulted in the recommendations that allowed a benefit to be paid to grandparents who were caring for children instead of placing them with strangers.

Participants N, H and O also shared this view and stated that the biggest impact of Pūao-te-Ata-tū on their practice methods was the inclusion of whānau, hapū and iwi in the 1989 Children Young Persons and their Families Act (CYPF Act). This led to the employment of Māori social workers in social work positions at government run social services. N states, *“At the time we weren’t qualified but they wanted to change the face of social workers, instead of being predominantly Pākehā, middle class... they wanted Māori, frontline Māori staff.”* Participants that were practicing before 1986 found that Pūao-te-Ata-tū brought Māori methods into the view of their employers and colleagues.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū encouraged Māori social workers to develop their methods and to form *“Rōpū Teams,”* where Māori social workers within mainstream social service organisations developed as a subgroup and supported the enhancement of each other’s methods. Some participants described their establishment of a Rōpū Team and stated, *“The only reason it has lasted this long is that we’ve been fortunate enough to have a Māori supervisor.”* This will be discussed later in more depth.

Improving Support for Māori Social Work Methods

The results of question five were extensive, predominantly replicating themes from the previous questions but expanding them and adding a number of themes that relate to the huge change in the workplace environment. The themes will be discussed in two sections; first, the participants commented on a number of improvements that followed Pūao-te-Ata-tū. These improvements will be discussed in relation to what it was like before Pūao-te-Ata-tū and after it came out within the organisational setting. Secondly, there were significant problems that arose after the report was released that related to the level of support given to Māori social workers and the types of support provided. Participants said that after the introduction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, some changes had negative affects on the use of Māori methods. This aspect will be discussed later.

Participant P stated, *“With the introduction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū that is when things really changed... the Ministry started having to realise that there was more to dealing with people than their way.”* The predominant theme in this section of the interviews was that Pūao-te-Ata-tū created huge changes for Māori social workers. Not only were organisations actively employing Māori social workers but their methods were also being

validated, which encouraged the acceptance and understanding of Māori ways of doing things.

There was a sense of ownership over the document. Participants were actively involved in consultation with John Rangihau and the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective and described the report as crucial for Māori development initiatives. M stated, "*Pūao-te-Ata-tū with Rangihau, it was our booklet*" and it was described by N, "*Pūao-te-Ata-tū was like a Bible in those days, which was leading the way to the changes in the department.*" Māori social workers finally had a government document that legitimised their work and meant that the wider community and political environment considered their methods of practice to be "*acceptable.*"

This notion of being validated in one's practice was important to participants, not only in relation to practice methods but also regarding being Māori. H stated, "*It broke the barrier for me, all of a sudden I felt good about being Māori.*" It was encouraging according to participant E. When Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out he was ecstatic because the report stated, "*our way of doing things is professional, and it is no longer second best. It felt really good to be considered an expert in your own arena.*" Therefore, the report promoted the normalisation of being Māori and using Māori methods.

There were various emotions surrounding the release of the report. Participants stated that Pūao-te-Ata-tū put into words what they practiced and in certain ways "*reawakened*" some of those methods. Participant K stated that the report gave recognition to Māori and to working with Māori, a view that was held by all participants.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū made you a bit more confident because it validated some of our ways of doing things... I felt just in doing things like that because they were in line with Pūao-te-Ata-tū. They were things that kept kids out of institutions; they were things that stopped kids getting more charges for things by the police (Participant E).

The overall view that positive change was to come out of this report meant that participants recognised Pūao-te-Ata-tū as being responsible for new initiatives that benefited Māori clients and social workers.

Participants described that some of the changes in relation to Pūao-te-Ata-tū were implemented through the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act in 1989. They said that the report and Act gave them the freedom to support families using their methods and approaches. Participant E stated that through these initiatives avenues were

opened that allowed Māori social workers to work with the family, *“I’m not saying that those avenues work incredibly well, but at least they were acknowledged and were there, which was a good start.”* M added that the way the process was conducted changed as well. She stated that they were able to provide a different setting for their work to take place, rather than only a Pākehā setting. *“I’m not saying it is right or wrong, I’m just saying that in a Māori world, that is where they can identify.”* So the possibilities were open for Māori social workers to use their methods and to provide support for the whānau in an environment they could relate to and feel comfortable in.

Participant P said that following Pūao-te-Ata-tū the organisations started to recognise people’s ability to kōrero Māori and in some cases individuals were paid an allowance for using the skills within the organisation. The use of powhiri or mihi whakatau was introduced within the workplace at that time and enabled Māori social workers to introduce new staff not only to the job but also to a new cultural environment of the office. *“After Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out that is when we started having our formal welcomes... and they started calling on the expertise within the staff to whaikorero.”* Participants stated that the introduction of a pōwhiri into the workplace was positive in the sense that Māori methods were being acknowledged and accepted.

One of the major implementations at that time was the establishment of Māori Teams within social service organisations. Participants who were currently working in a *“Rōpū Team”* stated that the majority of the support they receive is from each other, although they acknowledged that the group would not be established without the support of particular managers and Māori supervisors. They stated that through the Rōpū Team they are able to unburden and talk through difficulties together.

As well as employing more Māori social workers, the employment of Māori supervisors has been fundamental to keeping the group together. As a Māori supervisor, one participant said that she supports the team in any way possible, and described how the supportive atmosphere of the group has drawn in non-Māori workers. She stated, *“I also supervise a Samoan and a non-Māori one because they want to be in the team, and that is the difference, they want to be in the team, they like this awahi, this support”*. Forming a group where Māori practices are the norm is beneficial to Māori and non-Māori workers. It is an initiative that has proven to be successful and a valuable asset to the organisation. Participant R stated that he was drawn to the Rōpū team, *“the big*

attraction was that I had heard about the Röpü Team, I had seen the documents and heard about the struggle there was to get it set up” It is a place for Māori to work using their methods without having to explain basic Māori concepts when they discuss methods with colleagues.

Participants related that from then on they started bringing on board more non-Māori staff who supported their methods, which was *“an awesome move for staff in general,”* and to increase the use of Māori practices. N stated that training Māori and non-Māori staff together on topics such as the Treaty of Waitangi has increased the organisational understanding of Māori methods, resulting in an improvement in support. *“Everyone, they just changed around, and they realised it was ours by right”* (Participant N). Participant K agreed and said that now colleagues and managers have a greater understanding of Māori models from Te Wheke to Poutama. He stated, *“there is less having to explain ourselves around those things.”*

Even now non-Māori, some of our Taiwi people that work in that field are more open to using some of our own practices and even to indigenous models, which is really neat and we have people like Professor Mason Durie who is able to put the background research into those methodologies (Participant N).

As a whole, participants have noticed a vast improvement in support for Māori methods of practice through texts and publications. As H stated, *“if you read, just about every article [in Te Kōmako] is about Māori methods”* and *“they [Ruwhiu, Bradley and others] are all talking about Māori methods, so that is an improvement.”* Participant K added that there are more publications regarding the importance of supervision, specifically relating to having a cultural component. *“The models of supervision have acknowledged the importance of cultural supervision, whether it is Māori or non-Māori and I think that has given more strength to our indigenous Māori Kaimahi”* (Participant K). Participants agreed that the more Māori publications there are, the more access there is to Māori knowledge.

One of the comments that Participant E contributed is that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was an acknowledgement that social services prior to the report were not adequately addressing social issues. E stated that it was the Governments way of stating *“yes, we have tried to do a number of things with Māori kids and it hasn’t worked,”* which is something that many Māori social workers had been saying for years. He stated that it was the

government's way of saying that all they have done is fill institutions with Māori children without dealing with the real issues. Thus, Pūao-te-Ata-tū gave (or intended on giving) Māori the power to address the problems using culturally appropriate methods of practice.

As stated previously there were considerable issues that arose after Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released that were detrimental to the type of support given to Māori social workers. Participants related that after the introduction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, some changes had negative affects on the use of Māori methods for a number of reasons.

Firstly, participants felt that at the time there was resentment by workers who felt threatened by the changes:

There were some that accepted change just like that, but there were others who had to go through the 'cycle' before they got to where others might be. But it eventually happened and those that couldn't handle it, they left (Participant P).

Participants who were involved in the establishment of a "Röpü Team" stated that at the time there was opposition from within the office, *"there were only eight people in the whole of [the region] that supported the forming of this team"*. It was a common theme that people resisted change and in some cases the resistance was from Māori social workers themselves.

Participant R related that resistance, especially when it came from Māori professionals, was difficult to deal with. He stated, *"I was struggling with understanding why there was a resistance"* because it was clear to him that it was something that needed to be done. Participant N stated, *"when we started here there were Māori staff against our team... so some Māori are happy being in Mainstream social work."* However, it was evident that with time, colleagues began to accept Māori initiatives and, as stated previously, some non-Māori joined, while some Māori remained as mainstream workers.

Secondly, participants felt that some of the initiatives that were intended to be the implementation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū were somewhat superficial. According to Participant A, some of the initiatives were lacking in substance. She stated, *"they think they are doing Māori(s) a favour by putting their names on everything. They are not doing us a favour."* It was noted by participants that in some ways the changes were excessive and unnecessary, Participant K stated that when Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out, whenever people

came to the office they would have a pōhiri²² and as he stated, *“then it became like, we are not ‘dial-a-pōhiri’.”* So Māori social workers were not only struggling to make a place for themselves within organisations but were also contending with various definitions of what a Māori initiative could be. Thus, the theme of ‘tokenism’ became evident throughout the interviews.

The custom of respecting elders was tested, according to Participant R, when Social services attempted to put Pūao-te-Ata-tū into practice. He states that there was an expectation that Rangatira could be at the ‘beck and call’ of managers. Some managers would require Rangatira or Cultural Advisors to be at particular meetings and then dismiss them when any significant decision-making took place. Participant M stated that because many Māori social workers did not have the qualifications, *“they were sort of ‘phased out’ and used as dial-a-Māori and that was the sad thing about that.”*

Another recurring theme was the lengths of time government initiatives exist. Participant E related that he has noticed an improvement in support for Māori methods but *“if you talk to long-term Māori practitioners, a number of them will still be waiting for the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū to be put in place”*. Participants R and M stated that they worked in organisations that would initiate positive change for Māori and then phase it out. R stated that while working in a unit that focused on Māori employment a change in government resulted in a change in departmental focus, which eventually cut all the strategies, and funding for Māori programmes. As the political climate changed so did the Government’s approach to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the report slowly became eroded (Participant R).

Participant M stated that what seemed a *“perfect model”* in Matua Whangai was also eroded, even though they had finally found a model that Māori children could relate to. *“I felt cheated at that time, I’ll say this for me, as a Māori, I felt cheated... because we were finally making connections in a Māori way.”* Therefore, participants agreed that they needed to consistently use Māori methods of practice in order to keep the vision of Pūao-te-Ata-tū alive.

