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Abstract

This research critically engages with the history and practice of Maatua Whangai within Aotearoa/New Zealand. Specifically it focusses on Maatua Whangai O Otepoti, examining the discourses of care-givers within this context. Further, this research is constructed within a Maori world view of both traditional fostercare practices and State interpretations of those practices. Case studies of the discourses of caregivers within the Maatua Whangai Programme are described and articulated in terms of kaupapa Maori research methods. The data generated identifies the discourses of the caregivers and their desire to have their voices heard. In contrast, the discourse of the State is examined in the light of reports such as Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (1986), and the work of Bradley (1994) and Ruwhiu (1995). It is argued that any shift in the current dominance of power relationships surrounding the Maatua Whangai Programme and fostercare practices in relation to Maori would entail a strengthening of ties between service providers, Iwi and the Crown. This would go some way towards redressing Crown dominance of Maori fostercare practices.
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Chapter One

MAATUA WHANGAI O AOTEAROA

Whakahokia mai te mana o te iwi kite iwi, o te hapu ki te hapu, o te whanau ki te whanau, o te tangata ki tona rau kotahi. (W. Tibble, Submission 58, Hui Taumata 1984)

Return the authority of the tribes to the tribes, of the subtribes to the subtribes, of the families to the families, of the individuals to the individuals, representing as they do the generations of the past and present.

Background and Context

The Maatua Whangai Programme was a joint initiative launched in 1983 by the Departments of Maori Affairs, Social Welfare, and Justice (who joined the partnership in 1985) as an alternative means of addressing social problems encountered by Maori children and young people and their families. This objective was expanded to become the preferred way of providing alternative care for all Maori children who needed it. Its kaupapa was to “substitute formal intervention by the department in the lives of Maori youngsters for the traditional caring networks of Maoridom (whanau, hapu and iwi)” (Department of Social Welfare 1989: 1). The overall objective was to “reduce the flow of Maori children and young persons into the department’s institutions” (Department of Social Welfare 1989:1).

Under the banner of Tu Tangata and leadership of Kara Puketapu (Secretary of Maori Affairs), Maatua Whangai was one of a number of initiatives that signalled what many believed was the beginning of genuine efforts by the State to negotiate with Maori on the basis of autonomy and equality (Stewart-Harawira 1997, Walker 1990). These initiatives were in response to recommendations and endorsements made at the annual national leadership conference (Hui Whakatauira) held in the Legislative Chambers of Parliament Buildings in Wellington. Kaumatua had expressed concern over the effects of urbanisation and the correlation between this and the social ill-health of Maori. It was believed that the breakdown of Maori kin-based community systems was symptomatic of the effects of urbanisation. In their view whanau-based communities, which were the
strength and backbone of rural areas, had deteriorated during the process of urbanisation (Bradley 1994). This process is documented by Bradley (1995), who discusses the changing nature of whanau (traditional, migrant, marginal, adapted, homogenous versus traditionalist) in terms of adaptation to the urban setting.

The Hui Whakatauira of 1981 passed a resolution that “gave unanimous support ... for the promotion of a programme to take young Maori out of Social Welfare institutions and place them back with the tribal groups” (Department of Maori Affairs 1983: 6). That resolution led to the forming of an agreement. The issues raised at the Hui Whakatauira were discussed at Cabinet level and a partnership was formed between the permanent departmental heads of Social Welfare and Maori Affairs and Maori people. Following this in November 1983, a Maatua Whangai pilot was initiated by grafting the Maatua Whangai concept on to existing child welfare services in the Department of Social Welfare (Bradley 1994).

The conclusions drawn from the pilot scheme were:

1. that the Department of Justice needed to be involved because of the importance of diversionary processes in the justice system;
2. Maori people were willing to become involved in the programme;
3. the Maori kinship base required for placement needed strengthening.

(Department of Social Welfare 1989:1).

In 1984 a national conference of departmental and community participants was convened for the purposes of evaluating the programme (Department of Social Welfare 1989:1).

That conference:

1. confirmed the kinship base on which placements should be made;
2. requested that the authority for decisions on placements and resource allocations be given to each district’s Maatua Whangai core committee;
3. promoted the concept of whanau development, particularly to strengthen the connections of whanau in urban areas with their parent iwi (for example, in
Auckland, with Ngati Porou, Kahungunu, Te Arawa-Mataatua and Nga Puhi).
(Department of Social Welfare 1989:2).

After a hui held at Hoani Waititi marae in March 1985 the Department of Justice became the official third partner (Bradley 1994). In 1986 the Department of Maori Affairs identified the programme as “the only hopeful long-term option” currently available to New Zealand society to reduce the number of Maori offenders and “at-risk” Maori youth (Department of Social Welfare 1989:2). However, it was still felt that the Maatua Whangai programme was not realising its full potential and an interdepartmental review conducted in 1985 showed that:

- there were various administrative and operational deficiencies in the programme;
- the principle that at-risk or institutionalised Maori people should be placed in the care of their whanau, hapu and iwi needed reiterating;
- before placements could be made, Maori people had to properly develop their kinship systems. This was needed in order that the responsibility of caring for their own could be undertaken effectively. This in turn required the involvement of the iwi authorities. (Department of Social Welfare 1989:2).

As a result of this review $750,000 was made available by the three departments to be distributed to iwi for whanau development. Further to this, the Department of Social Welfare allocated another $500,000 for “placement koha” as payment for families who were caring for whangai. From that time whanau development became the focus of the programme (Department of Social Welfare 1989).

In return for the commitment of the Maori community, Government was to provide some assistance with boarding costs and housing loans if necessary. The initial tasks of the programme were to:

- Firstly, compile a register of Maori foster parents;
- Secondly, to provide consultancy services for departmental social services which gave access to Maori networks and help with tikanga and kawa (protocol) issues;
- Thirdly, to develop, support and strengthen tribal infrastructures (whakapakari whanau). This later included the devolution of funds from the Department to
the Iwi for their disbursement to whanau who had taken in whangai (Bradley 1994).

A secondary overall aim of the programme was to encourage and establish, in some places at least, a stronger Maori presence within those structures that made decisions regarding children, i.e. Children’s Boards, the Youth Aid section of the New Zealand Police and the court system. A system was needed that would allow Maori to identify who Maori young people were and who they belonged to. Initial identification could in fact keep them out of the justice system altogether (Bradley 1994).

Maori concepts of family, kinship and shared responsibility therefore provide the context for Maatua Whangai:

Maatua Whangai as a system is based on traditional Maori practice and comes from the words “whangai” to feed or nurture and “maatua” meaning parent. Hence this Maori social welfare concept refers to “feeding parent” or foster parent. It is a very common practice and an adopted child or foster child is often called a whangai or tamaiti whangai (Bradley 1995). Words associated with the care of children include tiaki (“look after”),
whakatipu ("to make grow"), taurima ("to treat with care") (Griffin 1981, cited in Bradley 1994). (These concepts are covered further in chapter 3.)

A poignant comment comes from the 1986 report “Puao-Te-Ata-Tu” about the general nature of previous health and welfare initiatives for Maori which were seen as “a curious blend of assimilation, paternalism, integration and exploitation. Most legislation included institutionalised improvements for Maori”. Yet: often the same legislation reinforced the unequal status of Maori by containing special restrictions (Bradley 1994:187-189).

The programme was co-ordinated through community Maatua Whangai suburban-based roopu under the auspices of the Department of Social Welfare. It was wound up locally in 1991.

**Historical Context – background to the development of Maatua Whangai**

Events, influences, groups and policies have shaped the evolution of the Maatua Whangai programme. I cannot, within the confines of this thesis, provide a detailed analysis of the events that have shaped the relationship between Maori and Pakeha and the way in which this has affected the ability of Maori to care for their own. There are studies available which contain a comprehensive summary of the shared history of Maori and Pakeha, and the process of colonisation and Maori responses and initiatives (The Rowan Partnership 2000, Walker 1990, Ihi Communications 1992). I have however tried to focus on those factors which have had a direct influence on the care of children by Maori. However, some historical background is important.

The State’s role in the provision of care for neglected and dependent children has for the most part reflected the “Pakeha monocultural philosophy that has undergirded the law and welfare services in New Zealand” (Worrall 1996:12). According to Walker (1990:67, cited in Worrall 1996), Maori people have not at any time been involved in the establishment of New Zealand’s child welfare system, and the social needs and cultural values of Maori have never been respected. There was in fact a total failure to recognise the social systems and institutions that were a crucial part of Maori society (Worrall 1996). This is clearly stated in “Puao-Te-Ata-Tu” which noted that:

- the central State’s chosen administrators supplant traditional leaders;
- the State’s agents impose new structure; legal-judicial processes replace
the traditional tribal law; and most significantly, permanent government forces enforce the new rules ... Weaving a fine bureaucratic net about traditional society, they impose regulations, restrictions and obligations upon the people ... For the Maori, political modernisation resulted in a systematic and unrelenting assault on their traditional society (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986: 7-8, cited in Worrall 1996:12).

Traditional Maori society was held together by the organic solidarity of kinship and decentralised tribal autonomy. It consisted of four organisational levels, linked to varying degrees, to a common ancestor or event (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:3). The whanau was the basic social unit of Maori society. It had food-producing, residential and land-holding functions and provided its own social service delivery system. It had its own internal authority structure and was the group in which the basic day-to-day decisions were made. It was the operational unit of the tribe—in smaller iwi the hapu had this role (Ihi Communications 1992). A child was not seen as merely the child of its biological parents, but as a child who belonged to the whanau in a communal sense (Worrall 1996). Jackson (1988) described the strengths which underpinned the whanau system:

The kinship ties of the large family unit implied a sharing of support, discipline and comfort for all members of the whanau. Its structure provided young people with their feeling of well being, their security and their sense of a group good greater than their own. It provided them with a sense of their place in the scheme of things and ensured rules of behaviour and cultural transmission were maintained (Jackson 1988: 76, cited in Worrall 1996:12).

Members of the hapu trace their descent from an eponymous ancestor several generations in the past, therefore comprising a closer kin group than the iwi and a more extensive one than the whanau (Ihi Communications 1992). Formerly, each hapu lived on that part of iwi land apportioned to them and for which they were responsible (Ihi Communications 1992).
The system of social and political life based on this structure was (and still is) dynamic. The Treaty of Waitangi was signed with hapu: "ki nga Rangatira me nga Hapu o Nu Tirani" (see Appendix 1). This system represents the traditional Maori approach to autonomy and is also responsible for the difficulties associated with boundaries and autonomy. Whanau and hapu were kaitiaki (guardians) over their natural resources and taonga. Apart from a person's inalienable interests in those lands, he or she possessed little individual property, which was mostly confined to garments and weapons (Ihi Communications 1992). This collectivity of ownership, or "beastly communism" as it is referred to in "Puao-Te-Ata-Tu" (1986) by Sir Francis Dillon-Bell, was not limited to property and was an underlying principle of traditional Maori care and protection practice.

When parents were not in a position to care for their own children they were cared for within the whanau or hapu, usually in a way that was advantageous to all concerned (Worrall 1996). Parents and children usually maintained contact as placements were made within the hapu and whanau and were usually of a temporary nature (Worrall 1996). This is well stated in "Puao-Te-Ata-Tu": "Maori children knew many homes but still one whanau" (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:23).

When I was a child, I never saw my family as only father, mother, brother and sisters. My childhood experiences involved interactions with grandmothers, aunts, uncles, cousins, great uncles, great aunts, and so on. These relatives gave me as much attention as my own parents gave me.... My parents, like others in the village, expected my relatives to have parental responsibilities over me. If they failed to do so, they were considered 'bad relatives' (Ritchie and Ritchie 1979:27-28, cited in Worrall 1996).

Iwi were the largest socio-political organisation that existed in Maori society. The iwi constituted the larger group of hapu and maintained political and social control of the hapu. Iwi were a territorial entity and formed the basis for iwi boundaries and alliances of hapu (Ihi Communications 1992). The largest social grouping of Maori was the waka, comprised of a loose confederation of iwi based on the ancestral canoes of the fourteenth century (Ihi Communications 1992).
The sustained attack upon, and breaking down of, these four social structures has led to the breakdown of traditional Maori society. Land was the cornerstone upon which Maori political, social and economic structures depended (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:8). Land was “the take that brought us into armed conflict with the Pakeha and remains a primary source of tension between us today” (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:8). The acquisition of that land through a combination of a modern system of profit-orientated economics and centralised politics devastated Maori. In one foul swoop they were “stripped of autonomous government, their legal basis of communal solidarity, their social and their spiritual being” (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:8). The alienation of land was seen as the final nail in the coffin in terms of the breakdown of traditional Maori society:

It was the fragmentation of the land that finally destroyed traditional Maori social structure, for the chief’s mana now no longer ran over the whole of his territories, individuals henceforth stood on their own, even though a sentimental tribal cohesion continued. (Schwimmer in Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:8)

Those institutions by which “New Zealand society governs itself, distributes its resources and produces wealth do not serve Maori people, but they clearly do serve the great bulk of Pakeha people” (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:26). Traditional Maori social structures were by and large ignored by national policy-makers.

Walker (1990:86), cited in Worrall (1996), undertook a historical review of kinship care and found no evidence in terms of policy that Macri children in need of care and protection should be placed within the care of their whanau. According to Worrall, Walker cites early departmental letters that illustrate practice that is clearly racist, with very little understanding of whanau systems. Walker did find evidence of policy decisions that Maori children should be placed in the care of Maori foster parents, but it was not always adhered to and (if it was) a lower board rate was paid. According to Walker 1990, cited in Worrall 1996:13.