Participants provided other reasons for the erosion of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. According to Participant R, managers at that time were subject to far more scrutiny regarding culturally appropriate practices. He stated, *“I think a lot of them struggled with the*

²² Powhiri (dialect of the participant).

cultural stuff in that environment” especially in relation to recruitment policies. M also added that when Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out there was not enough money to fully implement the changes. She commented, “*So many times they introduce things with no money behind it,*” which adds to the difficulty of incorporating the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū into mainstream practice.

Participant E stated that, in his opinion, the Government have gone some way towards achieving Pūao-te-Ata-tū but that they definitely have a long way to go to achieve what they first envisaged. Participants were not greatly supportive of more recent documents such as Te Punga²³ and stated that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was the seminal document, which the department still has to fulfil. Participant E stated:

It is not an issue of blaming individual practice...I think it is a more structural issue in terms of having a department that comes under the Public Finance Act²⁴ and that has its core business changed depending on the whim of politicians.

However, another theme of the interviews was that in terms of fundamental principles and methods of practice, social workers practice how they want to practice. Participants agreed that tikanga Māori and the basic principles of their methods do not change. What does change is the political climate and its effect on the way Māori are viewed by the majority culture.

How To Better Support Māori Social Workers and Māori Methods Of Practice

The responses to this question were similar from each participant. All participants agreed on a number of areas that could be improved within social service organisations. These major themes will be discussed first, followed by the various suggestions that were unique to each participant.

The first improvement was related to the way in which Māori social workers and social workers in general share their knowledge. They stated that Māori methods of practice would vastly improve if Māori social workers, specifically long-term

²³ Te Punga was a report produced by the Department of Social Welfare in 1994 (See Chapter Two).

²⁴ The Public Finance Act of 1989.

practitioners, shared the methods they use on a day-to-day basis. According to Participant E, “*Māori social workers and Māori practice methods have to be professional... That means people have to start sharing their stories, they have to start writing them down, they have to start turning them into theoretical ways of doing things.*” He then stated that the best practice models used by Māori social workers need to be measured so that better ways of working with people can be developed. It was agreed that unwillingness to share was not an issue; rather, a lack of means to document and distribute the information was the problem.

Participants stated that one difficulty, which is perhaps getting in the way of the documentation of Māori methods, is the constant need to justify and define Māori methods to non-Māori readers. It was as if the use of Māori methods was not yet considered ‘normal,’ or was not yet fully accepted, within social service organisations. Rather than developing methods from a Māori perspective, participants stated that they still have to explain themselves to those who view them from a non-Māori worldview.

Participants also said that there is still a sense of caution when sharing knowledge and stories in a public forum. Participant K related that it is absolutely important to explain Māori ways to non-Māori and to teach them Māori ways of doing things but adds, “*I don’t tell them too much though.*” The feeling of “*us and them*” was perhaps present in this statement and is an underlying reason why Māori methods are not being shared as much as would be liked. This is linked to the historic misrepresentation of Māori knowledge by non-Māori writers when documenting information in the early years of colonisation.

A second theme is that participants felt that gaining a professional qualification and joining the New Zealand Association of Social Workers is vital for the improvement of Māori social workers and their methods. Participants H, N and R stated that when discussing Māori development, “*we want every Māori to have a qualification.*” They then follow on to say, “*and then the next step is joining the association so that we are professional.*” Participant E added that this is fundamental for Māori social workers because a number of long-term Māori practitioners are not yet qualified and the new registration policies could have a devastating impact on Māori social work in general. Participants stressed the importance for Māori social workers to not only work on a daily basis to achieve positive outcomes for themselves and their organisation but to also

concentrate on the development of their professional approach as social workers. This includes being active in teaching and learning, keeping up with the Social Work Review journal and maintaining networks with other Māori social workers within the community.

A third suggestion was that the most appropriate way to improve support for Māori methods is to increase the numbers of Māori managers and supervisors. Participant M stated, *“the best person to work with a Fijian is a Fijian, the best person that could work with a Samoan is a Samoan”* and participants agreed the best person to understand and be supportive of cultural issues is someone from that culture. A reoccurring theme was that the employment of more Māori managers and supervisors would enable Māori to use their methods without having to teach and explain basic principles about being Māori. Participant K stated, *“We need more Māori managers because those methods can be used at all sorts of levels”*.

The increase of Māori methods at a management or supervisory level would promote a greater understanding of Māori methods for Māori and non-Māori. Participant H added that it is not enough to have a Māori person in that position. That person needs to have the skills of a manager or supervisor, knowledge of Te Reo and tikanga Māori, and need to have the ability to lead, encourage and be respected. She stated, *“I am also of the belief that it is who you are, because sometimes they do have Māori Supervisors but they don’t have the same strength and āhua.”* This suggests the theme of being ‘Tūturu Māori’, which will be discussed later.

Participant K stated that in situations where there are no Māori supervisors, social workers needed to be provided with access to cultural supervision. He stated that there needed to be positive recognition of it as an essential part of every social workers employment. *There are more publications coming through now in terms of the importance of supervision, which relates to the cultural component* (Participant K).

Participants stated that organisations need to take responsibility for providing cultural supervision for social workers. They also said social workers need to be aware of cultural supervision and demand access to it. Participant K recommended that social workers should be made aware of this support at training institutions so that they are conscious of it when beginning their employment at an organisation. Other participants added that the organisation needs to be more active in offering cultural supervision and provide it unconditionally.

The final theme from this section that was stressed by all participants is the importance of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Treaty of Waitangi. They stated that government initiatives, regardless of their success levels, are continually poorly implemented. Since Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released they have noticed it slowly being abandoned. Participant R stated, *“I noticed with the change in political climate, that Pūao-te-Ata-tū slowly became eroded,”* and he adds that it was as if *“the essence of the wairua was gone.”* They stated that this is because the government does not maintain the implementation of positive initiatives, each time the government changes, the way policies are put into practice changes.

Participant M added that Māori social workers would never be able to achieve successful change when the government constantly changes its approach to Māori issues. She said the reasons why Māori make up disproportionately high levels of the client population is because of the continual change by policy makers, which is in many cases obstructing Māori social workers. She stated if she could change anything it would be in relation to the Treaty, *“why write something if you are not going to keep your word? And for policy makers, keep your damn word! Don’t change the goal posts when you get to it.”* The emotion felt by participants was strong when it came to inconsistencies relating to iwi and cultural policies. They said that policy makers and organisational managers were always trying to change something that worked well and that in order to keep Pūao-te-Ata-tū alive they needed to persevere and strive against the policy changes.

The following suggestions are individual opinions that were not necessarily voiced by the whole group of participants. One suggestion from a participant about working with children in care and protection was the need to know that child’s whakapapa. She stated that often children do not know their whakapapa and if you know it then you can teach them who they are related to and what the significance of whakapapa is. This also enables the Social worker to place the child with whānau and as Participant A stated, often the grandparents are not aware of the child’s situation because of a breakdown in relationships with the parents.

Participant M stated that one way of better supporting Māori methods is by giving a putea to kaumātua and kuia when they are called on for support and guidance, specifically related to one’s mahi. She said that organisational regulation regarding a ‘koha’ makes it difficult when being respectful of people’s needs. Social workers who

want to give a koha have to be reimbursed for this, but she stated this is a difficult process. In her opinion, if organisations were more supportive of practices such as giving a koha then they would be moving towards developing an acceptance of Māori concepts and approaches.

Participant P suggested that one improvement would be for organisations to allow social workers to spend more time with clients. This would allow workers to do adequate assessments and to develop a rapport with clients. It would also give workers the opportunity to thoroughly explain to clients what is happening and why. Participant P stated that if clients had a thorough understanding of what they were entitled to, their rights and why social workers do what they do, the client's exposure to social services would decrease. Participant E concluded that one of the crucial issues for CYFS is the image it has of itself and that the public has of it. He stated, "*The public has these huge expectations of it that it is not capable of meeting because of its own funding problems*". Overall, participants agreed that social work has changed in many ways over the past 20 years. They said, in order for services to improve, there needs to be a better understanding and consistency regarding the fundamental goals of social service organisations.

150 years of bad management by those that have colonised Māori cannot be turned around in what is now 16 years with a new Act. If you look at the history of child protection in this country for Māori, Māori ways of doing things were completely disregarded until the 1980's (Participant E).

This explains why the struggle for Māori methods to be normalised is continuing today and why significant changes are needed for Māori to develop even further.

Finally, being 'Tūturu Māori' was an issue that participants mentioned, which does not 'fit' into a category within the questionnaire structure but is by no means less important than the other themes. The term "Tūturu Māori" is discussed here as it relates to how people identify, being Māori or being non-Māori and being confident in ones identity.

Tūturu Māori

Being strong in one's Māori identity, to be 'Tūturu Maori,' was a recurring theme throughout the interviews. Even though the interviewer did not specifically refer to the issue, the theme of one's identity arose throughout each question. Participants said that

being Māori influenced their methods of practice and how they had practiced as social workers over time. They described it when recalling the reasons behind why they were dedicated to their work. Some of these reasons came down to the underlying feeling that as Māori people they felt a responsibility to help their people.

Being Tūturu Māori was a way some participants described their approach to social work. As Participant M stated, *“It’s about identity and being comfortable in your own world.”* Participants also talked about having the ability to walk in two worlds and having the skills to work in both a Māori and Pākehā setting. Participant K stated, *“I had a lot of titles as a social worker but I have always kept my feet firmly on Papatuānuku, you know, being Māori, he Māori ahau.”* They agreed that it was not easy in the 1980’s being Tūturu Māori within a Pākehā work environment.

When asked what it was like before Pūao-te-Ata-tū their response was that having a strong Māori identity was something that was not held by every Māori. Some Māori social workers identified as Māori but only practice their customs at home and not in the workplace. *“There were a lot of people in those days who even though they were Māori, they didn’t practice the customs”* (Participant P). This meant that not only did they struggle to develop the acceptance of Māori social work methods within the Pākehā environment but there was resistance between Māori as well.

Participant H stated that it was as if some Māori were not quite sure whether they wanted to be Māori and were only Māori when it suited them. All participants agreed that this issue changed when Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released. Māori were given the freedom to chose to work as Māori social workers or as mainstream workers. Participant A stated that Māori people are trying to find their identity. They were in search of their roots and were learning their whakapapa.

This could only be a positive move for Māori social work because the development of one’s cultural identity enables one to more effectively work with Māori people (Participant E). *“Now you can take it back to the Marae where kids can identify it as their place, rather than the office being their place”* (Participant M). The more culturally secure Māori people are, the more opportunities will arise for guiding young Māori and their families in relation to their Māoritanga.

These are the things that Māori social workers today who have come through the land marches and the fights to get where we are today for the social

workers of today...I hope this has been a theme of the interviews, that our people have been prepared to move and to challenge and change but not lose sight of the tikanga and the taonga-tuku-iho (Participant K).

With regards to the theme of being ‘Tūturu Māori,’ it is not surprising that being strong in one’s identity is a common theme of the participants. Having lived and practised as social workers through the struggles of the 1980’s and the multiple changes of the now Department of Social Development, these participants developed their skills and knowledge of Te Ao Māori in order to be secure in their practice methods. In conclusion, six major themes appeared in the interviews with the eight participants.

They are:

1. Tikanga Māori such as whakawhanaungatanga, wairuatanga and aroha are all fundamental aspects of Māori social work methods, are vital to their relationship with clients and also their approach in the organisational environment;
2. Māori social workers are receptive to learning from their elders and appreciate the tikanga that was passed on to them. The changing political environment of the 1980’s influenced their employment status and ability to practice as Māori social workers;
3. The organisational environment before Pūao-te-Ata-tū was released was disempowering for Māori social workers and there was little support for the use of their methods;
4. The essence of Māori social work methods (tikanga Māori) has not changed throughout the years since Pūao-te-Ata-tū, however social workers have benefited from the contemporary Māori developments, such as contemporary social work models;
5. Pūao-te-Ata-tū encouraged a vast improvement in support for Māori methods of practice, however Māori social workers are continuously battling to use their methods as the level of support for their methods has been inconsistent;
6. Through the Treaty of Waitangi and Pūao-te-Ata-tū, Māori social workers stress the importance of being knowledgeable and highly

skilled in all areas of the social work profession, from management to social workers.

To conclude this chapter it must be stated that the information provided by the participants' interviews far exceeded the themes discussed in this chapter. There are a number of areas that could easily be expanded, proving that this topic not only causes dynamic discussion but also is one that can be examined from a number of different angles. However, the writer has attempted to describe each person's comments with the full meaning and emotion with which they were stated.

Chapter Five: An Analysis of Themes from the Narratives.

*Kia mau koe ki ngā kupu o ōu tīpuna.*²⁵

This chapter follows on from the previous description of the interviews with Māori social workers by analysing the data and comparing it to the theoretical and literature review in Chapter Two. The proverb above encourages one to listen to the words of one's ancestors. This research project also hopes attention is paid to the words of elders, however, this chapter is about developing an understanding of those words with a critical eye. It does so by referring to the previous themes in Chapter Four. These themes will be presented following the same chronological order of the previous chapters (beginning with question/theme one and following through all six questions from the interview). After presenting the interviews with Māori social workers the researcher asks the questions posed in Chapter Two. They were:

1. What are the underpinnings of Māori social work methods?
2. How have they changed since the 1980's?
3. What impact has the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report had on Māori social work?
4. What else has influenced the experiences of Māori social workers?

Jones (1993:56) states that the analysis of qualitative data, especially from 'depth interviewing' is a highly personal activity that has no definite rules for the researcher to follow by rote. This is perhaps an area where qualitative research and Kaupapa Māori research are most similar in that neither provides a step-by-step process for the researcher to follow (Eketone, 2005:9). Within this chapter there will be a data analysis of the themes identified in Chapter Four, and finally a discussion of these findings and future possibilities for research developments and change.

²⁵ Hold fast to the words of your ancestors (Brougham and Reed, 2004).

Traditional concepts used by Māori social workers

Theme One: Tikanga Māori such as whakawhanaungatanga, wairuatanga and aroha are all fundamental aspects of Māori social work methods, are vital to their relationship with clients and also their approach in the organisational environment.

Theme one addresses outright the question: What are the underpinnings of Māori social work methods? There was an overall consensus among participants that the methods they use are embedded within tikanga Māori; therefore, they do maintain the theories of the past and tikanga Māori underpins the participant's methods. The description of whakawhanaungatanga and other practices are the equivalent of those described by theorists in Chapter Two (Mutu, 2003:162; McNatty, 2001:1; Durie, 1998:68; Bishop, 1996:13), indicating the validity of the theories.

The Literature, in Chapter Two, describes Māori social work methods as being elements of tikanga Māori that are used eclectically, so that all aspects of the client and family are addressed. The literature demonstrated that Māori methods are ever evolving and being adapted to any particular client situation or part of the country. The role of 'whānau' was particularly important in the descriptions by theorists, as was the inclusion of spirituality in the process.

One important aspect to note when analysing the data from participants is that 'one concept' did not appear to be more significant to social work than other traditional concepts. Participants listed their processes in their distinctive ways, as do writers and theorists, but all descriptions maintained that each part is as important as the next: whanaungatanga is as important as the acknowledgement of wairua in the form of a karakia. Aroha is fundamental to whanaungatanga, which cannot exist without Manaakitanga (Pere, R 1997:4). Therefore, it was found that the literature described each tikanga as being as significant as the next and this was also the case in reality for the participants.

It is not surprising then, in a 'helping' profession, where the focus is on people, that the process of whanaungatanga would be important to Māori social workers. The description of whakawhanaungatanga by participants was, therefore, the same as that of

McCully (Mutu, 2003:162) in *Te Whānau Moana* where he calls it one of the most fundamental values that hold a Māori community together. It follows that whakawhanaungatanga featured as a key dimension of all contemporary methods discussed in Chapter Two, either in the form of whanaungatanga or ‘Taha whānau’ (Durie, 1998:68; Stanley, 2000:38; Dreardon, 1997:6).

According to participants M, H, N, E and P, whakawhanaungatanga is the forming of a close relationship with families that is continual and in many cases outlasts the purely working relationship. The participants know the families so well that they are familiar with many generations in the community and often know aspects of the clients’ whakapapa. Evidently, the ideal means of continuing positive relationships within the community environment requires the worker and clients continuing a prolonged inhabitation of the same society (ibid).

Whakawhanaungatanga could be described as consistent with the notion of ‘networks’ that social workers maintain in order to be more effective within the community. However this research demonstrates that Māori social workers not only uphold networks with other organisations and community groups, but also continue the relationships with clients through living and existing in the same geographical areas as them. Therefore, whakawhanaungatanga is more than the maintaining of networks. Participant N stated,

[Before Pūao-te-Ata-tū] Social workers used to be living in a different area from their clients, they couldn’t relate to them. Now if they [clients] say ‘what do you know about it?’ I say, ‘well I live around here, this is my neighbourhood too.

However, theorists from Chapter Two often describe whakawhanaungatanga as being the nurturing of relationships within the family of the client. The social worker is thus more of a facilitator of the relationships rather than being personally involved (Durie, 1998:68). These theorists also omit discussing the length of involvement the social worker has with the family, as opposed to Participant E who stated that when working with Māori clients, the relationship never ends, it just changes when the ‘working relationship’ is finished. This is more realistic, considering that social workers and clients often live in the same area. The discrepancy between the consistent practice of Māori social workers and that of Māori theorists is perhaps stemming from

the difference between theory and practice. It could also be relating to the fact that these theorists are writing from a profession other than social work, such as Education or Health, where the concept of whanaungatanga is implemented differently within the different environment.

Theorists describe the concept of whakawhanaungatanga in relation to building the strength of the client/family. Social workers, however, are preoccupied with the notion of rapport and its significance for achieving positive outcomes. In relation to question one, it is assessed that the concept is altered and negotiated in relation to the situation at hand, rather than being distorted or unrecognisable.

This analysis demonstrates that for whanaungatanga to be achieved by social workers, more than networks and kinship links need to occur. The process of whakawhanaungatanga consists of the development of a rapport with the family and the achievement of positive outcomes, thus the strengthening of the family is the fundamental outcome of whakawhanaungatanga for social workers. Theorists did not discuss this and this researcher suggests that theorists have not been describing whakawhanaungatanga from a social work perspective, where change is the focus of the interaction. One also observes that for whakawhanaungatanga to occur, much like social work practice, the emphasis is on the process as much as the outcome.

Other issues

When responding to question one, only one participant mentioned contemporary models as a way of describing the traditional concepts she used. *“If you look at Te Wheke, we do these things: whakawhanaungatanga, Manaakitanga, all the time.”* She presented the diagram and explained the way each aspect of the model is important in Te Ao Maori. However, as she continued she stated, *“but I never used these before, I didn’t know the names for these things.”* This is due to the fact that contemporary Māori social work models were not well documented until the late 1980’s because they had not yet been created and Māori social workers were not expected to label their methods using traditional Māori terminology. These contemporary models were created to explain how Māori social workers were already practicing.

The researcher anticipated that participants would raise contemporary models as surrounding influences that have caused changes to their methods. This, however, was

not the case. In answering question two, no participants reported that contemporary models influenced their practice. There was however, a discussion of contemporary models under question four, which is where participants acknowledged an improvement of support for Māori methods of practice.

The researcher identifies two possible reasons for the lack of discussion by participants about contemporary social work models. The first concerns the wording of the questions and the particular focus of this research on Pūao-te-Ata-tū. By telling participants of this focus before the interviews, the researcher possibly swayed their discussion towards reports and legislation as influential factors, as opposed to contemporary Māori developments.

The second suggestion is that Māori social workers have socially constructed, well-established models of their own, formed from their own interaction with society. They have developed processes based on their current or past knowledge surrounding interaction with others (Bruner, 1990:54) This suggests that these well-developed models consist of a combination of tikanga Māori (presented in Chapter Four) and organisational practices that each participant has fine-tuned to suit their approach to working with people.

This relates to the discussion of definitions, where models are described as the working ‘tools’ for social workers, as opposed to the underpinning values and theories. The underpinning values and theories of Māori social workers is evidently tikanga Māori, a theoretical approach that is unchanging, according to theorists and social workers alike. This research suggests that contemporary models are mainly “legitimizing devices” for outside consumption, while Māori social workers continue to use tikanga Māori.

A significant theme that surfaced from question one and question two, which is scarcely mentioned by theorists, is respect for one’s elders. Durie (1998:68) mentions Taha-Whanau as involving a focus on the extended family, which inevitably involves ones elders. Te Ahu Poata-Smith (1996:45) says that respect is an underpinning value of the Poutama model and Stanley (2000:36) recommends that social workers have access to elder knowledge. This is relevant for the stories of the participants but what the theorists omit is the way in which Māori social workers learn from a particular elder as a mentor figure.

The findings of this research state that a fundamental aspect of a Māori social worker's development is through working with an elder and learning from them. Becoming accepted in a Māori community involves skills of listening, watching and copying. These are skills that are more easily obtained with the support of one's elders (Durie, E., 1986). Eketone's (2005) Waka model recommends the inclusion of kaumātua in the process and delivery of services. This is an ideal area for contemporary theorists to add to their models and for social service organisations to initiate. Thus, young Māori social workers could be provided with similar support systems as long-term practitioners. This will also enable long-term practitioners to pass on valuable experiences and processes.

The use of Te Reo Māori is also fundamental to Māori social workers. Contemporary theorists do not discuss the use of the Māori language as being specifically important to social work practice. However they do choose to describe aspects of their methods in Te Reo, which requires an understanding of the language in order to fully interpret the meanings of the model. In relation to Smith's (1997:38) description of Kaupapa Māori theory, the explicit use of Te Reo and emphasis on its use is a characteristic of resistance, concientisation and praxis.