It can be evidenced that Maori children were taken into care with Pakeha from the beginning of state intervention, and were disenfranchised from all that was familiar to them. (Walker 1990:71-72).
Child protection law was a part of the colonising narrative of integration (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986) that had become the fate of Maori since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

1840  The Treaty of Waitangi
The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi affected the ability and capacity of Maori to be able to care for their own (see Appendix 2 for Maori and English versions of the Treaty). The Treaty’s three main areas of concern and conditions are contained in three articles which formed the basis for a relationship between the British Crown and Nga Iwi Maori (Biggs 1989). There are a number of promises made in Article 2 which protect taonga ("treasures"). The Treaty definitely identifies lands, estates, forests and fisheries and other properties. However it can be argued that taonga should also include the Maori social structures of whanau, hapu, iwi and waka. It is the breaking down of this social structure and the alienation of land that has denied Maori the same rights and privileges as British citizens, promised in Article 3.

It is clear that the exact status, meaning and consequences of the document were not clear to those signing the Treaty. While achieving for Europeans the justification for claiming sovereignty over New Zealand, the clauses apparently protecting the interests of the Maoris (sic) carried little weight in the designing of legislation and procedures regarding Maori land and political participation. (Appendix to Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:12).

The whakapapa of the Treaty relationship and its subsequent implications for Maori and Pakeha is not the primary focus of this work. It does however have a direct bearing on the contemporary relationship and emancipatory politics operating between these two people groups.

The 1835 Declaration of Independence is significant because it declares the sovereign status of Maori and the language that had specific implications for the Treaty: "ko te kingitanga ko te mana i te whenua." This was taken seriously by the British Crown: “Her Majesty’s Government acknowledge [that] in the Natives of New Zealand an independent community should be observed” (Lord Glenelg 1839, cited in Cheyne 1992). The Declaration of Independence was a precursor to the Treaty of Waitangi and provides a basis upon which to challenge the hegemonic practice inherent in current social policy.
Moana Jackson (1994) when discussing colonisation uses the illustration of two whares, one Maori and one Pakeha, that have their own foundations and systems of law and authority, education, health, and social structure and cohesion. The British Crown, in recognising New Zealand as an independent community, had already accepted the legitimacy of the Maori whare and its foundations.

Therefore the pedagogical roots of the Maatua Whangai programme existed long before the arrival of the Pakeha, and child-rearing practices form a significant focus from which to briefly examine the relationship between tangata whenua and tauwi. There are a number of significant works that take this approach, in particular Walker 1990.

Tangata whenua law and child-protection philosophies and practice were challenged by tauwi approaches where the responsibility for indigent children was based on the Elizabethan Poor Law Act (1601) and lay with their families and the church. The Destitute Person’s Act (1846) was clear in stating that the responsibility for those who needed some sort of support lay with relatives and putative fathers (Worrall 1996). According to Tapp, Geddes and Taylor (1991:1), cited in Worrall (1996), the welfare of a child was the business of the family. According to Worrall (1996), destitute and neglected children were cared for by the churches and private schools with some financial assistance from provincial government.

1867  The Neglected and Criminal Children Act

This Act empowered Superintendents of the New Zealand provinces to establish industrial and reformatory schools. The Act was designed to give care and shelter to those children who were deemed to be in need of care and protection. There was, however, no discrimination made between those who were viewed as neglected and those who were deemed to be destitute. Section 21 allowed for the child or inmate to be placed “on trial with some person.” The primary intention of this was to have children released on parole in licensed farming or domestic service. As a result of this Act, a number of Maori children came into care (Manchester 1984). The domestication of Maori was now State policy. An Inspector of Schools stated in 1862:

I do not advocate for the natives, under present circumstances, a refined education or high mental culture; it would be inconsistent if we take into account the position they are likely to hold for many years in the social scale, and inappropriate, if we remember that they are better
calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour. (Sharple 1994:13).

In 1882 this Act was replaced with the Industrial Schools Act; section 55 of this Act allowed school managers to farm out suitable children to homes and families that were considered to be respectable (Worrall 1996).

1867 Native Schools Act
Under this Act English became the language spoken in Maori schools. At the time it was said by a Member of Parliament who was a former inspector of native schools “that the Maori language was ‘imperfect as a medium of thought.’ English was ‘a perfect language’ and was the only way for Maori to be civilised” (Sharple 1994:6). Sharples goes as far as saying that not only has this attitude produced a generation of non-Maori speakers but it has left the language with the stigma of being inferior. “Telling people their language is useless: what a way to destroy them” (Sharple 1994:14).

The world is socially constructed by language in accordance with the way in which social institutions and social life generally are culturally produced rather than naturally given or determined (Jary and Jary 1995). The “social construction” approach emphasises the way in which the social world was continually reinvented (produced) by individuals rather than being something which simply confronted them. Moll (1990, while discussing Vygotsky) refers to language learning as the process of enculturation. Smith (1993) describes it as the means of entry into a culture. I refer to language as the “cradle of concepts,” and the marginalisation of the Maori language has undoubtably had a significant effect in terms of the ability of Maori socialisation structures to care for their own.

1907 The Suppression of Tohunga Act
The role of tohunga as spiritual experts and healers was seen as a barrier to Maori assimilating into Pakeha culture, and therefore under this Act their role was made illegal (Rowan Partnership 2000). According to Peter Sharples “this not only made Maori knowledge worthless but against the bloody law” (1994: 13-14).

1909 The Native Land Act
Adoptions (maatua whangai) according to Maori custom were recognised in law until 1909, when the Native Land Act brought in a requirement that all Maori adoptions be
registered and details published in the *New Zealand Gazette*. This had the effect of driving maatua whangai practices of Maori underground as they were not recognised legally (Durie-Hall and Metge 1992:59).

**1925 The Child Welfare Act**

This Act made for better provision for the maintenance, care and control of children who were specifically under the protection of the State and sought to provide in a general way for the protection and training of indigent, neglected or delinquent children (Brown 2000). The Act did not mention foster care as such, but had a firm commitment to the placement of children in the community in private homes as a means of providing nurture, care and training for the young person of working age. Live-in farm employment for boys and domestic work for girls continued to be the usual work for those in care until the 1950s (Manchester 1984).

By 1926 there were 3,859 children under the control of the Superintendent of Child Welfare. A total of 1,819 children were boarded out in foster homes—usually middle-class, European, church-going, two-parent homes. Often there was no contact between these Maori children and their parents. It is also significant that the figures were not specified in terms of Maori and Pakeha (Manchester 1984). Walker (cited in Worrall 1996) states that parents and relatives had difficulty getting their children back before the end of their term and seeing their children while they were in care. As there was very little inclination to place Maori children with their whanau (whether this was purposeful or not) further assimilation would have been a likely outcome given the policies and processes of that time.

In 1951 the Maori Women’s Welfare League was formed. The League’s purpose was to promote the well-being of Maori women and their families through the spiritual, cultural, social and economic development of Maori people. It was a response to the urban drift of Maori to the cities and the increasing social and economic problems faced by Maori.

**1953 Maori Affairs Act**

Parts of this Act continued to distance Maori from their own cultural norms by reinforcing the process of assimilation into Western legal forms and institutions (Maori Affairs Act S.79). No marriage in accordance with Maori custom was regarded as a valid marriage under the Act (section 80). There was to be no adopting of any child in accordance with Maori custom. By 1962 all adoptions had passed to the General Courts,
and the legal assimilation policy was perfected (Butterworth and Young 1990, Durie-Hall and Metge 1992).

**1955 Adoption Act**

According to Durie-Hall and Metge (1992:59) "this Act openly rejects Maori beliefs and practices." It stated this very clearly by repeating a section in the Native Land Act 1909 which declared that "adoption in accordance with Maori custom" would not henceforth be recognised as legal (1955 Adoption Act, s.19). This disregarded the Maori socialisation structures, tikanga and purposes of the maatua whangai process. As a DSW Maori advisory committee put it:

> The child was not the child of the birth parents but of the family, and the family was not a nuclear unit in space but an integral part of a tribal whole, bound by reciprocal obligations to all whose future was prescribed by the past fact of common descent ... the children had not so much rights as duties to their elders and community. The community in turn had duties to train and control its children. It was a community responsibility (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988:74).

Hence, the traditional Maori practice of maatua whangai continued to be a victim of colonisation, where Western paternalistic individualistic concepts overrode Maori communal concepts.

**1961 The Hunn Report**

This was one of the first systematic attempts to document the racial disadvantage of Maori. Whilst the outcomes of the Hunn Report (filed in 1960) have been sharply criticised, the report did question the myth of racial equality and presented the issue as one that had to be addressed by New Zealand society. It uncovered the true state of socio-economic disadvantage of Maori. This report also served as a mechanism which spurred Maori discontent with the status quo. Maori activism provided the impetus and skilled people to conduct more sustained critiques of racial disadvantage, for example Nga Tamatoa (Spoonley 1990). The report called for an accounting of Maori assets and how they could be used for the betterment of Maori (Butterworth and Young 1990). Hunn’s viewpoint was however coloured by his analysis of contemporary Maori society.
Hunn identified three groups of Maori:

- A completely detribalised minority whose Maoritanga is only vestigial.
- A main body of Maori(s), pretty much at home in either society, who like to partake in both.
- Another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions. (Butterworth and Young 1990:100).

It was not surprising that subsequent social policy was a blend of assimilation and integration (Fleras and Spoonley 2000), as Maori were not consulted widely (Butterworth and Young 1990).

**Guardianship Act 1968**

The Guardianship Act made no frontal assaults on Maori social forms and practices, but by ignoring the fact that they existed and failing to accommodate them it increased the pressure on Maori to abandon them (Durie-Hall and Metge 1992). This had a further implication for maatua whangai practice in that it drove it further underground and accorded it the status of being second class.

**1972 The Department of Social Welfare**

The Department of Social Welfare (DSW) was established as a result of the consolidation of several government entities. At its inception, very few staff with social work qualifications and background secured senior management positions. As the 1970s progressed, the Department was increasingly dominated by benefit work with a focus on the Domestic Purposes Benefit and Unemployment Benefit (Weeks 1994).

**1974 The Children and Young Persons Act**

Under this Act the State's role continued assuming parental rights for fostered children by placing them under the guardianship of the Director General of Social Welfare.

This approach applied to young offenders as well as children in need of care and protection. It could encompass any sequence of institutional or community placements according to need, in institutions such as Hokio, Kohitere, Lookout Point, Stanmore, Kingslea and Campbell Park (education facility). The most damaging part of this Act for Maori was the power given to "the discretion and judgement" of the Director General,
which paved the way for many young Maori to be placed in these institutions (Manchester 1984). The trickle-down effect of the “discretion and judgement” of the Director General was to increase the power-base of the professionals involved in making decisions about Maori children. This group controlled assessment, intervention, monitoring and evaluation of social work interventions.

1985 Maatua Whangai Programme.
This was a joint programme launched nationally in 1985 but locally in 1983 by the Departments of Maori Affairs, Social Welfare, and Justice as an alternative means of addressing social problems encountered by Maori young people and their families (Bradley 1994).

1986 Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (“Daybreak”)
This was the report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare.

The report makes 13 recommendations and is unequivocal in its expectation that both the Department of Social Welfare and other institutions need to adopt effective bi-cultural policies, which give Maori communities (defined in terms of tribal networks) the power to direct and allocate resources that the State has at its command. The report argues that the breakdown of traditional Maori society needs to be reversed through equity and powersharing. The appendix of the report refers to “the roots of dependency” and states:

It is certainly clear that virtually all policies concerning Maori welfare and development have been founded on Pakeha cultural prescriptions of what was best for Maori. It is equally clear that virtually all Maori attempts to direct and shape the Maori future in ways reflecting Maori values and institutions were resisted, either militarily, legislatively or by ignoring them. (1986:6).

Recommendation 7 of the report is especially pertinent as it is about Maatua Whangai:

“We recommend that:
(a) the Maatua Whangai programme in respect of children return to its original focus of nurturing children within the family group;
(b) additional funding be allocated by the Department to the programme for board payments and grants to tribal trusts for tribal authorities to strengthen whanau/hapu/iwi development;
(c) the funding mechanism be through the tribal authorities and be governed by the principle that board payments should follow the child and be paid direct to the family of placement, quickly and accurately and accounted for by the Department in respect of each child. The programmes should be monitored for suitability of placement and quality of care;
(d) the level of the reimbursement grant for volunteers be increased to a realistic level” (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:35).

An extremely valuable part of this report is the Appendix which provides an historical and legal perspective and discusses the pervasive effects of racism as the backdrop for the large numbers of Maori young people in care at that time.

1988 Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy
“Nga Kohinga Mai No Nga Putea I Whakairia ki Nga Tahuhu o Nga Whare Tupuna” was an analysis of views expressed on marae. This paper drew together the views expressed to the Commission at meetings held on marae throughout the country and involved 369 submissions from various individuals and roopu. Both “Puao-te-Ata-Tu” and “Nga Kohikohinga Mai” take a broad socio-structural approach to the analysis of the Maori situation and the formulation of Maori social policy objectives. The writers insist that a particular problem such as family issues can be understood only when placed in this wider context. Donna Durie-Hall and Joan Metge (1992) summarised Maori social policy objectives with respect to the family as follows:

(1) the recognition of Maori family forms (nuclear family and whanau), not in isolation from but as an integral part of hapu and iwi, and as means through which whanaungatanga is expressed and mana enhanced;
(1) the replacement of policies which undermine Maori family forms with policies designed to enhance them;
(3) Maori participation in legal management of family matters (especially marriage, marriage breakdown, matrimonial property, domestic violence and the care, protection and control of Maori children, young persons and their families) under tikanga Maori, that is, using Maori
styles of management, accountability and decision making, and
promoting the authority, control and standing (mana) of Maori
individuals and groups;
(4) their ability to look after their own while providing hospitality to others
(manaakitanga), and their unity and group cohesion (kotahitanga);
(e) maintenance and enhancement of the links between Maori (as
individuals and groups), Te Ao Turoa and their turangawaewae;
(f) recognition and protection of the status of taonga-tuku-iho. (Durie-Hall

1989 The Children Young Persons and Their Families (CYP&F) Act
This Act arose out of contradictory concerns over child abuse, children's rights, youth
offending and social justice which developed in New Zealand during the 1970s and
1980s, in parallel with general problems in the whole welfare state. As elsewhere the Act
reflected sharp differences of opinion, with "child-savers" ranged against children's rights
advocates and demands for liberal social change conflicting with "law and order"
proposals (cf. Shannon and Webb 1980).