Through the use of Te Reo Māori, participants are resisting the dominance of other languages and emphasising the importance of Te Reo for the maintenance of the culture. They are also making the use of the Māori language 'normal,' so that the focus of Māori social workers can be on Māori as opposed to the 'de-colonisation' approach that puts the coloniser at the centre of attention (Smith, G. 2003:2). The use of language is also a characteristic of a constructivist approach, which depicts the construction of one's understandings of the world through the use of language. Therefore, through a constructivist and Māori social work approach, one realises that Te Reo is significant for all Māori development, Kaupapa Māori theory and for the future construction of Māori ways of understanding and interpreting the world.

Kanohi ki te kanohi is an aspect of tikanga Māori that was used by Māori social workers and is described by theorists as vital for Kaupapa Māori work (Smith, L. 1999:120). Smith describes the importance of "the seen face," as presenting oneself to people be face-to-face. Participants also said that being with clients in person enables whakawhanaungatanga to be achieved more rapidly, often without the difficulties that

are experienced when contacting people by phone. Being with the family in person quickens the development of a rapport and proves one's willingness and commitment to the relationship. It also enables the social worker and family to use many of the non-verbal customs and body language, typical of Māori protocols, in order to develop trust and understanding. Although it is an important aspect of Māori culture, the fact that more is achievable in person is a principle all cultures will be aware of but do not always use.

Another theme coinciding with Smith's (1997:38) description of Kaupapa Māori theory is concientisation. Participants noted that they were often pro-active in their work with Māori, combining a critique of Western infrastructures with the use of tikanga Māori. Participant E stated that he was often active in the use of Māori methods as he chose to avoid social work practices that alienated and marginalised Māori clients. He saw his resistance against Western methods as an active validation of Māori methods of practice. Other participants developed strategies for using Māori methods in the years when they were not encouraged, while others chose to adopt Western methods. A further area of interest would be to study how this history of resistance impacts on Māori social workers today.

Surrounding Influences

Theme Two: Māori social workers are generally receptive to learning from their elders and appreciate the tikanga that was passed on to them. The changing political environment of the 1980's also influenced their employment and ability to practice as Māori social workers.

As previously stated, the researcher thought that contemporary models would perhaps present themselves as an influential factor that have changed Māori social work methods in one form or another. However, there were only two areas that participants described; the support of elders and the changing political environment of the early 1980's. The wording of the question may have influenced the response, however, the researcher chose to refrain from leading the discussion onto topics of contemporary models, acknowledging that they may not be as significant in the view of the participants.

One noticeable aspect of this section was that participants who described furthering their social work training did not specify this as a major influence on their methods, rather, that the training about the Treaty of Waitangi influenced the development of positive working relationships among colleagues. It is questionable as to whether or not training would have been more significant in the development of skills and perspectives for Māori social workers that are beginning their careers as opposed to those who have extensive practice experience.

The changing political situation was significant for participants because those that were already employed at a social service organisation could now call themselves 'Māori' social workers and could now use their natural methods of interaction with people. For other participants, those changes initiated their employment as social workers. Although this is not necessarily a change in practices it is a beginning. Therefore, the changes were not so much in the methods of the worker but in the way they were viewed by the organisation. This does not necessarily mean the fundamentals of their practice models changed; both the worker and the contemporary models were only beginning.

Social Services before Pūao-te-Ata-tū

Theme Three: The organisational environment before Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out was disempowering for Māori social workers and there was little support for the use of their methods.

Participants were unanimous in their description of social service organisations in the 1980's before the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report came out. It was evident that the changes described in the literature review had immense effects on participants, both personally and professionally. They passionately described being involved in 'Hikoi' and other such protests or alternatively in the establishment of Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Kohanga Reo. Participants were unquestionably active in the 1980's, either in establishing a place for themselves within some sort of active group or transforming groups in which they were involved.

Participants described the effects of urbanisation on their practice as being somewhat influential. Participant K stated that his mentor, a kuia who had moved to the city, had brought tikanga from her haukainga that he had then learnt, thus improving his practice and links with the haukainga. This relates to Bradley's comment that even though many Māori moved to urban areas they often continued to identify with their iwi affiliations (1997:3). Other participants had a more difficult experience of government agencies and perhaps did not receive the same level of support as participant K.

Participants described the 1970's – 1980's era as being "*a Pākehā world*" that restricted their use of Māori methods. Shirley (1979:101) states that organisations had little understanding of Māori society and the participants agree that they were restricted from developing the little understanding the organisation had. They described the social services at the time as "damaging" to Māori children, an opinion that was also stated by theorists and writers on the topic (Bradley, 1997:3; Durie, 1998:24).

Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Changing Methods of Practice

Theme Four: The essence of Māori social work methods (tikanga Māori) has not changed throughout the years since Pūao-te-Ata-tū, however social workers have benefited from the contemporary Māori developments.

As one returns to the possibility of whether Māori methods of practice have changed and are easily susceptible to change, this section more bluntly states, that the answer is no. Participants unanimously stated that, yes, the ability to openly use ones methods has changed significantly, however since Māori social workers have begun working with Māori clients, using Māori methods, there has been little transformation in their tactics. This answers the hypothesis that Māori methods have remained the same, and although it does address it, there are still a number of factors to consider when taking the social issues into consideration.

One area of interest was the way participants responded to this question. Beginning with the methods participants used before Pūao-te-Ata-tū, some described not knowing how to describe their methods in the early days and being "cagey" about what they told supervisors. However, others described stories of using Māori methods and disguising them with Western terminology. Participant P admitted she refused to

break organisational rules by using Māori methods and tried to use only Western methods. Others described it as a constant battle to justify their use of Māori methods with clients. Thus, each approach and action at the time was a reflection of their personal response to their employment within a particularly restricted environment. One could argue this adaptation to a non-supportive environment was in fact an adaptation of Māori methods of practice.

Māori Methods Since Pūao-te-Ata-tū

Theme Five: Pūao-te-Ata-tū encouraged a vast improvement in support for Māori methods of practice, however it has never been fully implemented.

This theme was significant in the sense that on one hand, participants agreed that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was outstanding for Māori but state that, in another sense, it was ineffectual. Participants fully supported the initiatives of John Rangihau and the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective. They describe the era with an enthusiasm that emulates the impact the report would have had in 1986. However, participants supported what theorists previously stated: Pūao-te-Ata-tū was never completely implemented.

It may in fact be timely to reflect on whether the challenges proffered by the Advisory Committee have been implemented, and whether the early morning sunlight of the new dawn has yet to reach whānau, hapū and iwi (Richard Bradley, 1997:18).

Pūao-te-Ata-tū did, however, have a significant impact on Māori social work models, firstly through the employment of Māori social workers but more importantly through recommending the acceptance of Māori methods of practice within the workplace. Participants stated that they have validation in the use of tikanga Māori in the workplace and know that it is their right to do so because of the report. This notion is significant because Māori social workers that are aware of this right can use Pūao-te-Ata-tū to justify their action if or when others question them.

But, an underlying question of this project is “*Why write a report if you are not going to implement it?*” It seems the naïveté of the researcher and participants is

revealed by this remark, as the literature review showed Pūao-te-Ata-tū was not the only significant report to be “put away in a draw” (Bateman, 2005:417). This is comparable to the Treaty of Waitangi, a significant document, much respected by Māori, which has been either ignored or developed into ‘principles’ by the state (Bazley, 1994:1-2). Perhaps principles are more easily implemented into social services, however it could be that they are in fact more easily manipulated.

Participant E stated, *“if you ask me, Māori social workers will still be waiting for the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū to be put into place”*. Arguably, almost twenty years later, the participants are still waiting, in their own ways, for the recommendations to be implemented. Not in a way that is ignorant or naïve, but in a way that stems from knowing both an ideal report and what they consider is best for their people.

Therefore, with reference to Bradley’s comments, the early morning sunlight of the new dawn has reached whanau, hapu and iwi, through the employment of Māori social workers. Although, one could argue that in many ways it has not yet reached them to its full capacity. The dawn of Pūao-te-Ata-tū has been grasped by Māori but has not been allowed to rise to its full potential. In many ways the answer rests with participant M, who stated, *“it really depends on the person”* Māori social workers, like any social workers, have different ways of addressing the organisational environment and therefore achieve different results with their work. If a Māori social worker knows their right to use Māori methods and receive the support they are entitled to, then the dawn may reach their clients.

Participant K touched on this when he stated that, in a role he undertakes as an educator, he is concerned that young Māori social workers do not fully understand the significance of reports like Pūao-te-Ata-tū and are not well equipped to use it to support them. Those who lived and worked through the 1986 report are more likely to know how to implement it into their practice and to demand it of the organisation they work at. However, participant K stated the tuakana-teina relationship is vital for passing on these skills and experiences, for working with clients but just as importantly for existing within an organisation.

How To Better Support Māori Social Workers

Theme Six: Through the Treaty of Waitangi and Pūao-te-Ata-tū at all levels of social service organisations, Māori social workers stress the importance of being knowledgeable and highly skilled in all areas of the social work profession.

All participants agreed that, in order to improve support for Māori methods of practice, Māori needed to develop as a whole. The participants all promoted the development of skills in all areas, professionally and in Te Ao Māori, so that Māori social workers have the skills to not only “walk in both worlds” but also be high achievers in those worlds.

They place the responsibility for this development with academic institutions, with the social service organisations, the Ministry of Social Development and most importantly with Māori in general. Participant K stated, *“It is good to see training organisations and tertiary institutions... starting to have a whole Māori stream”*. This enables Māori social workers to become qualified professionals in an environment that is respectful of their needs.

The responsibility social service organisations have falls into two sections. Firstly, participants stated that more Māori social workers need to be hired and more at supervisory levels. The only way to fully support Māori supervisors is for tikanga Māori to be fully understood and implemented at all levels of the organisation. Secondly, the organisation should take responsibility to ensure their staff continue training and are well educated in the treaty of Waitangi and tikanga Māori. This does not mean making a course available that staff need to take time off to attend. Rather, this means a substantial training course that is attended by all staff members together so that the learning and understanding is achieved as a team. It is not the responsibility of Māori social workers to teach their colleagues, although they admit to being happy to help others to learn about Māori issues, it is the responsibility of managers, whether they are Māori or non-Māori.

Participant H stated, *“I think I wouldn’t change anything except the Treaty,”* meaning, not that the Treaty itself should change but that the organisation should change and improve their implementation of it. She felt this would be one change that would cause positive changes to other areas of the working environment. Participants agreed that in order to achieve their goal of improving Māori social work in general, the Treaty must be the driving force of positive change.

Research Questions and Implications For Māori Social Workers

The discussion of themes, findings and literature shows that the research questions were addressed and answered extensively. This impacts, evidently on Māori social workers, as there are many implications from these findings. The first question regarding the underpinnings of Māori social work methods has been thoroughly answered throughout the findings and themes discussion. This research proves that tikanga Māori are the underpinnings of Māori social work methods. Therefore, in order to assess the practices, processes and theories used by Māori in the social work field, one should primarily develop an understanding of ngā tikanga before anything else. Whether a worker chooses to explain their tikanga with a particular “model” (such as ‘The Marae Model’) it is shown in this research that a worker who identifies herself as Māori will use tikanga to guide her practices and processes, from the beginning stages of becoming employed to the individual interaction with clients and whānau.

The implications of this for Māori social workers are that this research not only proves the validity of tikanga for working with people (Chapter Two) but shows that tikanga can effectively be applied to practice by people who have a thorough understanding of it. This project also proves that Māori social work methods can be used within any social service organisation for the benefit of clients and have only positive implications for the work environment. The participants prove that tikanga can be learnt and adopted by non-Māori colleagues on the condition that tikanga is supported and implemented at a managerial level.

The second research questions, which asked ‘how have Māori methods changed since the 1980’s’ is a difficult question to answer. On one hand, the short answer has been that the tikanga, which underpins the methods has not changed, therefore the methods have not varied throughout the years. On further analysis the literature review proves that Māori social work methods were not documented before the 1980’s, therefore one cannot prove whether they have changed or not without talking to the real social workers who practiced then. However, the obvious face of Māori social work did not exist until after Pūao-te-Ata-tū. The participants stated that when they were practicing before the report they were not known as “Māori Social workers.” They could not use tikanga within the work place. If they did, they would be breaking organisational policy.

Therefore, one could say that the methods have changed from being practically non-existent in the beginning of the 1980's to the well-developed methods of today. Alternatively one could say that the change has not been with the methods but with the organisational environment and political environment of New Zealand society.

The implications of these findings for Māori social workers are that they can feel validated in the use of tikanga Māori as methods of social work practice. There have been few changes over the years with regard to the practices and processes used by Māori social workers, which shows that tikanga can still be applied to today's society. Māori social workers benefit from the writings and new initiatives by Māori academics and practitioners, therefore the implications are that Māori social workers need to feel encouraged to publish and to document their knowledge as it is beneficial to the Māori people.

The answer to the third question, which addresses the impact Pūao-te-Ata-tū has had on Māori social workers, is that the report had a fundamental influence on Māori social work in general. The report affected the employment of Māori in social work positions and also supported the use of Māori methods within social service organisations. The implications for social workers, especially those who are still struggling to get their employers to implement the recommendations, are that this research proves the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report recommends ideal ways for organisations to support their workers. This project draws the conclusion that the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report should still be implemented. Obviously there are aspects that are somewhat outdated or that have already been implemented (for example the change of certain Acts and committees) however the fundamental aspects, the acceptance of Māori ways of doing things, need to be included into organisational practice. This means that Māori social workers would receive significant support, regardless of which organisation they work for or the quantity of Māori social workers employed there.

The final research question, discussing other influences on Māori social workers was in many ways a 'wild card' question. The aim was to see what exactly Māori social workers, found to be beneficial and supportive, without having the influence of the researcher's perspectives. The findings were specifically related to the positive influence of one's elders and the forming of beneficial relationships for young Māori social workers. The implications for Māori social workers are that this project proves there is a

definite need for better support systems for Māori workers, especially those in the early years of their career. This research project shows that organisations need to provide cultural supervision and access to support systems, even perhaps the “pairing off” of a young Māori social worker with a more experienced worker so that knowledge and practices can be passed on to the next generation.

Discussion

Recalling the comments of Merv Hancock (1994:9), social work is a profession, a community of people who share common goals of always seeking new ways to assist people. Māori social workers are similar to non-Māori social workers in that they share a common goal of assisting others. However, the common goal for Māori social workers is to specifically focus their efforts on Māori people. In the words of Harawira (1998:204), “supporting my Māori side is not to disregard any other part of my ancestry, but to save my identity as a Māori from being lost.” Participants said that when they work with non-Māori clients they are equally as respectful and as supportive as they would be with Māori families. However, perhaps the focus on Māori clients stems from the memories of what social services were like before Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out and the need to maintain the changes that stemmed from this report. This underpins the researcher’s need to focus on Māori development and relates also to that of the participants’ in this project, and Māori social workers in general. It seems that Māori pleas, whether produced in activism or in political reports, were predominantly grounded in the Treaty of Waitangi and the need for a sense of Tino Rangatiratanga. However, had the Government taken up the challenges set forth in Pūao-te-Ata-tū, there would have been greater advancement by the State towards adequately addressing the needs of Māori children and their families.

Hakiaha (1997:12) describes how early practitioners were products of the values, processes and principles of their time, as we are today. Māori social work methods are important to practitioners who focus on interpersonal approaches in today’s setting, although to Māori practitioners they are less significant than the impact of political reports. Pūao-te-Ata-tū is not an important issue for all New Zealanders who are interested in social policy, but it is for Māori social workers. In the introduction the

researcher commented about the lack of literature on the implementation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū today. That is because the report is not being implemented today. In the opinion of many social policy writers and theorists, the report is a thing of the past. Why is it then still significant to Māori social workers and to tertiary institutions?

In a search undertaken by the researcher on government websites, the most recent mention of Pūao-te-Ata-tū found Tariana Turia stating the following, in March 2001:

It is unfortunate that it has taken 10 years for government to recognise the significance of this document. Significance, which the Māori community has always kept to the forefront. Pūao-te-Ata-tū has always been important to our whānau, hapū and iwi. Despite its age, and it is only a teenager, fourteen years old, it remains every bit as relevant today as it did when it was first prepared back in 1986. There are some who suggest the framework in Pūao-te-Ata-tū can be successfully used across the social policy sector. I believe that this may well be worth considering. I am committed to seeing the re-implementation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This is a commitment I have made to Māori social service providers, who themselves are totally committed to the re-implementation of this document.

- Tariana Turia (2001, March).

Hopefully, the commitment to what Turia calls a “re-implementation” at this level will enable the report to receive the acknowledgement it has not yet obtained. However this researcher argues that firstly, it has not taken 10 years for the government to recognise Pūao-te-Ata-tū and that, secondly, it has been significant to a minority of members of Parliament since 1986.

This researcher argues that it is not at the governmental level where things need to change in order to support Māori social workers. The changing character of the various governments since the 1980’s has presented an array of neo-liberal approaches that have caused difficulties for Māori social workers. However, the consistency and stability needs to be at the managerial level, where a relative amount of decision-making takes place in relation to the implementation of policy handed down to them from politicians and policy writers. In the view of Māori social workers, social policy writers do not need to write any more reports regarding Māori in social services; the ideal report was written in 1986 as Pūao-te-Ata-tū. However, efforts need to be made at the next level with the people who decide how policies will be implemented in the organisations they run.

Many Māori social workers now have a large degree of autonomy over their methods and are thus able to implement tikanga into their practises. However, consistency is needed in areas where social service organisations do not provide workers with this amount of autonomy. This is, in part, due to a low Māori population, the employment of a solitary Māori social worker, or the age, ability and experience of the worker themselves. Here the recommendation of the participants becomes extremely important.

These experienced Māori social workers have established their autonomy and use their methods, but what happens to the 22 year old, recent graduate who is employed as the only Māori social worker at a community-based service in Gore? It is assumed young Māori social workers are aware of the fact that to become the best social workers they can, they need to be supported by family members, kuia, kaumātua and the Māori community in general. With these pre-established connections the role as the only Māori social worker would be easier but there is also a need for the organisation to take some responsibility by actively pairing Māori social workers with kaumātua. Participant K stated that this is where organisations can encourage the sharing of knowledge between new Māori social workers and long-term practitioners through supervision and community immersion.

There are multiple definitions of what it now means to be a 'Māori social worker'. It is interesting to note that regardless of the organisation, the town, the iwi or the participants' age, the results are very similar. Participants provided the same methods, all stemming from tikanga Māori and reflected on the influence their elders have had on their development. The description of social service organisations before Pūao-te-Ata-tū was fundamentally the same as afterwards, and even though all participants stated that huge changes had been made since then, they all concluded that their methods have remained essentially the same.

Unfortunately, together with the improvements described by participants there also remain many areas that have not changed or that are actively detrimental to Māori development. However, the participants remain optimistic and dedicated to improving their methods for the better support of Māori clients. The participant's suggestions for future improvements gave the overall impression that they are dedicated to the wellbeing and development of Māori people.

Chapter Six: Conclusions

This research project critically engaged with Māori social workers in order to develop an understanding of their practice methods and the ways the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report affected them. The researcher was interested to ascertain what the fundamental aspects of Māori methods were, whether Māori social workers changed them frequently or whether they had well-developed methods they had used since their early employment in the 1980's. The researcher was also interested in the influences of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report on the experiences of Māori social workers within social service organisations.

There are two areas that this conclusion needs to include. Firstly, the recommendations of the participants need to be addressed. In accordance with Kaupapa Māori research, the participants remain involved until the absolute end; therefore, this researcher wishes to include their comments throughout. Secondly, the researcher herself, will draw her own conclusions from the project, and suggest both future possibilities and solutions.

The Participants' Recommendations

Each participant was asked how he or she thought support for Māori methods could be improved. There were five common themes that arose out of the participant's recommendations. These were alluded to in the findings for question six and the analysis given above, but are presented below in a form that allows for straightforward comprehension of the recommended guidelines.

1. Māori social workers need to share their stories.

Many of the problems faced by Māori social workers may be addressed by documenting their stories and experiences. The most important reason to document one's stories and experiences is to ensure that the lessons learned from those experiences are not lost and can be built upon by others. Although a characteristic of many Māori social

workers is to be tangata hūmarie, or tangata āhau wakamowai (Durie, E 1986), the telling of stories is a way of helping others and learning at the same time.

In other circumstances kanohi ki te kanohi may be a more appropriate way to share their stories and experiences. This researcher found that much of the whakawhanaungatanga that arose from these interviews occurred when the tape recorder was not turned on. These ‘lost’ stories are in fact a way of building support systems and trust. The participants were able to share their knowledge while still retaining control of its dispersal, while valuable information was still passed on.

2. Māori social workers must be qualified.

This is relevant in two ways. In the first place, Māori social workers must attend tertiary institutions and training centres in order to gain professional qualifications. Participants stated that the first thing they would say to any person who is interested in social work would be to gain a qualification. However, they added that, on the whole, they were employed before gaining professional qualifications. They stated that this way of becoming a social worker was also effective but possible only in the era in which they were first employed. In today’s environment one must become a professional in order to be ethically competent and capable of the work.

As a Māori social worker, one must also be competent within the Māori world. This means having the knowledge and use of Te Reo Māori and the ability to use, understand and respect tikanga Māori. There is also a need to be able to balance these skills within the workplace.