After several years of debate, an act of empowerment (Connolly1994), the CYP&F Act,
incorporating the principles of families/whanau and client decision-making, was
introduced in 1989. What seemed ultimately responsible for its innovative nature was the
growing Maori political and social renaissance of the 1970s and 1980s. The proposals in
the Act were substantially based on Maori principles and evolving bicultural practice by
innovative workers within the Department of Social Welfare-"whanau (extended family)
decision-making" and culturally appropriate forms of substitute child care (maatua
whangai).

The CYP&F Act therefore inaugurated a significantly new set of procedures and
principles in the fields of child protection and youth justice, with the central place being
given to effective decision-making about each case by the whanau or extended family
involved. While there is oversight of this process by the judiciary, with professionals
having the right to object to, decisions of the family group conference (hereafter FGC) to
the court, never the less real, effective decision-making power rests with the family. The Act gives the power, not merely of consultation but the right to make decisions, with family/whanau decision-making, support and diversion the overall aims of both the child protection and youth justice systems.

The new Act involved considerable changes in both procedures and personnel. Major educative and other efforts were put in place to implement the Act effectively. In general, it seems that, initially at least, the new Act was both remarkably successful and widely supported. As a major change in direction it certainly faced some opposition, particularly from some police. They were opposed to the civil liberties and due process elements of the Youth Justice legislation, which had been brought into line with that for adults (the previous legislation had been seriously deficient in that respect) (Walker and Shannon 1997). On the basis of these criticisms the newly-elected conservative National government set up an early review in 1990 to “water down” the Act. The largely positive submissions to this review committee however meant that only minor changes were proposed (Mason Report 1991).

The most recent changes in government legislation regarding social welfare provision must be seen in a positive light, as they help empower Maori communities as well as give them an autonomy which has not been their experience since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 (Spoonley 1990). The CYP&F Act has been in existence for 11 years and is heralded overseas as an example of how to empower families and deal effectively with care and protection and youth justice issues (Laurenson 1993). The CYPF Act 1989 has deepened our awareness of cultural sensitivity and effectively encompasses traditional Maori social structures of whanau, hapu, and iwi, and other Maori values and beliefs.

It can be argued that the CYP&F Act 1989, through equity and power-sharing, has the inherent ability to contribute to the reversal of the breakdown of traditional Maori society (Spoonley 1990). It is designed to promote culturally appropriate and innovative service development. However, the effectiveness of the Act is being seriously undermined by
inadequate resourcing to fund its provisions and the all-too-apparent failure of the Act to implement the principle of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) for Maori at the appropriate levels. This goal may seem impractical, but at practice, policy, organisational, and funding levels Maori aspirations of determining what is best for their children is still controlled by a paternalistic State which utilises cultural understandings to meet its own needs (Brown 2000).

After the passage of the Act, the number of care and protection referrals to NZCYPs and Child & Family Support Services continued to increase each year, but there had not been an increase in funding to match this increasing referral rate (Laurenson 1993). Overall opinion at the time was that, despite teething problems, the Act richly deserved the excellent reputation it had gained. A small army of people from overseas arrived to inspect it and then report back to their own countries. Major progress seemed at last to have been made in problem resolution and prevention of repeated problems (secondary prevention).

However, such impressions may be misleading as, despite the importance of the legislation, evaluative research on its effectiveness has been almost completely absent. Only one early major study of the implementation of the Act, dealing with the Youth Justice section, has been published (Maxwell and Morris, 1993). With reservations, the conclusions were positive:

- The new system in New Zealand follows many overseas trends and has its own unique features.
- Increased use of diversion than in the past-fewer young people are appearing in court and going into institutions (residences and prisons).
- There is also more accountability than in the past, with more young people apologising to the victims of their offences, making reparation and accepting tasks as punishments.
- Increased family involvement than before; 85% of families and young people were satisfied with the outcomes.
- Cultural practices and the needs of victims are being recognised more
even though there is room for improvements in both of these areas.

(Maxwell and Morris 1993):

Less directly, early results and in-depth exploratory study into the conduct of family group conferences in the care and protection area also suggested a positive reception (McKenzie-Davidson 1996). The limited number of social workers, lawyers and other professionals involved were unanimously in support of the new procedures as compared to the old. Families, similarly, were in majority support of the process and decisions involved although there was some criticism of a professional tendency to manipulate and 'manage' the process to reach desired conclusions. This latter element, along with resourcing problems, also a major concern of the Maxwell and Morris 1993 study, did not bode well for the future.

Over the 11 years since the Act came into force, the State has reduced its direct service provision. One of the criticisms of the Act is that the State has been able to reduce its financial responsibilities for certain welfare functions by transferring those functions from itself to iwi under the banner of devolution—but without providing the funds to pay for those services.

Whilst the Act redefines the role of Maori in their own social service provision in a positive way, the State, through the Department of Social Welfare, has failed to return the necessary power and resources so that the Maori people may be equal partners, particularly in policy and decision-making.

This is important in terms of potential because according to Denny (1999) there are a number of desired broad outcomes that can be derived from the CYP&F Act 1989 by Maori children, young persons and their whanau:
1. that they have available to them a wide range of accessible and appropriate services;
2. they are 'safe' in both societal, legal and cultural contexts;
3. resolution of family dysfunction, whether between individuals of family or for the whole family;
4. tino rangatiratanga or self-determination exercised by individuals and collectives over their own members;
5. family stability; and
6. informed decision-making, in respect of themselves and those to whom they are related or for whom they are responsible.

Conclusion

In summary, through a whole variety of legislation, policy and practice, “the Maori experience since Pakeha institutions became dominant, has been one of recurring cycles of conflict and tension against a backdrop of deprivation. This has drained the Maori spiritually, physically, socially and economically. It finds its expression today in atrocious levels of social dependency” (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986). Even when Maori-inspired legislation was passed in the Children Young Persons and their Families Act 1989, in practice it has been undermined and side-tracked. For instance, since 1986 the negative indices and gaps in health, welfare and justice between Maori and the general population have continued to grow (Te Puni Kokiri Report 1998).

In August 1999 the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Agency (CYPFA) had 19,222 “children in care” (defined by CYPFA as being those who receive services from CYPFA and organisations funded by CYPFA and Unsupported Child Benefit UCB), 7,885 of them were Maori representing 41%, 7,542 were Pakeha representing 39.2%. The ethnicity of the remainder was Pacific Islands 1,711 (9%), Asian 212 (1.1%), with 1,567 (8.2%) whose ethnicity is not recorded or available (Denny 1999). These statistics were significant because even though Maori children and young people comprised 41% of the client group, the establishment of Iwi Social Services as mandated under section 396 of the Act had made slow progress and at that time there were approximately ninety CFA approved or conditionally approved Child and Family Support Services operating—and yet there were only two approved Iwi Social Services (Bradley 1997:4).
Chapter Two

MAORI KNOWLEDGE & MAATUA WHANGAI

“There is no view from nowhere, we can never leave our prejudices behind and operate from a wholly disinterested standpoint” (Haber 1994)

Introduction
In this chapter I review the meaning and tikanga given to words such as adoption, fostercare, and tamaiti whanga. Part of Mead’s (1994) framework is then utilised to view Maori anecdotal evidence from the literature regarding tamaiti whangai. Maori knowledge and theory are then discussed in the light of critiques by Leland Ruwhiu (1994). National and international laws relating to care-giving and foster care are discussed briefly. Finally John Bradley’s (1994) review of the national programme is discussed.

Adoption and Foster Care For Maori
Metge (1995) sees “foster care” and “adoption” as having distinctly different meanings for Maori and Pakeha, generally the terms can even be viewed as opposites, with adoption referring to legal adoption in Pakeha usage. This becomes clearer when we examine the dictionary meanings. To foster is defined as “… of or involved in the rearing of a child by persons other than his natural parents” (Collins Concise English Dictionary 1992:501). Accordingly “to adopt” is seen as “law, to take (another’s child) as one’s own child” (Collins Concise English Dictionary 1992:16). On the other hand Williams (1975) illustrates the idea that Maori have one concept that applies to both adoption and foster care and is variously described as whangai: “to nourish to bring up”, (Williams 1975: 488) atawhai: “show kindness to, be liberal, to foster” (ibid:19). Taurima: “treat with care, tend”, (ibid: 402). An adopted and foster child are referred to as tamaiti whangai and a foster parent as maatua whangai (Bradley 1994, Metge1995). For this reason any discussion of traditional Maori foster care includes knowledge that has been gathered from both the Maori foster care and adoption literature.
According to Metge (1995) other words may serve as both nouns and adjectives: tama, tamahine, kotiro. Even when Maori use English terms like fostercare they may not ascribe the same meaning to it as Pakeha, often applying a Maori meaning to the non-Maori word (Metge, 1995). The clarification of terminology and meanings becomes critical in the final analysis of this project. Maori and Pakeha may ascribe different meanings to the same words because fostercare and maatua whangai can mean different things to different groups of people.

**Tamaiti Whangai**
The concepts and constructs which underpin Maori customary fostercare (even the usage of this word is problematic, see Chapter 1) practice are often discussed and used interchangably with those of customary adoption practice. This is not surprising as there seems to be very little evidence to suggest that the principles of operation were very different. Dame Georgina Kamira Kirby QSO JP, in her article “Taku Whangai – My Child that We Nurtured”, provides a useful starting point for this discussion by stating that “the tamaiti whangai system will persist into the future irrespective of the many accorded circumstances under which the tamaiti whangai principle operates” (1994:21).

The purpose of this research is to examine one of those accorded circumstances. A guiding principle of paramount importance is that the cultural education and care of tamaiti whangai be undertaken by their own whanaunga (kinfolk). It is important for the Maori psyche that the tamaiti whangai be raised in the culture of their parentage. Maori ideas on tamaiti whangai have had to adapt over generations for a number of reasons: changes in interpretations, attitudes, and social needs, to the point where non-Maori are telling Maori what some Maori constructs are (Kirby 1994). This is significant in terms of the way this knowledge was used by the then Department of Social Welfare. The concept of tamaiti whangai did not translate well within the legal status of fostercare and adoption, as a difference was seen between statute law and Maori lore. We must ask: Is the use of the term *lore* here part of a colonising narrative; is Maori *lore* somehow inferior to statute *law*? (Jackson 1988). Kirby found the idea of legalising tamaiti whangai by translating it into these Pakeha terms as abhorrent. Because tamaiti whangai
as a practice did not happen in a cultural vacuum, the Pakeha practice of closed adoption relegated tamaiti whangai and its very open practice to a lesser position.

The concept of tamaiti whangai is defined as “an absolute whanau promise – a spiritual promise.” This promise is that the future care and interest of the tamaiti whangai is a precious taonga to be protected by the whanau, hapu and iwi. According to Kirby all children of Maori descent, including tamaiti whangai, have the right or social status as tangata whenua. This then “entitles the child to its culture of birth, its languages, its inheritance to land, and [makes it] privy to its tribal or cultural history.” (1994:22).

There are a number of circumstances or reasons in which tamaiti whangai status would arise, such as death, illegitimacy, barrenness of a spouse, parental age. However, once the situation was identified the processes of tamaiti whangai would decide who would be responsible as the nurturing whanau parents of the tamaiti whangai. The key aspect of the interaction would be whanaungatanga.

The development and growth of the tamaiti whangai is seen as the responsibility and commitment of the nurturing parents, the immediate family and the whole whanau (Kirby 1994).

Kirby then makes a number of proposals that:

- the principle of tamaiti whangai is of absolute paramount lore to Maori people; that tamaiti whangai is the responsibility of the direct birth family, whanau hapu and iwi of the whangai; and finally that these principles recognise immediate and long term, lifetime responsibility for the care and interest of the tamaiti whangai (1994:23).

Kirby (1994) also makes a comment which notes maatua whangai and tamaiti whangai as being different. The broader concepts of adoption contain many of the concept and practice elements of tamaiti whangai. In fact they are discussed in an interchangeable way. This adds to the confusion about “fostercare” as a concept for Maori. The words taurima, tamaiti, and whangai are used interchangeably (Metge, 1995). The terms
“adoption” and “fostercare” by themselves do not seem to have any literal or legal equivalents in Maori.

Mead 1994 provides a useful analytical framework derived from the story of Maui to analyse tamaiti whangai, covering the following points:

Te Take (The Cause),
Te Whanaungatanga (The Relationship);
Te Kimihanga I te Whakapapa (Seeking the Identity)
Te Mana Whanau (Mana of the Birth Family)
Te Mana Whanau Whangai (Mana of the Foster Family)
Nga Mahi (The Deeds).

For the purposes of this research I will discuss the first two as they are the most relevant and significant.

Te Take (The Causes and Circumstances)
There were a number of reasons in traditional Maori culture as to why a tamaiti whangai relationship was thought necessary. (These were between circumstances and people but there were a number of precedents that existed in Maori culture Mead 1994.) I have added other causes to this list that are founded on my familial experiences, those of the respondents and the literature.

(a) He Whare Ngaro (“a lost house”)
According to Mead a house may have a “ritual lien” (1994:88) on it and the family living in it could be classed as te whare ngaro (a lost house). For the children or the house to survive it was sometimes felt that their best chance would be to move in with other members of the family.

(b) He whakamahana I nga whanaungatanga (“warming the kinship links”)
Sometimes Maori people would negotiate over a long period to gift a child as a way of “warming” or strengthening whanau ties. This was usually a very open process where the
tamaiti whangai (foster child) would have access to both sides of his whanau (Mead 1994).

Tom Smiler Junior (1998) when discussing his own upbringing supports this practice:

My mother’s name was Teria and my father was Pera Punahamoa. After I was born, so I have been told, my paternal grandmother came to pick me up and take me away with her. Her name was Hine Te Ariki and she was about forty-five at the time; Manu Tawhiorangi was her second husband – they brought me up. I don’t know if my mother objected. The custom in those days was that the first-born was adopted by the father’s parents and the second-born by the mother’s parents. My younger brother Winiata, was taken by Moanaroa Pere and Riria Watene Pere, my mother’s parents. The third one in our family, Michael, came to join me at Hine Te Ariki’s. Puku, the fourth, stayed with Mum and Dad, as did Mary and the others. But at some point another sister, Josephine, when she was older, also came to stay with Hine Te Ariki. This was possibly to make it easier for Mum and Dad, who were going through hard times during the Depression (pp.64-65).

(b) He Wahine Pukapuka (“barren women”)
When a couple could not have children it was not uncommon for them to negotiate with relatives to find a child for them to raise. They could have one tamaiti whangai or several (Mead 1994).

It was never stated that Te Puea Herangi [1883-1952] was barren but she did not conceive any children during her three marriages. She did however foster several tamaiti whangai. During the 1913 smallpox epidemic many children were left orphaned, and old people left without people to care for them. Te Puea gathered them up and took them back to Mangatawhiri to look after them (MacDonald, Penfold and Williams 1995).

She had eight whangai. The youngest one was John, a Pakeha-looking boy. He was a mischief boy. One day he took a gun and shot a milking cow. He would have been almost eight years old. He come back and acted out how the cow staggered around. So Nanny had to go and look for it. She found it when she came back and we wondered what Nanny going to do to him. She put John in a hole. Cover him right up to his neck and she left him there all afternoon. He never done anything naughty for a long time after that.

What I remember about her most was the way she cared for us. The love she gave us and the patience she had. I think I'm a better person today because of it (:483-485).

Of Tumanako Te Puna Reweti (Aunty Hope) [1903-1980] it was said she had no children of her own but raised three whangai. As a kaumatua she gave her awhi and support to the protest group at Bastion Point during the 501-day occupation (MacDonald, Penfold and Williams 1995). Danny and Josie Tumahai (1995) share a number of memories about her. Danny remembered:

I was brought up by Tumanako (Hope) at a very early age. She was Reweti. Her father was Te Puna Reweti and her mother was Ani Paora. Tumanako was Te Puna Reweti’s only child and she belonged here at Orakei. I was a week old when she came and picked me up. I don’t know how I look at someone riding a motorbike and wonder how many times she must have dropped me on the road! In my young days I was brought up with Hope at the old papakainga (village) down on the flat by the urupa (cemetery). This place was known as Orekei Pa. From
there we shifted up on to Bastion Point (Danny and Josie Tumahai 1995:556).

Josie said:

Hopey took on all the street kids – well, that’s what we call street kids, but they weren’t street kids to her. She just helped them and treated them like human beings. I think how she got them right again because her houses were at street level. Her premises weren’t flash by any means, but she cared for these kids and she did all this without the assistance of government or anything like that (Danny and Josie Tumahai 1995:557).

Apirana Taylor (1998) when discussing her mother’s upbringing, also supports this practice without explicitly stating that the women who raised her mother were barren:

My mother was of Ngati Porou, Te Whanau a Apanui, Nga Puhi, and Ngati Ruanui descent. The blood of the Spanish and Portuguese and some English ran in her veins. Her maiden name was Shelford. Her mother was Te Aowaini Kirikiri. Some people called her Te Aowaina porangi. Which means crazy Te Aowaina. Te Aowaina spent a lot of her life riding on horseback between Gisborne and Opotiki. She stayed at many of the marae along the way where she had relations. Mum told me that when she was about three she and her older brother, Charlie, were taken by Te Awaina around the coast on horseback from Te Kaha and left in Waiomatatini, to be raised by a lady who was tough on the children. She sometimes beat them with a spade. The elders rode over and took my mother and her brother and gave them to another women called Riwai Fox, to raise as her whangai. Whangai is the Maori term for adoption or to adopt. Riwia Fox had no children but raised eighteen adopted children on her own. My mother
was fond of Riwia Fox, as were all those adopted by this old lady (Apirana Taylor 1998: 206-207).

(c) He Waka Pakaru ("broken canoe")
A broken waka was a metaphor for an incapacitated or deceased parent or parents, usually the mother. In this case the family would have a meeting and the children would be divided up amongst them. This was a time when whakawhanaungatanga would come into play and kinship obligations would ensure that the relatives shared the children (Mead 1994).

(e) He Whanau Pakaru ("broken family")
It is not uncommon for Maori children to be shared around the family in times of stress such as illness, economic hardship, war, or difficulties with a child.
Donna Awatere Huata (1998) talks about being raised by her older sister:

I was brought up by my older sister whom I called Mum. My father never took to me as a baby; he didn’t like me when I was little. But there were forty-six other people in my immediate family, and I could eat at any house I liked or sleep there if I wanted to (Donna Awatere Huata 1998: 141).

Whilst Margie Hohepa (1998) does not state the reason she had an older brother for a while, she shares her experience candidly:

And then for a while I had an older ‘brother,’ our second cousin. My family had gone up north, I’d stayed behind with my aunty and uncle and two younger girl cousins. On the night they returned to Auckland they picked me up. I’d climbed into the back of the station wagon to be met with green-eyed stares of a kitten and my cousin; this was the first time I had met either of them. While he stayed with us my ‘cousin brother’ increased my popularity amongst the girls at school no end.
Apparently he was a spunk. All I knew was he was like a dream come true. Someone older so that anything that went wrong, especially if it involved the younger kids, wasn’t always my fault, or my problem anymore. And I had someone to stick up for me rather than me having to stick up for all the littler ones, when we were fighting first the Maori kids (until their parents told them to stop because we were their relations) and then the Pakeha kids (because if we were related to those Maoris then we figured along with the Pakeha kids that we must be Maori too) who lived across the park (Margie Hohepa 1998:59).

(f) "Keeping Grandparents Young"

This was the only way I could describe this aspect of tamaiti whangai, and there are a number of references in the literature (Makareti, Kirby, Pere, cited in Else 1991) regarding those who have been raised by their grandparents. This practice is not peculiar to Maori culture but is mentioned here (even though it is not part of Mead’s framework) because it was the most common tamaiti atawhai relationship.

Iranui Te Aonohoriu Haig (1998) talks about being raised by her old people:

I was one of the lucky ones that grew up with the old people. I was brought up by my grandparents. Fortunately for me there were a lot of old nannies and koroua around and they always spoke Maori. They didn’t understand English a lot of them. Even for myself, I learnt English from over the fence. The neighbours had five boys, and they spoke Maori and English. Sometimes they would forget themselves and swear like anything, and an aunt of mine would say, ‘Hey! Hey! Hey! Moko is at home, you speak nicely, so that she can speak good English.’ That’s how I picked up my English (Iranui Te Aonohoriu Haig 1998:40).
Te Whanaungatanga Principle (The Relationship or Kinship Principle)

Mead (1994) discusses this principle in terms of protecting the interests of the child involved in the fostering process. The closer the kinship ties the better, in order to protect interests that could include the social place of the child; its heritage, including physical property such as land; culture and language; and the self-esteem, mana and tapu of the child. Kirby (1994) describes the concept of tamaiti whangai as “an absolute whanau promise—a spiritual promise” (p.22). As far as Kirby and Mead are concerned the tamaiti whangai is a precious taonga to be protected by the whanau, hapu and iwi. The whanaungatanga (relatedness) principle operated along bloodlines and it was unusual for a whangai to be placed outside the whanau, hapu and iwi, let alone introduced into another culture (Mead 1994, Kirby 1994). In fact Mead (1990) says that it was not the prerogative of an individual parent to “throw a child into another culture” (Mead 1994: 90) and that this type of cultural violence would not happen if whanaungatanga principles were followed.

Whakahuihui Vercoe (1998) is very clear when he talks about whakawhanaungatanga and his old people:

My old people were concerned with maintaining family relationships so that everyone understood their place. They told the history of who you were and where you came from. They sang their songs. They gave the genealogical aspects of one’s relationships, not only within the extended family but across the inner-tribal boundaries, which was important, because you became part of a wider and bigger society. They spent time looking after and nurturing children, the married couples and the family. I was never brought up just by my mother and father. I was brought up by my aunts and cousins and grandparents too. There were the parameters within which Maori society was upheld. Old kuia and koroua had a special place (Whakahuihui Vercoe1998:162).
Hone Kaa (1998) talks about a brother who was raised by an uncle:

Whatever the name or the circumstance, I'm here and I'm number eight in a family of twelve, eight boys and four girls. We didn't all grow up together. Rutene, one of my older brothers, was brought up by my mother's brother, Uncle Horace Whaanga. I always considered him lucky because he didn't have to milk cows and weed kumara. But it was good being eighth because it meant that your older siblings had to look after you — even if some of their treatment left you wishing them something other than good health and God bless! My big sisters, though, were wonderful surrogate mothers as they made up for the bullying from my big brothers (Hone Kaa 1998:105).

Erana and Eru Brown had fifteen children. The oldest girl was raised at home by her parents but a number of their subsequent children were whangaied by members of the extended family. It was thought to be entirely appropriate that for Erena and Eru to have many, many children. They should not be worried with bringing them up (MacDonald, Penfold and Williams 1995).

Wetekia Ruruku Elkington [1879-1957], like the rest of Maori society, practised the concept of maatua whangai. Often people would whangai children to give them a chance at a better life. When her cousin Tiro knew she was dying she did not know who could look after her children, so she asked Wetekia, who of course agreed and said yes. She had a myriad of kids and had to devise a method of dealing with them. She used to pair them up and give them jobs to do (Hippolite 1995).

Irihapeti Ramsden (1995), when discussing Erena Raukura Gillies (Taua Fan)[1896-1989] states that as well as bringing up four children, mokopuna and whangai, she gave home, shelter and love to whangai Pakeha. She had an open home and an almost unconditional love for people (Irihapeti Ramsden 1995:240).
Morgan, Selby, Bell & Sciascia (1995), when discussing their mother Lucy Jacob, recall that from an early age she accepted responsibility within the whanau. Her mother fostered many of her mokopuna and Lucy took a motherly role with children who were often only a few years her junior.

Dovey Tairoa (1995) was the niece of Dovey Katene [1912-1987] and recalls the following about her:

My first memory of Aunty Dovey was when I came down to Wellington and she was living in Johnsonville with a man called Whata Green. He was a champion Axeman and they’d adopted the twins by then. The twins were Dorothy and Mary Enoka but we used to call them Maina and Taina. They were whangai, brought up by Aunty Dovey from babies (Tairoa and Parekowhai 1995: 340).

Kupere Sanders was a whangai of Te Whiu Maitai [1869-1960] and told his story to John Walsh:

She loved people for what they were. Practically all Mum’s life, people were more important to her than things. We always had someone living in our house that did not belong in the family. She collected them wherever they came from. She originally brought five of us as whangais, but actually she collected people like nobody’s business. Europeans, Maori they were all there, and if she could have got Chinamen she’d have had those too but Chinamen are a bit thin on the ground in Tolaga (Walsh, Sanders and Parekowhai 1995: 403).

The maatua whangai relationship may last a month, a year or longer, that is not regarded as important. Metge (1994, cited in Else 1991) states “it is the quality of the relationship that matters, not its duration,” and this helps explain why the terms used for Maori adoption are the same as for fostercare in the Pakeha sense.
Rose Pere, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku and Joan Metge all refer to their maatua whangai experiences within their whanau and share some themes in common, they knew their birth parents well, the placements were within the iwi, and they stayed within their tribal areas (Else 1991).

I asked a Maori woman born in the 1940s for her views concerning maatua whangai, and these were some of her responses:

"It's wholistic, it starts and finishes in the home."

"It's been there forever, I was born into it from day one."

"I observed Maori children being taken away from the pa. If they were born illegitimately and they didn't go to Taua and Paua, they left (Stringer 1995).

"We have just found two children (now adults) who were taken by the Superintendent of Welfare, there was no contact, they were never returned."

"The Maori Women's Welfare League worked with and helped protect mothers so they could keep their children" (Stringer 1995).

Concerning the Maatua Whangai Programme within the Department of Social Welfare she states:

"They saw maatua whangai as a big word, the Department had picked up from Maori. They were told it would never work because it would not work in their structure."

"It can and does work within the tribal, hapu, whanau structures" (Stringer 1995).

As I looked to my own childhood in the 1960s I remembered the whangai children who lived with us, on and off, my own experiences of being whangaied and being a maatua whangai caregiver myself for ten years. This effects my own positioning within this thesis as "there is no view from nowhere" (Haber 1994), and I have both insider and outsider perspectives that are discussed further in chapter three.
Knowledge & Theory

I now want to discuss the theories and knowledge base that inform the maatua whangai practice area. I have found it difficult to locate theoretical explanations and research findings that might underpin both the theoretical and practice implications of the subject. The maatua whangai approach is the cutting edge of social work, but Maori are yet to write theory and conduct research in this area. There is also no one Maori perspective that can act as a panacea for the ills that beset Maoridom in the 21st century. It is important first to examine the nature of traditional Maori culture.

Maori Culture

Traditionally, Maori culture existed wholistically in acknowledgement of God, man, animal, the elements and nature. Socially, Maori society was structured so that no man, woman or child was expected to exist without the support of the whanau, hapu and iwi. Spiritually, Maori did not exist alone either: the precept “my past is before me” illustrates this point. Maori acknowledged their past (tipuna) as an integral living part of their daily life and future. Kaumatua and mokopuna were equally revered. Maori linked all aspects of their existence into a single whole, thus creating a cultural network. It is this network that engenders the true spirit of maatua whangai, the awareness of the whanau, hapu and iwi within the past, present and future. The coming of the European upset Maori life so that these networks were splintered, and whanau and hapu separated. The natural order of Maori life was eroded. Maori spiritual links have however remained intact (Department of Social Welfare 1991). Today, Maori are reclaiming their traditional networks through the provision of their own social service delivery, utilising their own tikanga within the framework provided through the Maatua Whangai Programme.