3. Māori social workers must join the association.

This refers to the Aotearoa, New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW). According to their website, ANZASW was formed in 1964 “as an incorporated society, ANZASW is recognised as the primary body that represents the interests of social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand”. This organisation provides a structure for the accountability of social workers to their profession, consumers and the public and more specifically to Māori social workers through its seven Rōpū Māori. This is supported and managed by the Tangata Whenua Takawaenga O Aotearoa (the national Māori caucus); the Board of Competency; Course Approvals Board; Ethics and

Judicial Committees; Education and Training Committee, Professional Standards Committee and Publications Committee (ANZASW, 2005). The major reason for Māori social workers to become involved in the association is the Tangata Whenua Takawaenga o Aotearoa, the Māori caucus of ANZASW. The caucus's partnership involvement in the association is through a collaboration under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, consisting of the five following guidelines:

- The Caucus will display inclusiveness between Tangata Whenua and Tauwiwi;
- They will place a premium on Tangata Whenua being informed;
- Tangata Whenua will have an opportunity to determine their level of involvement on issues facing ANZASW;
- Tangata Whenua will critique professional issues in their own space and utilize their own processes through the caucus;
- Tangata Whenua also will develop positive relationships with Tauwiwi to share and access their skills, talents and knowledge.

- ANZASW, (2005).

Although it is unclear to what level Tangata Whenua are “being informed,” this collaboration inevitably provides Māori social workers with a forum of their own that gives them validation, support and wider networks within the Māori community. This collaboration also provides Māori social workers with a base for achieving other recommendations such as sharing stories through Te Kōmako, the Māori publication of the Social Work Review Journal.

4. There needs to be more Tūturu Māori managers and supervisors.

The promotion or employment to management positions is an area of improvement that is not necessarily suited to all Māori social workers/individuals, however, there is no doubt a considerable group of Māori are capable of taking these positions. By gaining qualifications and appropriate training, Māori, like any other group, will increase their involvement in managerial positions. The participants indicated that there were not many Māori managers. One might ask, why is this? This researcher feels that there needs to be more encouragement of social workers in general to train and strive for positions at management level, if there are positions they seek. Māori need to support each other more and acknowledge their capabilities in order to improve Māori self-confidence. Organisations also need to acknowledge that not just any given Māori individual should be hired in a managerial or supervisory role. The hire individual needs to have an understanding of both Te Ao Māori and management.

5. Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Treaty of Waitangi need to be taught more at all levels of the Education system, and organisations need to put them into practice.

There needs to be an improvement in the way the Treaty of Waitangi is taught to young New Zealanders. This should entail an historical overview but also include a practical analysis of how the Treaty can impact on each person's life. People need to be aware of how changes affect them at a personal level. Participants agreed that the increase of awareness of the Treaty of Waitangi happens when people openly talk about it, expressing their emotions and familiarising themselves with other people's impressions. Participants stated that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was more relevant at a tertiary level and is important for all social workers to learn about. Through improved education and understanding, the participants said Pūao-te-Ata-tū could be implemented more at an organisational level.

The Researcher's Conclusions

In any environment of experienced practitioners, a young 'mokopuna' is bound to feel overwhelmed by their wealth of knowledge. This researcher has been taught, from a particularly young age, to respect her elders and was, thus, extremely humbled and honoured with the privilege of hearing their stories and being given their information. It

is acknowledged that different individuals would draw from these interviews, multiple conclusions and, therefore, it is stressed that this conclusion represents the opinion of the researcher alone and follows the research questions formed in Chapter Two.

The primary focus of this research project was to develop an understanding of Māori social work methods, not contemporary developments specifically, but the methods that were *really* being used by practitioners. The assumption that each social worker has their unique methods leads this focus. The researcher developed the notion that Māori methods of social work would not have changed since ‘*the beginning of time*’ but this was soon shattered by the fact that the history of Māori social work is not one that can easily be assessed. One needed to ask, what are the underpinnings of Māori social work methods? The researcher then needed to place a time limit on the project to keep it within manageable proportions. Thus, the 1980’s and Pūao-te-Ata-tū were brought into the picture.

Research Question One: What are the Underpinnings of Māori Social Work methods?

This research shows that the underpinnings of Māori social work methods are ngā tikanga Māori and these have not changed substantially in the past twenty years. As the participants pointed out, change is not a bad thing, although changing values; principles and tikanga Māori were things they felt have not happened, especially not within the short time-span that this research covered.

Research Question Two: How Have They Changed since the 1980’s?

McNatty (2001:1) argued that whakawhanaungatanga has taken on a new meaning in the new milieu (See Chapter Two), however, this research suggests that it is not the concept that has changed, but the social construction of that concept. As New Zealand society changes, tikanga Māori are being applied to a different setting and are being adapted to that setting. The meaning of whakawhanaungatanga has not changed, but the environment in which it is practiced has changed. Therefore, social work methods are still guided by the traditional concepts of the past, even if the implementations of those concepts have changed.

Research Question Three: What Impact Has Pūao-te-Ata-tū Had on Māori Social Workers?

The specific focus on the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report was a reflection of the researcher's personal admiration for the recommendations the report produced. It was taught, in the researcher's academic setting as being extremely important to Māori social workers. Therefore, she wanted to see the reality of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

This research suggests that Pūao-te-Ata-tū had a huge impact on Māori social work in the 1980's and the researcher argues that this impact is ongoing. Through the educating of young people, mentioned above, the understanding of Pūao-te-Ata-tū is being passed down to the generations that were not previously aware of the 1986 report. The participants are actively passing on their knowledge, which ensures their goals are still being strived for.

Research Question Four: What Else Has Influenced The Experiences of Māori Social Work?

An important issue that came out of the research findings was that the bond between a 'mokopuna' and a 'kaumātua' is of vital importance. The forming of genuine relationships between a young person and his or her elders enables the young person to learn important concepts and will evidently strengthen their identity and confidence in being Māori. This leads to the following recommendations, formed out of this research project. These recommendations are ways that one can interpret the findings of this project and put them into action.

To Māori Social Workers...

Māori social workers need to continue using their Māori methods of practice and promoting their importance in the organisational setting. If Māori methods are not accepted within the organisation, the social worker needs to work at conscientising his or her colleagues and employers. They can gain strength and support through networking with other Māori social workers, through furthering their training and by joining the ANZSW Association. Finally, Māori social workers need to share their experiences, methods and knowledge.

To Social Service Organisations...

Social Service Organisations need to implement the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report and in doing so, encourage the use and acceptance of Māori social work methods. Specifically, it is important that organisations not only encourage the use of Māori methods with clients, but also among colleagues. This should not consist of ‘tokenistic’ gestures, or extra work for Māori social workers. It is up to managers and supervisors to implement this recommendation. There should also be extra support and guidance for new Māori social workers (perhaps under the guise of supervision) so that sound and positive relationships can be developed with kuia and koroua.

To Education Institutes...

Although this is a repetition of Pūao-te-Ata-tū’s recommendations, institutes that train social workers need to employ staff who are respectful of tikanga Māori and who have a thorough understanding of the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi for Social Services. All students, regardless of ethnicity, should be taught the importance of cultural supervision and should know how Pūao-te-Ata-tū applies to them both as individuals and in their future career as social workers.

To Policy Makers...

This research has highlighted the importance of social policy and the impact reports have on social workers. There is an evident gap between the writing of reports and their implementation at an organisational level. The gap widens even further when one looks at social workers at the ‘front-line’. The need for more stability at a political level is evident and the ‘gap’ needs to be addressed, so that policies and reports are implemented successfully and sustainably. Obviously, this requires an increase in funding for social services and the increased involvement of policy makers at the ‘social-work’ level to ensure their reports are implemented. This is one option for bringing policy makers and social workers together; this researcher anticipates further research will attempt to address the infamous ‘gap’ between social policy writers and front-line staff.

Further Questions

There are plenty of areas that were not addressed by this research project, areas which propose further questions for the reader and future researchers. The researcher acknowledges the potential for disparities between Māori social workers in the North and South Islands. It is suggested that this is an additional area of research, not as a study of comparison between them, but for further recommendations to consider the social environment, acknowledging the extreme differences of the two areas.

As previously stated, a further area of interest would be to study how Māori social workers have resisted Western concepts and how this history of resistance impacts on Māori social workers today. The area of Māori clients and their experiences of social service organisations since the 1980's would be beneficial for interpreting the impact of social services on the Māori people.

Another further area of interest could be to research the role of the Royal Commission on Social Policy and the Treaty principles in relation to Māori social workers. As previously stated, there is little published work discussing Māori social workers historically. The documentation of this would be extremely beneficial for Māori social workers and for students in this area. The researcher is also interested in looking at the value of Pūao-te-Ata-tū today and whether it is important to all members of social service organisations, such as young Māori social workers, non-Māori social workers and managerial staff. It is hoped that Māori social workers will continue to develop their methods and to share their knowledge for the benefit of all Māori people.

Koina tāku mö tēnei wā. Nō reira, tīnō anō tātou katoa. Noho pai mai i roto i ngā manaakitanga katoa.

Nāku iti nei nā,

Äwhina Hollis.

Selected Bibliography

ANZASW (2005) 'Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW)'. Available: <http://www.anzasw.org.nz> Available: December, 2005.

Babbie, E. (2004) The Practice of Social Research. Thomason and Wadsworth Learning: Belmont.

Baker and Huata. (2000) Hui Whakawhanaungatanga. Ruawharo Marae. Tairawhiti Polytechnic: Gisborne.

Ball, M. and Smith, G. (1992) Analysing Visual Data. Sage Publishers: California.

Barlow, C. (1994) Tikanga Whakāro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Bateman, D. (2005) New Zealand Encyclopedia. David Bateman Ltd: Auckland.

Bazley, M. (1994) Te Punga. Ministry of social work: Wellington.

Bevan-Brown, J. (1998) By Māori, for Māori, about Māori - Is That Enough? Massey University: Palmerston North.

Bishop, R. (1950) "Freeing Ourselves From Neo-colonial Domination in Research: A Māori Approach to Creating Knowledge." Qualitative Studies in Education 2.1 199-219.

Bishop, R. (1950) Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Otago.

Bishop, R. (1996) Collaborative Research Stories. Whakawhanaungatanga. The Dunmore Press Ltd: Palmerston North.

Bishop, R. (1998) "Freeing Ourselves From Neo-colonial Domination in Research: A Māori Approach to Creating Knowledge." Qualitative Studies in Education 2.2: 199-219.

Bishop, R. (1999) "Researching in Māori Contexts: an Interpretation of Participatory Consciousness." Journal of Intercultural Studies 20.2 167-182.

Bishop, R. (2003) "Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Māori Messages For 'Mainstream' Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand." Comparative Education 39.2 211-238.

Black, Thomas. (1996) Evaluating Social Science Research: An Introduction. Sage Publishers: London.

Bogden, R. and Taylor, S. (1975) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. Wiley Publishers: New York.

Boggs, C. (1976) Gramsci's Marxism. Pluto Press: London.