According to Ruwhiu (1994), the concepts of whanau and whanaunga have been defined in terms of ‘family, extended family, relatives, group dynamics and social interaction relationships’ (Pere 1998 and Roa 1987 cited in Ruwhiu 1994:135). The philosophy of whanau (the most basic (individualised) social unit of Maori society) reinforces the belief that it is Maori society’s own [natural] form of social service delivery institution (Kupenga 1992 cited in Ruwhiu 1994:135). This principle links with the perception that the bonds of whanau are joined together in whakapapa to include even the gods. Thus, the role and function of past or even future entities in one’s whanau can be very influential in the conscious or subconscious healing processes. Ruwhiu (1994) has no hesitation in
arguing that the "Maori whanau structure, by its very nature, has been a proven environment for cultivating the ways and methods (the appropriate social and community work practice and theory) to respond effectively to the needs of its members" (Ruwhiu 1994:136).

Ruwhiu (1994), in the context of discussion of Maori development and social work, believes that the emphasis given to such factors as "technical as opposed to intrinsic forms of knowledge, to experiential rather than book learning, to individual versus communal accountability, to history versus the here and now, determines the form of action taken when interacting" (Ruwhiu 1994:127) with the Maori world. Those entering such an arena in an ill-informed and unprepared manner, continually are at risk not only of jeopardising their own safety but also having a negative effect on the lives of those they work with (Ruwhiu 1994:127). The following principles underpin his perceptions and practice as a social/community worker in Aotearoa:

- "That Maori development initiatives are based around Maori people reclaiming the *validity and legitimacy of their own indigenous body of knowledge*, in dealing with problems and other debilitating or inhibiting situations.
- That this right to view the world in a Maori way and to draw from such a perspective when looking for solutions to some of the ills that may befall Maori people, does not reject the strategy of *interacting with other bodies of knowledge*.
- That Te Tiriti o Waitangi, as perceived by those who signed the Maori version, reflects a blueprint for relationships between tangata whenua and tauiwi. The Treaty is also central to Pakeha existence in Aotearoa, but must be placed in context, when critiquing Maori experiences and history" (Ruwhiu 1994:132).

Ruwhiu (1994) claims that the "experience of colonisation has left individual whanau with expressions of pain and suffering that have been handed down through their whakapapa lines, even to present-day whanau. Therefore, those involved in the art of healing need to be quite clear about that contact-history, and about the role and function of whanau in redressing those ills. This position rejects deficit-type theories that place the onus of healing on the individual rather than the system" (Ruwhiu 1994:132-133). Changes need to be made at the personal, organisational and structural levels to assist healing. Otherwise Ruwhiu contends, we may see a repeat of the mistakes made in the
Ruwhiu (1995), discusses some of the key conceptualisations (discussed and assessed in chapter seven under the headings of knowledge, power and practice) that underpin tangata whenua knowledge development, research and mahi in the area of social and community work practice:

1. “Tangata Whenua philosophies and experiences provide a range of conceptual frameworks that can be ordered into theoretical paradigms, in this case, to explain appropriate responses to ill health and sickness:

2. Tangata Whenua Stories [Described by Pakeha negatively as myths] are examples of these theoretical paradigms that underpin appropriate forms of knowledge acquisition for Tangata Whenua involved in the social service delivery arena:

3. Subsequently, Tangata Whenua philosophical perspectives on Social and Community practice, have different roots to those emerging from Western Eurocentric development pathways.

4. Practices in social service delivery are obviously not acultural. This means that Western Eurocentric explanations or understandings must be secondary to Tangata Whenua explanations or understandings if you are working with Tangata Whenua immersed in their culture. Likewise, for those who are whanau mokemoke, considerations of Tangata Whenua become crucial in terms of dealing with loss of heritage and culture based on cultural invasion strategies by Western Eurocentric colonisers.

5. Consequently, the evaluation of Maori [Tangata Whenua] social service programmes must take into account the Tangata Whenua theoretical paradigms that exist in terms of giving accurate explanations for the outcomes desired and observed. These conceptualisations are therefore the backbone [poutokomanawa] to my thesis, that from our own philosophical foundations as indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, emerge the theories that inform our social service delivery practices. Furthermore, they provide us with the absolute right to determine the appropriate responses to maintaining good health and well being” (Ruwhiu 1995:22).

Jackson (1995) makes similar points when he states that he believes decolonisation is inevitable and he encourages Maori to get ready for it. Part of the process of tino
rangatiratanga is identifying the values, or tikanga which will shape the reclaimed world in which the Maori live.

Jackson (1995) also states that if Maori have to use the language of the coloniser then they should reclaim the ways in which that language has defined them. This is especially pertinent to the issue of the meanings attached to specific words in the maatua whangai practice arena and Jackson’s insights have been a tremendous help when trying to produce legitimate Maori theory about maatua whangai. The situation is best illustrated in the following diagram.

Figure 1

It is only by using the traditional Maori terminology that we can begin to understand maatua whangai principles and practice. Only then does the process come alive. The Maori child is born into a whanau which itself is located within the wider hapu. To use the analogy of the womb, the hapu keeps the whanau safe and provides the sustenance needed for the whanau to survive. The term iwi comes from Ko iwi or bones. The bones
of the ribcage protect the womb and provide the body with structure. A graphic illustration of the effects of colonisation is seen when one imagines the womb being ripped out of the body (Jackson 1995). The word waka not only means canoe but also refers to a confederation of tribes. The term tipuna is important as it links man to God, to the whenua and to past, present and future.

The relationships between these roopu (groups) are mediated by a number of Maori concepts and constructs, for example:

- **whakapapa** (genealogical table, provides you with a cultural identity that links your past, present and future)
- **whanaungatanga** (relationship responsibilities to relatives/whanaunga)
- **arohatia** (to love, care for, and sympathise)
- **tautoko** (to support)
- **awhinatia** (to help to embrace)
- **whakapakiri whanau** (to strengthen whanau)

All of these terms came to bear on the concept of maatua whangai. According to Cleave Barlow (1991), maatua whangai refers to the custom of grandparents raising and taking care of children. “In days of old it was the general custom amongst Maori for the grandparents to take care of the firstborn of their grandchildren, and the practice continues today, for many grandparents, aunts and uncles take care of their grandchildren, nieces and nephews” (ibid:80).

More broadly, Durie and Metge (1992) state that the Maori practice of whangai (that is to feed and nurture) refers to “all situations where adults other than birth parents or grandparents are the primary caregivers for any significant period” (ibid: 71). ‘This is still a common practice amongst Maori.’

Indeed, according to Elizabeth Murchie (1984) of the Otepoti Maori Womens Welfare League (MWWL), when a major survey (Rapuora) of Maori women was undertaken, it was found that “one in five had a whangai child or adult living with them” (ibid:82).
In contrast, in Pakeha law, there is a lack of clarity as to the precise nature of fosterparenting or caregiving. There does not seem to be anything in statute (The Adoption Act 1955, The Guardianship Act 1968, and The Children Young Persons and Their Families Act, 1989) that defines the role and status of fosterparents or caregivers. Section 13 of The Children Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 does, however, provide guiding principles regarding who should care for children if their parents are unable to.

(g) Where the child or young person cannot remain with, or be returned to, his or her family, whanau, hapu, iwi, and family group, the principle that, in determining the person in whose care the child or young person should be placed, priority should, where practicable, be given to a person-

(i) Who is a member of the child’s or young person’s hapu or iwi (with preference being given to hapu members), or, if that is not possible, who has the same tribal, racial, ethnic, or cultural background as the child or young person; and

(ii) Who lives in the same locality as the child or young person.

This section is in line with the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Article 20 makes it clear that where a child is temporarily deprived of his or her family environment they shall be entitled to special protection and assistance to be provided by the State. The State is required to ensure that there is an alternative care system available to the child such as foster care. When the State is considering foster care as an option, due regard is to be paid to “the desirability of continuity in a child’s upbringing and to the child’s ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic background” (Henaghan 1996:1). Because it is incumbent on the State to provide special assistance and protection, fosterparents and caregivers are acting as agents of the State (Henaghan 1996).

The lack of an active definition and role for fosterparents in New Zealand is extraordinary considering how many children the State has had in its care over the last
twenty years. If fosterparents are acting as agents of the State then their status and role should be defined in a way that gives them a voice. This may in fact explain why fosterparenting has been so under resourced over the years and thus why the Maatua Whangai Programme was always struggling financially (Bradley 1994).

Worrall (1996) provides an extensive historical, cultural and social context for kinship care. According to her, the Maatua Whangai Programme was underpinned by the same unexamined context as the New Zealand Acts indicate and is pragmatically a combination of both kinship and non-kin care. As part of his critique of the programme, Bradley (1994) discusses the way in which Maori were treated as a homogenous group when it came to caring for other Maori.

The idea that Maori should care for their own was not new to the State or to Maori, but the concept of paying for it and co-ordination of the programme by three government departments was a new departure. Bradley (1994), provides an excellent overall analysis of the programme and notes that, by 1985, it was apparent that the graft was not taking as well as was first hoped. The project did not grow well in his view for a number of reasons:

- The underlying value-base of the kaupapa ("direction") did not follow Maori whakapapa-based (genealogical) community concepts.
- The State's co-ordination of the project mistakenly assumed that the community was a healthy and well-serviced reception system for children in need of alternative community care.
- Because of the aroha and manaakitanga involved, whanau who took in additional whangai seldom asked for financial or other assistance.
- Training was not provided to Maatua Whangai workers. Mokai worked in isolation, often unsure of what was happenings from district to district.
- Difficulties occurred in the relationship between the DSW Mokai and their supervisors.
- There were no Maatua Whangai senior social workers, which meant that Mokai were provided with a narrow professional supervision perspective.
Department of Social Welfare policy at the time was that child-based whanau could only receive financial support if they were legally under the custody or guardianship of the Department (for example as a Children and Young Persons Act 1974 section 11 or guardianship order) (Bradley 1994:187-189).

Working from the basis of Bradley’s (1994) review, material from whangai “stories”, and Ruwhiu’s (1994) discussion, this research seeks to assess, from the perspective of a Tangata Whenua “whangai” caregiver, the knowledge used, practices and power utilised by the programme, as a basis for evaluating Maatua Whangai. From this analysis, I suggest some proposals for better care with particular respect to Maori self-determination – tino rangatiratanga and a better future for young Maori.
Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

Where knowledge is gathered, wisdom should follow.
(Maori Proverb, author unknown)

Introduction

As discussed in the conclusion of the previous chapter this research seeks to assess, from the perspective of a Tangata Whenua “whangai” caregiver, the knowledge used, practices employed and power utilised in the Maatua Whangai Programme, as a basis for evaluating it and making proposals for better care.

To this end, I have investigated the views of caregivers regarding the development, implementation and subsequent implications of the Dunedin Maatua Whangai Programme between 1983 and 1991. This work includes some historical analysis of the programme itself, but is primarily an investigation into the perceptions of those who provided the primary care for children and young people at that time. It is an attempt to give voice to and acknowledge their mahi (work) and the way their cultural understandings and values worked in conjunction with the programme.

In undertaking this research, it was necessary to engage the discourses of people involved in the actual day-to-day care of children and young people on behalf of the Department of Social Welfare and the Maori community. On the face of it, this would seem like a simple task involving the identification of significant and appropriate caregivers, arranging and undertaking the interviews and hui, transcribing the interviews and hui and then undertaking an analysis of what they had said, feeding this back to the respondents and then writing up the final document for a thesis. Nothing is as simple as it seems as there were a number of factors that needed to be considered.

This research was being conducted by Maori with Maori, for a Masters thesis under the auspices of a tertiary institution that produces knowledge (the knowledge factory) regarding Maori, amongst other things. It was not to be assumed that merely because the researcher and two of the supervisors were Maori that this would guarantee an approach and result that was both authentic and useful to the general Maori population and more
importantly the respondents. For they are in fact the final arbiters of the value of this mahi.

**Western Research and Indigenous Peoples**

Western research is more than just research that is located in a positivist tradition. It is research which brings to bear, on any study of indigenous peoples, a cultural orientation, a set of values, a different conceptualisation of such things as time, space and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialised forms of language and structures of power (Smith 1999:42)

Said, cited in Smith (1999), refers to the “Western discourse about the other” as the process by which knowledge regarding indigenous peoples was “collected, classified and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized” (Smith, 1999:1-2). In regards to research and indigenous peoples it is important to have an understanding of the sophisticated ways in which the quest for knowledge is deeply embedded in the many layers of imperial and colonial practices (Smith 1999).

Bishop (1995), citing Olsen (1993:5), discusses French post-structuralist Michel Foucault’s (1980) ideas of “the productive function of power-knowledge” which is to “regulate populations by describing, defining and delivering the forms of normality and educability.” In other words, if you have the power to define (Jackson 1994) you can define what is knowledge, essentially through the production of grand narratives that may in turn be used for normalisation, interpretive potentialities or oppression (Bishop 1995). In Aotearoa/New Zealand research has specific implications for Maori.

**Research into Maori People’s Lives**

Bishop (1993) has stated that much of the early research conducted among Maori focussed on social pathology characteristics, functional inadequacies (i.e. reading and writing) and cultural deprivation (i.e. research that portrayed the Maori culture as deficient). This type of research has had profoundly adverse effects on the development of Maori and therefore has ethical implications for both Maori and non-Maori researchers. According to Bishop, Maori are sick and tired of being researched. “It is
from this position of being researched that Maori people have resisted and then
challenged social science research” (Smith 1999: 47). The alternative is research with
research to be an interactive process through which individuals and communities can
learn, benefit and be empowered. Research is something that should be done with and not
to others”. Being Maori does not guarantee that this research would not be undertaken on
Maori as opposed to with Maori because the researcher still represents the “knowledge
factory” (University).

The Language and Knowledge Bases Used.
Firstly, when I use the terms Maori and Pakeha I realise that these terms have their own
political construction (Fleras and Spoonley 1999) and cannot be applied in a blanket
fashion to each group. This is problematic when many of the commentators refer to a
Maori this, or a Pakeha that, knowing that these are generally held, but not exclusive,
views. To use such terms as descriptors leads to the criticism of a simplistic or over­
generalised analysis. Therefore, when I use the terms Maori and Pakeha, I recognise that
a variety of communal and individual interpretations of their meanings are implicit.
Jackson (1994) regards the historical use of the term Maori as a colonial imposition used
to broadly cagorise Maori as opposed to its indigenous definition which was ‘normal.’
This approach seems to be pan-tribal and a wiser pathway would be one that is iwi- or
hapu-centric. This is also problematic as even Maori commentators who acknowledge
their whakapapa are not necessarily speaking for their iwi, let alone all Maori. Durie
(1995) uses the term “matatini Maori,” that is the right of Maori to be diverse in their
views.

This study contains contributions from a variety of Maori people regarding child-raising
by a non-birthparent as well as reflective material from my own background. The
gathering and shaping of material is in my case a very subjective activity which has its
own prejudices and history. I acknowledge the mana of all these people in this chapter as
my thesis records their story imbued with the lessons of their lives and those who have
gone before them. For that reason I acknowledge my teina status to them. I say this with
sincerety as I had great trouble battling with the morality of taking parts of these peoples’
stories and using it for my own research purposes. I also felt uneasy about using the stories of iwi other than my own, because most of these stories belong not only to the whanau involved, but are part of the whakapapa of hapu and iwi. For that reason I did not want to be an ethnographic voyeur and I am not sure how to resolve this. I have also taken parts of stories out of their context and used them in another context that is not their original purpose. However I agree with Haber (1994) that there “is no view from nowhere” and that no one can operate bereft of prejudices and an interested viewpoint. Therefore, I have included my own familial and historical experiences within the narrative.

Secondly to this general point, the use of the term “fostercare” has implications in terms of framing this discussion. Specifically (as chapter two identified), the term fostercare has a particular hegemonic power because discussions regarding maatua whangai or tamaiti atawhau use the term as their starting point. Jackson (1994) talks about the power of language to define and the term fostercare is not just functional; it is ideologically underpinned and derives from a knowledge base that is not Maori. The term is part of a constricting paradigm that finds all “other” forms of non-birthparent child-raising wanting. I would argue this kind of construction is fundamental to our understanding of the traditional non-parental care of children within non-Western (indigenous/Maori) society. For the purposes of this study, and to reduce confusion, Maori customary non-birthparent child-raising is referred to by the term “tamaiti atawhau”. When I refer to the government programme I use the term “maatua whangai” and when using the term “fostercare” I will preface it with the terms Maori, non-Maori, or Pakeha.

Thirdly, when I initially engaged in this research I was determined to use only Maori sources to talk about Maori customary approaches to tamaiti atawhau. This brings up issues of authenticity and intellectual property that I found hard to ignore. When I have used non-Maori sources I have tried to use sources that have the backing and acknowledgement of the peoples that they discuss; for example, Metge (1995) relies heavily on the wisdom Te Tai Tokerau peoples. However, even then there is still some question as to the colonising nature of research. The voices of researchers like Metge may
have simply colonised a Maori space. In terms of non-Maori academics, Hirini Moko Mead (1998, cited in Ballara 1998) critiques those who would attempt to unilaterally constitute themselves as “knowledge managers” of the traditional history of any descent group. In response, Ballara (1998) makes a very clear statement regarding intellectual property rights, stating that “such knowledge remains that group’s intellectual property, to share with the wider world or retain as private as they choose, and that academics may only use what elders have, over time, decided to put into the public arena” (Ballara, 1998:11). Metge (1995) has strong links with Te Runanga O Te Rarawa and is claimed as one of their own in the forward to her book New Growth From Old. It is this relationship and the accountability that it entails which gives her voice authenticity. For that reason I agree with Lorde and can use Metge’s knowledge of and with Maori to dismantle the master’s house while having no compunction about using the master’s tools.

“The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.”

(Audre Lorde in Smith 1999)

Kaupapa Maori Research

The present study attempts to follow a kaupapa (agenda/philosophy) of Maori indigenous approaches. Bishop (1995), citing Graham Smith (1992b), describes this as

…the philosophy and practice of ‘being and acting Maori’ (p.1). It assumes the taken for granted social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Maori people, in that it is a position where ‘Maori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right’ (p.13). Further Kaupapa Maori presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the unequal power relations in our society. These include rejection of hegemonic belittling, ‘Maori can’t cope’ stances, together with a commitment to the power of conscientisation and politicisation through struggle for wider community and social freedoms (Smith 1992a:26).
Kaupapa Maori is not an attempt to create another grand narrative, as "Maori perspective," or a counter-narrative (Bishop 1996), but it provides its own pedagogical framework that is valid in its own right. Kaupapa Maori can be viewed as "the deconstruction of those hegemonies which have disempowered Maori from controlling and defining (researching) their own knowledge within the context of unequal power relations in New Zealand" (Bishop 1991). This deconstruction could be viewed as a counter-strategy of "writing back" to the West (Smith 1999).

In terms of this research project, it was important to ask the right questions to guarantee the emergence of Kaupapa Maori research practice principles that would address the issues regarding research into Maori people's lives. The methodology utilised needed to place with Maori the locus of control over the research issues of:

- initiation
- benefits
- representation
- legitimation
- accountability

These five practice principles are expanded upon by Bishop (1996:22) and form the basis and genesis of my research methodology. Taken literally, the following principles and the subsequent questions generated provided a framework for working within a Maori context. They do not guarantee that the research will not be an unwelcome intrusion into Maori people's lives, but they do increase the chances of a useful final outcome for Maori.

The Practice Principles

1. Initiation

In a technical sense (Bishop 1996), the research was initiated by the researcher as a result of his involvement in Maatua Whangai and the proposed development of Iwi Social Services in Dunedin. The work of formulating aims, objectives, goals, writing of the research proposal, design, setting up supervision, ethical approval, the initial interviews and questions, and writing the first three chapters were undertaken by the researcher. However, these tasks were reviewed and restated by the participants at the initial interviews and subsequent hui held to discuss the major themes that emerged from the data. The shape of the investigation began to change as the working research whanau's
role became clear at the hui. A final hui was held to present the overall findings back to the whanau roopu of participants and make any further changes if they were necessary to ensure that the outcomes were consistent with the kaupapa.

2. Benefits

There are a number of groups and individuals who will “benefit” (Bishop 1996) in a variety of ways from this research, including the researcher, the respondents, Otakou Runanga, and Te Runanga o Nga Tahu and maataa waka. This study supports the cultural and language aspirations of Nga Iwi Maori by providing evidence which gives voice to and validates Maori lived experience. Whakawharaungatanga extends and supports whakapapa, tikanga and te reo. Finally the University will have a unique piece of research to use as a resource. The Otakou Runanga, Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu and maataa waka will be provided with empirical data that will strengthen its social service research base, especially in terms of social service partnerships with the Crown. The researcher will gain personal satisfaction, extend his research base and skills and gain a Masters qualification.

The research has had a conscientising effect on the research participants’ desire to see good quality social services for Maori provided by Maori in this region. The participants are all still involved to varying degrees in some form of maatua whangai. It is a general conjecture that knowledge is power, and in this case, power remains with the participants.

3. Representation

In terms of “representation” (Bishop 1996) it was the respondents and the researcher together who decided what constituted an adequate depiction of their social reality concerning the Maatua Whangai Programme. The text represents their interests, needs and concerns. The goals and major questions, and task allocation of the study, were established by the researcher and reviewed by the participants at the hui. Most of the work for this document was undertaken by the researcher, but it would not have been possible without the years of hard work undertaken by the respondents. Regarding agency, the respondents were able to operate independently of the determining constraints of social structure, i.e. the University. However, in other ways their agency will always be undermined by the structural impositions of a university setting. The transcribing and coding of the transcripts raises issues of representation and control. Te Henepe (1993), cited in Bishop (1995), states that “only collaborative coding would be legitimately representational” (p.218). The researcher interpreted the research initially
but, because their agency is in itself prescriptive, interpretation of the data must finally be
decided by the respondents themselves. The voice that comes through in the research is
that of the participants, and the narrative is created by them in conjunction with the
researcher. The result is shared meanings. They did the work and put in the “hard yards"
initially and for that reason the researcher is teina (“junior”) to them and the analysis
which follows, even though he did most of the work.

4. Legitimacy
In terms of “legitimation” (Bishop 1996), the text has the authority of the respondents and
the University of Otago, even though all the data was processed by the researcher. The
results of the processing were considered by the respondents at two hui to decide what
was accurate, true and complete in the text. The results were all stored by the researcher.
The findings were theorised by the researcher with feedback from the respondents.

5. Accountability
In regards to “accountability” (Bishop 1996), the researcher is accountable to both the
respondents and his supervisors through a variety of processes. The research findings will
be accessible to anyone through the University Library but will be distributed by the
researcher to the respondents, Otakou Runanga, Te Runanga o Nga Tahu, the University
of Otago, and the general Maori population, in a variety of ways. This process was
decided jointly by the respondents, the researcher, supervisors including kaumatua and
the University of Otago.

Research Relationship

There were issues of both insider (participant) and outsider involvement, because of a
close web of networks and kinship crossing normal positivist research boundaries.
Because of my close association with all but one of the respondents, I was in many ways
an insider. I had rubbed shoulders and worked through social work cases as a whanau
worker and caregiver with the community group Te Hou Ora and worked as the director
of a Child and Family Support Service with many of the respondents. My wife and I were
former Maatua Whangai caregivers through the Department and in some cases the
respondents and I had historically shared both clients and resources; I had collaborated
with some respondents on other Maori development projects, and finally we were all Kai
Tahu and there were whakawhanaungatanga responsibilities that came with that. Dunedin
does not have a large Maori community and the networking and tribal links meant that I
had relationships that gave me an entrance into this research that may not have been afforded to an outsider.

But in saying that, as a researcher for a Masters degree and a staff member at a tertiary educational institution (the University of Otago), I also had a role as an outsider. I was never made to feel like an outsider, but the research undertaken was in a different context to our previous relationships and, even though I did not focus my attention on how they felt about talking to me, I was very aware of the different nature of the relationship dynamics. We were in many ways working towards a common goal, the sharing of their stories, but it was I who would get the Masters degree and I who worked at a university.

**My position**

As a former Maatua Whangai caregiver and Maori whanau worker, I was aware of my lack of objectivity in a conventional positivist sense. How was I going to learn how each participant constructed meaning, within a Kaupapa Maori approach, without taking over the outcomes of the research process? A method had to be devised that allowed more than the voice of the researcher to be heard and to allow the other voices their proper place. To ignore my own role in the process of investigation was not acceptable because I was also a participant in the Maatua Whangai Programme with views, experiences and interests of my own. Hence, it was necessary to formulate a clear statement regarding my role. In this situation I became teina to the participants and they became tuakana to me in terms of the Maatua Whangai Programme:

"Ma te tuakana ka totika te teina, ma te teina ka totika te tuakana."

"It is through the older sibling that the younger one learns the right way to do things and it is through the younger sibling that the older one learns to be tolerant."

According to Arapera Royal Tangaere (1997), the concept of tuakana/teina has emanated from two principles: whanaungatanga and ako ("learn, teach"). The tuakana/teina relationship is an essential part of the dynamic of whanaungatanga, which is drawn from the importance of people particularly within the whanau, hapu and iwi. The idea of tuakana/teina also operates through the dual nature of the term ako, which means to learn
as well as to teach. You can be a teacher or a learner depending on the mahi and the kaupapa.

This way of conceptualising the situation actually had a freeing-up effect on the process because I was no longer the expert, they were.

The “Working Research Whanau” or “Whanau of Interest”

Bishop (1992) introduces the idea of a “working research whanau” or “whanau of interest” as an essential component of research in Maori contexts. In order to address Maori aspirations for self-determination, it was imperative that the formation of the working research whanau (WRW) take place at the inception of the research process. In this case five people were selected (one from each of the Maatua Whangai suburban roopu). I had spoken to these people informally as they had all been Maatua Whangai caregivers themselves and had already indicated a keenness to be involved in this research. This group was to have responsibilities that would include (but not be confined to) aims and objectives, research design, data collection, and analysis. The researched were supposed to also become the researchers. However, it must be acknowledged that the ability of the WRW to undertake these tasks was limited by time constraints and each participant’s familial, community and work commitments, and the lack of opportunity afforded to them. As the researcher I felt as though I did not want to burden these already busy people with any more responsibilities. They were all involved in many other Maori networks and gave their time to others unstintingly.

Despite their involvement, there were clearly issues that were brought out in regards to the researcher and the researched. Bishop (1992) states that “there will be a power and control dichotomy within any research relationship ... The operational question becomes that of finding ways to reduce the power and control differentials between researcher and researched.” Bishop (1992) encourages researchers to ask themselves the following questions:

- Are we culturally competent, especially in regard to the research context?
- How will we share the workload (e.g. on a hierarchical or co-operative basis)?
- How will evaluation and rewards (if appropriate) be made?
- Are we dedicated to communication for social betterment?
- What will be our locus of accountability?
• Who will own the knowledge and how will it be acknowledged and guarded?