Bradley, J. (1995) "Before you Tango with our whanau you better know what makes us tick: An indigenous approach to social work." Te Komako: Social Work Review 7.1.

Bradley, J. (1997) "Iwi and Cultural Social Services Policy: The States Best Kept Secret." Te Komako: Social Work Review 8.4 3-5.

Bradley, R. (1997) "Puaote-ata-tu: 'He Manāko te Koura i Kore Ai'. The Paradigm Shift Fusing Fiscal Responsibility and Tino Rangatiratanga in the New Millennium." Te Komako: Social Work Review 8.1 18-19.

Brougham and Reed. (2004) The Reed Book of Māori Proverbs. Te Kohikohinga Whakatauki a Reed. Ed. Timoti Karetu. Reed Publishers: Auckland.

Bruner, J. (1986) Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Bruner, J. (1990) Acts of Meaning. Harvard University: Press Cambridge.

Butterworth, G. and Young, H. (1990) Māori Affairs and Iwi Transition Agency. GP Books: Wellington.

Cheyne, C. et al. (1997) Social Policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Critical Introduction. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Cleak, H. (1996) "Managing and Measuring Social Work Activity in a Hospital Setting: A Quantitative Approach." A Reflective Researcher: Social Worker's Theories of Practice Research. Ed. J. Fook. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Connolly, M. (2001) New Zealand Social Work: Context and Practice. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Craig, E. (1958) "Māori Battalion Reunion." Te Ao Hou: The New World 25.6:4.

Crotty, M. (1998) The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process. Allen and Unwin: Sydney.

Danaker, S. et al. (2000) Understanding Foucault. Allen Unwin: St Leonards.

Derry, S. J. (1999) “ A Fish Called Peer Learning: Searching for Common Themes.” Cognitive Perspectives on Peer Learning. Ed. O'Donnell and King. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey.

Doherty, W. et al. (2005) Indigenous (Māori) Pedagogies: Towards Community and Cultural Regeneration. Manukau Institute of Technology: Auckland.

Dreardon, E. (1997) “Matua Whakapai tou Marae, ka Whakapai ai i te Marae o te Tangata: First Set in Order Your Own Marae Before You Clean Another.” Te Komako: Social Work Review 3.1 6-8.

Durie, M. (1985): “A Māori Perspective of Health.” Journal of Social Science and Medicine. 20.5 483-6.

Durie, E. et al. (1986) Findings of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Māori and a claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and nga Kaiwhakapumau i Te Reo Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Māori Language). The Waitangi Tribunal, New Zealand: Wellington. 72.

Durie, M. (1997) “Māori and the State.” Te Komako: Social Work Review. 2.1

Durie, M. (1998) Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self Determination. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Durie, M. (2003) Launching Māori Futures: Nga Kahui Pou. Huia Publishers Wellington.

Durie-Hall, D. and Metge, J. (1992) Kua Tutu Te Puehu, kia Mau: Māori Aspirations and Family Law. Family Law Policy in New Zealand. Ed. M. Henaghan, Aitken, B. Oxford Uni Press: Oxford.

Eketone, A. (2005) The Theoretical Underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori Directed Research. An unpublished article that draws significantly from Eketone, A. Tapuwae: A Vehicle for Community Change. Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Otago: Dunedin.

Ember, C. and Ember, M. (2004) Cross-Cultural Research Methods. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers: Lanham.

Engel, R. and Scutt, R. (2005) The Practice of Research in Social Work. Sage Publishers: California.

Fook, J. (1996) The Reflective Researcher: Social Worker's Theories of Practice Research. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Foucault, M. (1978) The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Vol. 1. Penguin Publishers: Harmondsworth.

Foucault, M. (1980) Critical Assessments. Ed. Barry Smart. Routledge Publishers: London.

Gibbs, M. (2000) Toward a Strategy for Undertaking Cross-Cultural Collaborative Research. Department of Political Studies, University of Otago: Dunedin. 673-687.

Gifford. (2003) Research and Academic Outputs. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Gleed, S. (1996) "A First Attempt at Research: Surveying Rural Social Work Practice." A Reflective Researcher: Social Workers' Theories of Practice Research. Ed. J. Fook. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Glover, M. (2002) A Literature Review and Commentary on the Use of a Kaupapa Māori Approach Within a Doctoral Study of Māori Smoking Cessation. University of Auckland: Auckland.

Gramsci, A., (1971) Selected from Political Writings, 1910-1920: With Additional Texts by Bordiga and Tasca. Ed. Antonio Gramsci. International Publishers: New York.

Grinnell Jr. R. M. and Unrau, Y. A. (2005) Social Work Research and Evaluation: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1994) Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. Handbook of Qualitative Research. Ed. N. & Lincoln Denzin, Y. Sage Publishers: California.

Hakiaha, M. (1997) "Resolving Conflict From A Māori Perspective." Te Komako: Social Work Review 8.1.

Hancock, M. (1994) "Preface: A Conversation with Merv Hancock." Social Work in Action. Ed. R. Munford, and Nash, M. The Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Harawira, M. (2001) "Fair-skinned, blue eyed" In Growing Up Māori. Ed. W. Ihimaera. Tandem Press: Auckland,.

Harris, A. (2004) Hikoi: Forty Years Of Māori Protest. Huia Publishers: Wellington.

Healy, B. (1996) "In Doing You Learn: Some Reflections on Practice Research on an Advocacy Project." A Reflective Researcher: Social Workers' Theories of Practice Research. Ed. J. Fook. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Hemara, W. (2000) Māori Pedagogies: A View From the Literature. NZCER display: Hamilton. 1 - 12.

Henare, M. (1999) “Sustainable Social Policy.” Redesigning the Welfare State in New Zealand: Problems, Politics and Prospects. Ed. J. Boston, Dalziel, P., and St John, S. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Hermannson. G., (1985) Counseling Māori People. Ed. Durie, M. Dunmore Publishers: Palmerston North.

Hesse-Biber, S. and Leavy, P. (2004) Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Hodges, A. (1981) An Introduction to Qualitative Research. USA.

Hokowhitu, B. (2002) Te Mana Māori: Te Tatari nga korero parau: a Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of [Doctor of] Philosophy in Physical Education and Māori Studies at the University of Otago. Unpublished: University of Otago.

Holliday, Adrian. (2002) Doing and Writing Qualitative Research. Sage Publishers: London.

Huitt, W. (2003) “Constructivism”. Educational Psychology Interactive. Valdosta State University: Valdosta. Available: <http://chiron.valdosta.edu>. Updated August 12 2005.

Jamison, and Royal. (2003) “Royal, Te Rangiatāha Kiniwe 1896 – 1965”. Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Available: <http://www.dnzb.govt.nz>. Updated 7 July 2005.

Jones, R. (1993). Cross-cultural psychology: Some implications for psychological practice in New Zealand. Unpublished paper, Department of Justice Psychological Services: Auckland.

Kaye, M (2001) 1981 Hitting the Road. Available: <http://www.filmarchive.org.nz> Updated: 2004.

Ka'ai, T. et al. (2004) Ki te Whaiao: Introduction to Māori Society. Pearson Longman: Auckland.

Kawharu, M. (2001) “Kaitiakitanga: A Māori anthropological perspective of the Māori socio-environmental ethic of resource management.” Journal of the Polynesian Society, 109: 349-370.

Kawharu, H. (2003) Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Māori Since Colonisation. Reed Publishers: Auckland.

Keenan, D. (1995) "Puao-te-ata-tu: a Brief History and Reflection." Te Komako: Social Work Review 7.1 11-29.

Kelly, A and Sewell, S (1991) With Head, Heart and Hand - Dimensions of Community Building, Brisbane.

Kelsey, J. (1990) A Question of Honor. Allen and Unwin: Wellington.

Kelsey, J. (1991) "Treaty Justice in the 1980's." Nga Take. Ed. P. Spoonley. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Kim, B. (2005) Social Constructivism. 2001-2004. E-Book, Learning, Teaching and Technology: Auckland.

King, M. (2003) The Penguin History of New Zealand. Penguin Books: Auckland.

Kiro, C. (2000) "Māori Research and the Social Services: Te Puawaitanga o Te Tohu." Te Komako, Social Work Review. 7.4 26 - 32.

Levine, H. (2001) "Can a Voluntary Organisation be a Treaty Partner? The Case of Te Whanau o Waipareira Trust." Social Policy Journal of New Zealand. 1.17 161-170.

Lynn, M. (1996) "Negotiating Practice Theory (or, I've got the theory, you've got the practice)." The Reflective Researcher: Social Workers' Theories of Practice Research. Ed. Jan. Fook. Allen & Unwin: St Leonards.

Mahoney, M. (2004) "What is Constructivism and Why is it Growing?" Contemporary Psychology. 49: 360-363.

Makareti, M. (1986) The Old-Time Māori: New Zealand Women's Press Ltd: Auckland.

Marshall, S. (2002). Cultural Diversity and Teaching Practice - The Integration of Māori Theoretical Perspectives Into Social Change Participant Research Projects. The Department of Social Work, University of Canterbury: Christchurch.

Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1986) Puao-te-ata-tu = Day Break: the report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. New Zealand Department of Social Welfare: Wellington.

McFarlane-Nathan, G. H. (1997) "The Bicultural Therapy Project: Psychological Service, Department of Corrections, Auckland, August 1996." Te Komako: Social Work Review. 3.1 22-27.

McMahon, M. (2005) Social Constructivism and the World Wide Web - A Paradigm for Learning 1997-2005 ASCILITE. Available: <http://www.coe.uga.edu> Updated: 13 April 2005.

McNatty, W. (2001). "Whanaungatanga" Department of Psychology, University of Waikato. Available: <http://www.starlight.net.nz>. Updated: October 2001.

McRae, J. (1993) "The Function and Style of Runanga in Māori Politics." Journal of Polynesian Society. 105.1.

Metge, J. (2001) Korero Tahī: Talking Together. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Mikaere, A. (2003) The Balance Destroyed: The Consequences for Māori women of the Colonisation of Tikanga Māori. The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education and Ani Mikaere: Auckland.

Moko Mead, H. (2003) Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values. Huia Publishers: Wellington.

Moorfeild, J. (1943) Nga Kupu Me Nga Tikanga. Pearson Education New Zealand: Auckland.

Mourie (2005) "Graham Mourie." In Te Puke Ariki Resources. New Plymouth District Council. Available: <http://www.pukeariki.biz> Updated: 2003.

Munford, R., and Nash, M. (1994) Social Work in Action. Ed.: The Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Murchie, E. (1984) Rapuora: Health and Māori Women. Māori Women's Welfare League: Wellington.

Mutu, M. (2003) Te Whanau Moana: nga Kaupapa me nga tikanga = Customs and Protocols/the Teachings of McCully Matiu, Kaumatua Rangatira of Te Whanau Moana and Ngati Kahu. Reed Publishers: Auckland.

Nash, M. (2001) "Social Work Practice and Current Issues: Social Work in Aotearoa New Zealand." New Zealand Social Work: Context and Practice. Ed. M. Connolly. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Neuman, W.L. and Kreuger, L. W. (2003) Social Work Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Pearson Education Company: Boston.

New Zealand Government. (1984-1992). New Zealand Official Yearbook. Parliamentary Buildings Press: Wellington. Parliamentary Buildings Press: Wellington.

New Zealand Government. (1989) “New Zealand Bills: A-CH. 42nd Parliament 1st Session, 1987/88/89. Bills Initiated in the House of Representatives and Bills held over from 41st Parliament. As at 19th December 1989.” Parliamentary Buildings Press: Wellington.

Orange, C. (1977) A kind of Equality: Labour and the Māori People, 1935-1949. MA Thesis, Auckland University: Auckland.

Orange, C. (2000) “Māori War Effort Organisation.” Oxford Companion to New Zealand Military History. Ed. I. McGibbon. Oxford Publishers: Auckland.

Peratiaki, Q. et al. (2004) “Putting the Pieces together with Te Whare Tapa Wha.” Runanga Whakapiki ake i te Hauora o Aotearoa: Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand newsletter.

Pere, R. (1997) Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom. Ao Ako Global Learning New Zealand: Auckland.

Pitama, S. (2003) The Skill of Cutting Harakeke: A Literature Review looking at Best Practice models/programmes that raise expectations of whanau, schools and communities for the success of Māori youth and children. Trans. Te Puni Kokiri: Wellington. 1 - 41.

Rabbits, E. and Fook, J. (1996) “Empowering Practitioners to Publish: A Writers and a Publishers Perspectives.” A Reflective Researcher: Social Workers' Theories of Practice Research. Ed. J. Fook. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Rangihau, J. (1992) Māoritanga. Trans. University of Otago: Dunedin.

Razak, N. (2002) Transforming the Field: Critical Antiracist and Anti-Oppressive Perspectives for the Human Services Practicum. Fernwood Publishing: Halifax.

Reilly, M. (2004) “Te tīmatanga mai o ngā atua: Creation narratives”. In T.M. Ka'ai, J.C. Moorfield, M.J.P. Reilly and S. Mosely. eds. Ki te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society. Pearson Education: Auckland, 1-12

Rimene, C. (1994) The CYP&F Act 1989, from a Māori Perspective. A Masters thesis. Victoria University: Wellington.

Ruwhiu, L. (1995) “Home Fires Burn so Brightly with Theoretical Flames”. In Te Komako: Social Work Review, 7:1 21-25.

Ruwhiu, L. (2001) "Bicultural Issues in Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work." New Zealand Social Work. Ed. M. Connolly. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Sadique, D. (1996) "Undertaking the Challenge: Using Qualitative Methods to Identify Social Work Competencies." A Reflective Researcher: Social Workers' Theories of Practice Research. Ed. J. Fook. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards.

Salmond. (1975) Hui. A. H & A. W Reed: Wellington.

Sarantakos, S. (1993) Social Research. Mac Millan Publishers: Melbourne.

Shannon, P. (1991) Social Policy: Critical Issues in New Zealand Society. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Shannon, P. and Young, S. (2004) Solving Social Problems: Southern Perspectives. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Sheppard, M. (2004) Social Research in the Human Service: An Introduction for Social Work and Health Professionals. Jessica Kingsley Publishers: London.

Shirley, I. (1979) Planning for Community. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Silverman, D. (2004) Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for analysing Talk, Text and Interaction. 2nd ed. Sage Publishers: London.

Smith, R. and Manning, P. (1982) A Handbook of Social Science Methods. Qualitative Methods. Vol. 2. Ballinger.

Smith, L. (1994) "Kaupapa Māori Research." Research Unit for Māori Education. University of Auckland: Auckland. 1-12.

Smith, G. H. (1997) "The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis." IRI PH.D Series Number 3. University of Auckland.

Smith, L. T. (1999) Decolonising Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples. University of Otago Press: Dunedin.

Smith, G. H. (2003) Kaupapa Māori Theory: Theorising Indigenous Transforming of Education & Schooling. Hyatt Hotel, Auckland, New Zealand: The University of Auckland and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi: tribal-University; New Zealand. 1 - 17.

Stanley, G. (2000) "Cultural Dilemmas, Cultural Realities." Social Work Now August.

Stokes, E. (1985) Māori Research and Development. Wellington: National Research and Advisory Council. 1-19.

Taylor. (1993) The Texts of Paulo Friere. Open University Press: Buckingham.

Te Ahu Poata-Smith, E. S. (1996) “He Pokeke Uenuku i tu Ai: The Evolution of Contemporary Māori Protest.” Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Eds. P. Spoonly, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1991) He Tikanga Whakāro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community - a discussion paper. Ministry of Māori Affairs: Wellington.

The Department of Māori Affairs. (1952-1976) Te Ao Hou. The Department of Māori Affairs, Government Print: Wellington.

The Department of Social Welfare. (1994) “Te Punga: Our Bicultural Strategy for the Nineties.” Ministry of Social Welfare: Wellington.

The Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988) “The April Report.” The Commission: Wellington.

Turia, T. (2001) “Puao-te-ata-tu.” Scoop Independent News. Press Release: New Zealand Government. Available: www.scoop.co.nz. 25th November 2005.

Tsianian and McCarthy (2002) Reliability, Validity and Authenticity in American Indian and Alaskan Native Research. ERIC Education reports.

Van Maanen, J. (1983) Qualitative Methodology. Sage Publishers: Beverly Hills.

Walker, R. (1990) Ka Whawhai Tonu Matau: Struggle without End. Penguin Books: Auckland.

Walker, R. (1993) Applied Qualitative Research. Gower Publishers: Aldershot.

Walker, H. (1995) “Where is Puao-te-ata-tu and the Department of Social Welfare.” Te Komako: Social Work Review 7.1 12-16.

Walker, P. (2003) Partnership Models within a Māori Social Service Provider. University of Otago: Dunedin.

Walker, S. et al. (2005) Research by Māori, for Māori: An Exploration of Kaupapa Māori Research, Its Principles and Processes. Unpublished. University of Otago: Dunedin.

Walsh-Tapiata. (2003) "A Model for Māori Research." Making a Difference in Families: Research That Creates Change. Ed. R. and Sanders Monford, J. Allen and Unwin: New South Wales. 55-73.

Webster's, Encyclopedia Britannica. (2004) Encyclopedia Britannica Library. Vers. Deluxe Edition. Computer software. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc. CD ROM.

Williams, H.W. (1997) Dictionary of the Māori Language. 7th Edition ed. G P Publishers: Wellington.

Westmyer, P. (1981) A guide for use in planning and conducting research projects. Charles, C. Thomas: Springfield.

Yegidis, B. and Weinbach, R. (2002) Research Methodologies for Social Workers. Ed. 4th Edition. Pearson Education Company: Boston.

15th March, 2005

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

Title of Awhina's research:

What are Maori Social Work Practice methods and how have they changed since the 1980's?

Aim:

The aim of this research project is to record and compare the practice methods used by Maori Social Workers and how they have been influenced by Puao-te-ata-tu (1986). This research is part of the requirements for a Masters Degree in Arts.

Who is being approached to participate in the interviews?

This research is limited to Maori Social Workers only, who have worked in a Social Service Organisation before Puao-te-ata-tu. Eight participants are required.

Confidentiality:

All information regarding each participant's identities will be limited to the researcher and the supervisors. All documents that are written for public viewing will be anonymous unless you give permission after viewing the document for your name to be used.

What will Participants be asked to do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to take part in a one/one and a half hour interview with Awhina to talk about your methods of Social Work practice and your experiences as a Maori Social Worker within a Social Service Organisation.

The interview will take place in a venue and time of your choice and you can chose who is present at the interview.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What happens with what I say?

Everything discussed in the interview will be typed up by the interviewer and shown to you so that you can check it has been documented correctly and you can make changes as you see fit to do so. Anything you wish to delete can be done so at this stage.

All tapes and documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet until the project is complete and then returned to you if you wish, if not it will be destroyed after five years in accordance with University guidelines. People that will have access to the tapes and documents are:

Awhina Hollis – Student researcher/interviewer

Anaru Eketone – Supervisor

Raylee Kane – Supervisor

What happens to the finished report?

You will be given a copy of the thesis and any finished reports to read. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the library but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity if that is your wish.

What Questions will I be asked?

A copy of the questions you will be asked in the interview are attached to this form if you want to think about them before hand. If you agree to participate, please sign the following form.

This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Awhina Hollis Department of Community and Family Studies (03) 479 5159
Anaru Eketone Department of Community and Family Studies (03) 479 5051

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee.

Appendix 2

What are Maori Social Work Practice methods and how have they changed since the 1980's?

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. my participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. the data [*audio-tapes*] will either be destroyed at the conclusion of the project or returned to you but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
5. the results of the project may be published and will be available in the library but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

.....
..... (Signature of participant)
(Date)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee

Appendix 3

Questionnaire

1. When you work with Maori clients and Whanau what traditional concepts have you used?

2. What are some surrounding influences that have caused changes to the Maori methods you use?

3. What was it like for you working in a Social Service Organisation in the 1980's before the Puao-te-ata-tu report came out?

4. Can you describe Maori methods of practice you used before Puao-te-ata-tu and after Puao-te-ata-tu, and whether they have changed?

5. Have you noticed an improvement in support for Maori methods of practice since Puao-te-ata-tu came out?

6. Are there any changes you think could be made to better support Maori Social Workers to use their methods for the benefit of Maori?

NGĀI TAHU RESEARCH CONSULTATION COMMITTEE

TE KOMITI RAKAHAU KI KAI TAHU

20 May 2005

Mr Anaru Eketone
Community and Family Studies
University of Otago

Tena koe Mr Eketone

Title: Māori methods of Social Work Practice.

The Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee met on 3 May 2005 to discuss your research proposition. The Committee wishes to acknowledge that this project will be undertaken by a Māori student, Ms Awhina Hollis, supervised by Mr Anaru Eketone.

This project looks at Māori Social Work methods and how they have changed since the 1980's. Interviews will be undertaken with 8 long-term Māori practitioners in order to develop an understanding of changing practice methods and work environment.

The Committee acknowledges the Māori specific nature of this project and the potential benefits of this research to the Social Work environment and workforce.

The contribution of this research to Māori Social Service Organisation and Government policy agencies is also acknowledged. This project has the potential to contribute to the improvement of social work practice for clients, organizations and the profession.

The Committee recommends that a copy of your published research findings be forwarded to Māori Social Service Providers, Māori research units/centres, Māori Social Service Professional Organizations and Community.

The Committee would also value receiving a copy of your published research findings as well.

Naku noa, na



Christine Rimene
Administrator
Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee

The Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee has membership from:

*Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou Incorporated
Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki
Te Rūnanga o Moeraki*