These questions were never asked in the form that they were written here. However, during discussions, especially at the hui, many of these issues were raised in terms of who would own the knowledge, the interested parties being Ngai Tahu, the combined Runanga, the respondents and the University of Otago. It also became apparent that this was my Masters research and that I should “get on with it” in terms of the research mechanics. I also have to ask the question as the researcher: Did I really give the respondents the information and opportunity necessary to manage the overall process? The other issue that affected this was the three years it took to complete this project. As I was “the cog in the middle,” keeping the research process going was largely dependent upon my workload and commitments. This perhaps explains why the process took so long in terms of conventional schedules pertaining to university deadlines, but it also proceeded at a pace that the co-researchers could relate to and deal with.

Kaupapa Maori has its own world-view, asking different questions and having a different starting point from other approaches, utilising both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. Once I had worked through the pragmatics of working in Maori contexts with Maori people (dealing with such issues as kawa, tikanga, and ownership of information) it was up to me to design the research. It was, for example, important to grapple with the qualitative versus quantitative social research issue.

Qualitative vs Quantitative, Finding a Method

The present study involves both qualitative and quantitative data. However, talking and unravelling discourse through an interview or hui process cannot simply be reduced to the positivist tradition of measurements and numbers, so the logical consequence was to place a major emphasis on a qualitative approach. Only this type of research approach was going to bring out the depth of emotion and the subtle nuances of each of the respondents regarding the Dunedin Maatua Whangai Programme.

Qualitative methods of data collection are appropriate and suitable for this research because they permit the researcher to study selected issues, cases or events in depth and detail, and they are not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis. These methods also produce a wealth of detailed data about a much smaller number of people and cases than is usual with quantitative methods. Qualitative methods of data collection
provide depth and detail through direct quotation and careful description (Patton 1987). In short, the researcher seeks to capture the richness of people's experiences in their own terms.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) demonstrate the appropriateness of qualitative research for such a task:

Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry. Such researchers emphasize the value-laden nature of inquiry. They seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning. In contrast, quantitative studies emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework (Denzin & Lincoln 1994).

The importance of qualitative work to this study cannot be over-emphasised. It seems impossible from my standpoint to gather information from respondents in a quantitative manner. It is the rich diversity of their discourses with all the nuances and subtleties that are generated in regards to their role in the Maatua Whangai Programme that I am attempting to capture. I have utilised some quantitative data to describe the programme. That does not mean utilising a binary dialectic that simply replaces quantitative research with qualitative research, as this does not address the key issue of the "domination of agenda setting" by the researcher (Bishop 1995). Both quantitative and qualitative research methods can be forms of domination. The test of validity is not "truths" attained (unapproachable from either point of view), but usefulness. If the research is useful in giving respondents control of their world, this constitutes as high a level of scientific validity as can be achieved.

The positivist tradition seeks to understand the world of the respondents by reducing their reality to a set of measurements (Smith 1999), thus framing questions in the researcher's own terms and giving the researcher power. A post-positivist approach, whereby socially constructed reality is never fully and completely captured and can never be fully understood, only approximated (Guba 1990), provides intellectual space for Kaupapa Maori research and power to the respondents.
The skills required and the flexible nature of qualitative research can also be seen in the term *bricolage* and the related term applied to the researcher, *bricoleur* (Nelson, Triechler and Grossberg 1992:2, cited in Denzin and Lincoln 1994). The *bricoleur* is a “Jack of all trades” or a kind of professional “do-it-yourself person” who produces a *bricolage*, that is “a pieced-together, close-knit set of practices that provide solutions to a problem in a concrete situation” (Ibid:2). The *bricolage* or solution is “an emergent construction that adapts and changes and may take new forms as different tools, methods and techniques are added to the puzzle in that it is pragmatic, strategic and self-reflexive” (Nelson, Triechler and Grossberg 1992:2, cited in Denzin and Lincoln 1994). Again, the test is the usefulness of the tools to do the desired job. If the new tools have to be invented then, according to Becker (1989 cited in Denzin and Lincoln, 1994), this is part of the reflexive nature of qualitative research. While at the outset this approach may appear as an expert creating something, this is not the case. In terms of the present research project, both the respondents and the researcher had to adapt as circumstance and time dictated.

**Participatory Action Research**

This piece of qualitative research is also congruent with (but not completely within the paradigm of) participatory action research. Sarantakos (1993), citing Whyte (1991), states that "this form of research is characterised by the strong involvement and degree of participation of members of organisations or communities in the research process" (ibid:8).

In participatory action research, members of the groups being studied are expected and indeed encouraged to participate actively with the researcher throughout the duration of the study. This participation begins with the initial identification of the research topic and design and continues throughout all stages of the study (Sarantakos 1993). This method of investigation is appropriate to the present study given the topic, context, aims of the research and configuration of the sample, and indeed given a social constructionist view of the human sciences. Whilst the researcher may have initiated the research, the process and findings were developed within the working research whanau (cf. Bishop 1992).

The whakawhanaungatanga of all participants being Ngai Tahu and all having a history in Maatua Whangai provides an added dynamic of "connectedness" (Bishop 1996) which differentiates this Kaupapa Maori research from other emancipatory and participatory action research. An interesting twist is that not only do the respondents “participate” in
the researcher's world of academic research, they also “participate” (and have participated) in their world of practice and action. This methodology is consistent with current Maori social, political, and economic aspirations of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) (Bishop 1996).

Kaupapa Maori ideas are about control of knowledge and therefore not just useful for Maori alone—classist and feminist research paradigms ask similar questions. For that reason I would make comment on the compatibility of feminist methodology in terms of methods of data-collection within a Kaupapa Maori framework. Sarantakos (1993), quoting Cook and Foriew (1990), states while there is in fact no “correct” feminist methodology within the field of sociology, there are a number of main criteria which give a concrete impression of what such methodology might be. According to Cook and Foriew (1990), firstly, it sees reality through a “female prism,” where women are the focus of inquiry. Secondly, it is “consciousness-raising” as the research process becomes a process of conscientisation for both the researcher and respondent. Thirdly, feminist methodology rejects the artificial separation of the researcher and researched. Fourthly, feminist research points to new areas in which ethics are being violated. Fifthly, the purpose of feminist research is to empower women to transform oppressive and exploitative conditions.

In terms of the above criteria, it is clear that the feminist research paradigm has commonalities with Kaupapa Maori research, in that, reality is seen through a “Maori prism.” Kaupapa Maori research is “consciousness-raising”, may reject the artificial divide between the researcher and the research, challenges hegemonic research ethically and its purpose is to empower Maori to transform exploitive and oppressive conditions. The researcher also acknowledges the potential gender power differential within the research relationship; the strategy employed to deal with that issue was consistent with the traditional tikanga of tuakana and teina.

**Data-Collection Techniques**

Qualitative research has been generally defined as:

Multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the...
meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials—case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional and visual texts—that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives. Accordingly, qualitative researchers deploy a wide range of interconnected methods, hoping always to get a better fix on the subject matter at hand” (Denzin & Lincoln 1994:2).

The fact that qualitative research is multi-method in focus provides a variety of choice in terms of data-collection. To ensure that the process was working with, rather than on, Maori, I have had to find a method of data collection that suits both the respondents and the researcher within a Kaupapa Maori framework. This is not as simple as it would seem.

Sample

The five respondents were drawn from one of the four Dunedin Maatua Whangai whanau/suburban roopu—Pine Hill, Brockville, South Dunedin and the Baby Whanau (kaupapa-based). These roopu included other caregivers from other suburbs who are connected by whanau, hapu and iwi. The rationale for this purposive method of selection was based on the fact that when the programme was instigated, these suburban-based roopu (groups) were an essential part of the initial programme structure and thus would provide a full geographic coverage.

In terms of demographics, the five respondents were Ngai Tahu women aged between 40 and 56 years who had lived in the greater Dunedin area for at least 15 years. The fact that we were all Ngai Tahu was not discovered until the interviews were over and was not intentional. We had known each other for years and I did not purposefully set out to find respondents who were of my own tribal background. It did, however, serve as a vehicle for drawing us together in a way that connected our voices to each others’. It was not accidental that the respondents were all women, because they were the primary caregivers and representatives of their suburban roopu.

The criteria for choice of sample size and its appropriateness were considered; Shipman (1988) refers to “purposive sampling” where the researcher does the picking; Patton (1987) uses the similar term “purposeful sampling” and states: “The power of purposeful
sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth where we can learn a
great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of evaluation” (Patton,
1987:52). One of the criticisms of qualitative methods is the small sample size usually
involved and the impossibility of generalising from it (Patton 1987). Perhaps reasonable
extrapolations which are “modest speculations on the likely applicability of findings to
other situations under similar but not identical conditions” (Patton 1987:168) are more
consistent with qualitative methodology, and are illustrated in the conclusions to this
study. However, the purpose of this research was not to extrapolate, but to empower.

A small sample size combined with good geographical coverage, especially when
combined with limited resources, was the only logical option open to the author in order
to achieve any kind of in-depth analysis using qualitative methodology.

The respondents were invited to participate in in-depth face-to-face (kanohi ki te kanohi)
interviews and a focus-group hui. As the techniques used in data collection have
considerable impact on the information that is gleaned, the choice of technique is
dependent on the type of information the researcher needs. In this instance the material
required was of a personal nature and centred on the feelings and experiences of the
participants. Therefore, in-depth interviews and focus-group hui were used.

**Face-to-Face (kanohi ki te kanohi) In-depth Interviews**

Bishop (1995), citing Oakley (1981), develops the idea of an “enhanced research relationship”
and suggests that gaining the most valuable information from people through interviewing “is
best achieved when the relationship of the interviewer and the interviewee is non-hierarchical and
when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship”
(Oakley 1981:41). In this study the respondents and the researcher had a history of interactions
that meant that this was already happening before the inception of the research process. Bishop
(1995), citing Reinharz (1992), suggests that the interview process “needs to explore people’s
views of reality” (Reinharz, 1992:18) and needs to “encourage openness, trust between
participants, engagement and development of potentially long-lasting relationships in order to
form strong bonds between the interviewer and the interviewees” (Bishop 1995:70; see also

In terms of this research the interviewer had a proven long-term relationship and a shared
practice history with all but one of the respondents. The best way to allow this openness to
develop, according to Bishop (1995), is to arrange interviews that are semi-structured or unstructured (citing Reinharz 1992), interviews as conversations (citing Burgess 1984), in-depth interviews (citing Patton 1990) and co-structured interviews (citing Tripp 1983). The interviews in the study were all semi-structured with the question guidelines treated as no more than guidelines, and none of them were hurried.

The interviews took the form of shared conversations where in the respondents and researcher discussed a broad range of issues as they related to maatua whangai. Bishop (1996) refers to this process as “interviews as chat.” According to Tripp (1983:34, cited in Bishop 1995), in-depth interviews will “more clearly reveal the existing opinions of the interviewee in the context of a world-view than will a traditional interview where the interviewer’s role is confined to that of question-maker and recorder.”

The interviews were conducted one-to-one in an environment of the respondent’s choosing, and it was agreed the interviews would be taped. Four of the interviews were held in the respondents’ homes, the other at Otakou Marae. The location seemed to make a difference as, given the collective nature and kawa of a marae setting, the interview at the marae was non-individualistic and fairly lively as there were plenty of people who wanted to participate in the discussion; perhaps telling them I was only interviewing a specific person was a disrespect of kawa. I think these complications had something to do with the inclusive nature of the marae where I was trying to undertake an individual pursuit in a collective environment.

The kawa for the interviews was up to the respondents. For some, we started with a karakia and for others, we had a cup of tea and kai. Because the interviews were in their homes, it was appropriate that their familial kawa took precedence. During the interview the respondents were asked to talk about the Maatua Whangai Programme based on the Interview Question Guidelines (see Appendix 2) that the researcher had prepared beforehand. The questions were a guide only, and even though all the respondents were asked the same questions in the same order, the “chat” ranged very widely, but stayed on the kaupapa. Often the interviews elicited a number of responses from the researcher and the respondents. At times we laughed; at other times we were emotional, silent, shed some tears, or got angry. But overall the interviews were a positive experience for everyone concerned. During two separate interviews, whangai whom two of the respondents had living with them walked into the room. This was a “poetic” touch and added a reality check to the process.
A transcript was made of each of the interviews, with the tape being listened to by only the researcher and transcriber. The transcript was returned to the appropriate participant for alteration and/or correction. It was stressed that the information was owned by the participant and that if they chose to withhold the information, their wishes would be adhered to and the tape/transcript would destroyed. It was also discussed with the respondents that the researcher would draw the major themes out of the data and present his findings to the respondents at a focus-group hui.

**Focus Group Hui**

The second stage of data-collection was a hui involving all the respondents designed to feed back the major themes drawn from the data and find broad consensus on the relevant issues. The research was becoming part of what Bishop (1996) refers to as "hui as a metaphor for collaborative storying."

This was a hui where the respondents and the researcher collaboratively constructed a story or narrative regarding their experiences in Maatua Whangai. This construction of shared meanings was not new to those involved, because they were all seasoned campaigners in terms of hui and “knew the score” on these matters. They had plenty of experience of the kawa and were comfortable in this environment. They were quite used to the rituals of encounter, the karakia, waiata and the laying down of the “take” and the spiral discourse that followed. When someone had the floor they spoke without interruption as the issues were visited and then revisited, co-constructing the narrative. The process of creating a narrative seemed to be tailor-made for Maori cultural aspirations. Maori have historically been an oral culture and used a number of methods to transfer a variety of knowledge-forms from one generation to the next, waiata (“song”), moteatea (“poetry”), pakiwaitara (“story”), and kaawhau (“moralistic tale”) (Metge 1989, cited in Bishop 1995). The use of an oral narrative to co-construct shared meaning just seemed natural to the respondents and the researcher.

Let me give a personal example of this type of transmission. When I approached my paternal Ngati Kahungunu grandfather in Hastings about my whakapapa and asked him to write it down, he looked at me in a bemused fashion as if it was a strange question. He eventually relented and asked my nana for a pencil and paper, and began to chant our whakapapa. As he chanted, he wrote it down. He had to repeat himself over and over to be able to write it all down. This whakapapa was a permanent reality etched in my
grandfather's being. The only reason I did not know it myself was because I had not learned it off my own father, who died when I was 12 years old. I was raised in Bluff, way beyond the rohe of Ngati Kahungunu.

The hui took place on a Monday night at Arai Te Uru Marae, which had been burned in an arson attack two years previously. None of us could forget the graffiti sprayed on the side of the whare ["enough is enough"] after the arson attack. I arrived at 6.50 pm with the kai (food) prepared beforehand, set up the chairs and tape recorder, etc. One of the respondents was unwell with food poisoning and another was late because she had mistakenly gone to the Kokiri Centre. We opened with karakia and mihimihi, laid down the take and made a start. Initial corrections to the interviews were made and the respondents were given the draft reporting-back document which they read before we went through it. It was a relaxing hui as everyone was enjoying the kai, coffee and one another’s company. It was made very clear right at the beginning that the reporting-back document was a draft and that everything was “up for grabs” and nothing was sacrosanct.

There were, however, some moments, events and discussion that were highlights, depending on how they were viewed. For example, we were sitting in the dining room part of the prefabs (all that is left of Arai Te Uru after the “enough is enough” arson incident) in what was left of a burned marae and this mahi had a whakapapa. This reclaiming and acknowledgement of Maatua Whangai was symbolic in a burned-out marae. At one stage we were all in tears as we remembered a boy who two of us had whangai-ed. This opened up a torrent of discussion regarding different young people.

Even though all names had been taken out of all quotations from respondents in the reporting-back document, it was easy to identify other people’s quotes, and this almost had the feel of a “game show” to it. This brought up discussion on confidentiality and the need to keep everyone’s names secret, especially tupuna.

The idea of a roll of honour or acknowledgements section at the end of the Masters thesis was also discussed, as there were so many others who had been involved in the programme. During the hui one of the respondents received a call from one of her current whangai. This was not an interruption and served to remind us that the mahi was ongoing; a tribute was paid to that respondent—“he mana of your mahi goes forth before you.” One of the respondents talked about “blowing $100,000 and still living out of second-hand stores.” The waiata was not melodious and strong but a lone determined
spiritual voice. During the karakia the group of women banded together, arms around one another’s waists in a line. They were still a team, a whanau!

It was obvious, because of the absence of one of the main respondents and having only three hours at our disposal, that one hui was not enough. Another hui would need to be arranged after the transcribing of the tape of this first hui in order to prepare the final document. The respondents also took the reporting-back document away to re-read and digest.

Their voices said a great deal more than what was disclosed in the interviews, especially about the personal cost to the respondents. There were several additions to the initial interviews. My tuakana/teina role became apparent as I struggled to keep up with the respondents as we sparked off one another.

Later in the week I spoke to the respondent who had been unwell and was then almost over her bout of food poisoning, and dropped off the reporting-back document to her. We spoke briefly and I arranged to speak to her later in the week after she had read and digested it.

Data Analysis

Analysis is the process of bringing order to the data, organising what is there into patterns, categories and basic descriptive units. Interpretation involves attaching meaning and significance to the analysis, explaining descriptive patterns and looking for relationships and linkages among descriptive dimensions (Patton 1987:145).

Giving the narrative a clear meaning in a genuinely collaborative context was the challenge. The analysis/ordering of the data was undertaken by the researcher who organised the data into emerging themes, five general categories and several sub-categories. The respondents discussed, pulled apart, added to and sometimes agreed with this analysis at the first hui. At times the researcher became the researched when he was asked why certain things were ordered in certain ways or why particular meanings were given to certain statements. This was consistent with Kaupapa Maori, participatory action research, and feminist empowering approaches.
There were, however, some issues regarding researcher-imposition of meaning. As the purpose of this study was to hear the feelings, perceptions and experiences of the respondents, it was important that direct quotes be used, communicating their own particular meaning, inflections and, where possible, tone. (Confidentiality was guaranteed and all data was recorded against a number.) This was important because the idiosyncrasies of the Maori world-view, especially in terms of humour, can only be understood when captured in context. The context and the kawa helped to limit the level of researcher-imposition, but to a certain extent, it was implicit in the process of this research, because it was a learning experience for all involved.

The final collaborative interpretation took place at the second hui (which was attended by all the respondents) where the final draft document was discussed in a manner similar to the deliberations at the first hui. This was where the respondents attached their shared meanings and significance to the analysis, explained descriptive patterns, and looked for relationships and linkages between the descriptive dimensions. In other words, they decided exactly what it meant, what linked it together, and what conclusions could be drawn from the data.

At this stage a hakari ("celebration") took place to celebrate all that had been achieved in the Maatua Whangai Programme and a poroporoaki took place to farewell the programme and have a decent ending. This type of participatory approach to evaluation empowered the participants and served as a way to further "conscientise" them in that they had learned to perceive the social, political and economic contradictions generated by the DSW Maatua Whangai Programme and take action against the oppressive elements of that reality (Friere 1972). They had already gone one step further to form an authentic Maori model in the form of Kai Tahu Social Services.

**Validity/reliability**

The issue of adequate validity (can this be repeated? can we extrapolate from it?) (Sarantakos, 1993) and reliability (is the instrument of measure reliable?) (Sarantakos, 1993) are major issues for all research methods. Burns (1990) states that because of the subjective nature of qualitative data and its origin in single contexts, it is difficult to apply conventional standards of reliability. "Contexts, situation, events, conditions and interactions cannot be replicated to any extent, nor can generalisations be made to a wider context than the one studied with any confidence" (Burns, 1990:11). In
quantitative research such reliability is more likely. However the opposite applies to validity. Validity is more likely for qualitative research because it can capture great depth and accuracy. In this research project validity is definitely regarded as more important than reliability.

According to Taylor (1984) qualitative researchers emphasise validity while quantitative researchers emphasise reliability and replicability. Qualitative methodology allows us to ensure a close fit between the data and what people actually say and do.

In this research I make great use of “direct quoting” in the findings to ensure that the data is accurate and there is no attempt to make generalisations from the data. The study constitutes a “resource” which people can use to control their lives.

**Ethical Issues**

The Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand (see Appendix 2) has formulated general and Maori guidelines for ethical behaviour and decision-making with respect to research, teaching, publishing and professional conduct. It is in accordance with these guidelines that all interviews have been undertaken with the informed consent of the participants (see Appendix 3).

I have endeavoured to make sure the participants are informed as to:

- The aims and objectives of the research
- Their role in the research
- Whanau confidentiality and protection
- Whanau/respondents’ ownership of the data and findings
- The voluntary nature of their participation and their freedom to withdraw at any time
- The taping of the interviews, gaining of their consent, and opportunity for correction of the transcripts should this be necessary
- Who is funding this research and responsibilities to the funding body, the University of Otago
- The Treaty of Waitangi implications for the production and dissemination of the research findings
- The responsibilities of the study to the mana whenua and maata waka
This research project has been an interactive process through which individuals, whanau and communities have been provided with a platform to learn, benefit and be empowered. Appropriate steps have been taken to minimise harmful effects on participating whanau. I acknowledge that ethical approval was obtained prior to this research project and have included the appropriate approval/consent form in Appendix 4.

What we did—Actual research process

- Initial phone calls were made to float the idea of this research project with the respondents.
- Letters outlining the kaupapa and associated information sheets were then sent.
- Informed consent forms were then signed at the initial individual interviews which took place in a variety of contexts. This raised other interview-related issues such as individual vs group interviews, and whether they were to be undertaken at the marae or in people's homes.
- Individual interviews were then transcribed and shown to the respondents concerned.
- The general themes that emerged from all five interviews were then pulled together by the researcher and a hui was held at Arai Te Uru Marae to discuss them.
- The tape of this hui was then transcribed along with an interview with one of the respondents who was unwell at the time of the hui.
- This transcription was then written up by the researcher into the final document and it was agreed that a hui would be held, after the thesis was marked, to present it back to the respondents and the local runanga.

Conclusion

The researcher and the respondents sought to undertake a Kaupapa Maori, participatory-action-type, egalitarian, empowering research project. The sample, interviews, analysis, hui and research process were all geared towards this. The data is now to be presented in the following two chapters.
Chapter Four

MAATUA WHANGAI OOTEPOTI

The Context

Dunedin does not presently, and did not historically, have a large Maori community (less than 3.5% of the population at the 1996 census). It was a fairly tight-knit set of tribal groups that came under the general categorisation of Maataa Waka and Mana Whenua. The relationships between these groups were based around marae activities at Arai te uru (an urban marae on Shetland St) and Otakou, Huinapa, and Moeraki marae. Maori people came together for tangi and hakari and the like, but politically there was some autonomy. At the same time, there was a shared background of the Maori Women’s Welfare League, anti-racism workshops, Kohanga Reo, taha Maori in schools and kapa haka groups such as Te Huinga Rangatahi. This shared activity created links with groups like Te Hou Ora and other networks and alliances, with Maatua Whangai being an integral part of this broader growth of Maori networks. This description of relationship factors is important as it provides some context to the induction process for the Maatua Whangai Programme. Respondents were swept up in the broad emancipationist philosophy that accompanied the Maori renaissance, and the idea of something that could “save our kids” from the system (DSW, Justice, and Health) meant people opened up their hearts, homes and families to other people’s children.

My ability to provide a comprehensive description and analysis of the local programme was dependent on the availability of useful source material and the cooperation of Child Youth and Family (CYF hereafter) as it was known at the commencement of my research. In 1998, I approached CYF and was granted access to the Maatua Whangai files. On the face of it, this would seem to be a straightforward matter. I spoke to the office manager who went to a basement garage under a departmental school to look for the Maatua Whangai files. After searching this area thoroughly he informed me that they either did not exist or were in storage under the auspices of Maori Affairs (now named Te Puni Kokiri). I approached both the Dunedin and Christchurch offices and while they
were absolutely cooperative, they had no record of any storage of these files. I did not approach the Department of Justice, as the caregiver aspect of the programme was governed by the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Maori Affairs. Eventually, two current CYF staff who had worked in the Maatua Whangai Programme made information available to me that they had personally written, collected and stored in the Department. An informed description of the programme would not have been possible without the material they provided. The fact that they had been vigilant in keeping this material is a credit to them and their practice, but the unavailability of the public record is indicative of the programmes status and the manner in which it was wound up in Dunedin.

I have had access to two reports about the local implementation of the programme written in May and October 1988 by a senior social worker in the Maatua Whangai Programme. I have also made use of several internal departmental memos written between 1985 and 1990.

The local Maatua Whangai Programme was started in 1983 when a senior social worker from DSW and a community worker seconded from Maori Affairs called a meeting of prospective caregivers; four turned up. From this inauspicious beginning, there were six whanau groups in Otepoti later in 1983 and one each in Cromwell (Central Otago) and Balclutha by 1988. These whanau roopu were either geographically, kaupapa or iwi based. I could find no information on the basis on which these decisions were made or whose agenda was being served. It would seem that the major deciding factors in establishing the programme were locality and kaupapa. In Otepoti roopu (groups) were established in Brockville, Concord, Pine Hill, South Dunedin, Brighton, Halfway Bush, and there was a "Baby" whanau. The Concord and Balclutha whanau roopu were not operating until 1987. The total number of active whanau members was 84, representing 52 families. A number of whanau were active in more than one of the whanau roopu (this is confirmed in the present research findings) (Montgomery 1988).
It was not clear from the material I saw, how important iwi tuturu issues were (i.e. maata waka versus mana whenua) in the setting up of these whanau roopu. It seemed that it was important just to be able to do things utilising Maori tikanga and kawa.

The Baby Whanau catered for pepi (0 – 5 yrs) and unlike other whanau roopu was not geographically-based. It was kaupapa-based and aimed to support and provide parenting skills to young mothers. At the time a Baby Whanau House was planned, where young mothers and children could receive supervision, training and parenting skills. The member’s tribal affiliations were Te Ati-awa, Tainui and Ngai Tahu. This whanau roopu had the second-largest number of active members (see Figure 2), 52% of whom were beneficiaries (see Figure 3), and 53% from single parent families (see Figure 4). There were seven beds available for emergency, short or long-term placements (Montgomery 1988).

![Figure 2. Active Whanau Members](image)

The fact that 52% of the carers were beneficiaries makes a clear statement about the commitment and ability of the respondents to undertake this mahi. The koha mentality of the Department of Social Welfare is criticised by Eradley (1994) and in Puao-Te-Ata-Tu
(1986). The effect of underfunding on the whanau and the whangai was and still is one of the major issues talked about by the respondents.

![Figure 3. Income Status](image)

![Figure 4. Types of Families](image)

The Brighton whanau was not formed until August 1987, and catered for tamariki and rangatahi aged 5 – 20 years. It also provided support to whanau, pakeke, taua and paua.
The tribal affiliations of its members were Ngai Tahu and Tainui and all active members were beneficiaries (Montgomery 1988).

The Brockville whanau had the largest number of active members (Figure 2), many of whom were also active members of the Baby Whanau; 52% were beneficiaries (Figure 3) from single-parent families (Figure 4) and were of Kai Tahu, Te Ati-awa and Tainui descent. It catered for tamariki and rangatahi aged 5 – 20 years and also supported whanau, pakeke and kaumatua. There were 9 emergency, short and-long term placements or beds available (Montgomery 1988).

The Halfway Bush whanau was a hapu-based roopu with Tuhoe tribal affiliations and its members were beneficiaries from two-parent families. It catered for whangai of any age or tribal affiliation, offering four beds for emergency, short or long-term placements (Montgomery 1988).

The Pine Hill whanau catered to all types of whangai and in 1986 involved a family who specialised in working with Probation Service clients and “street kids” (to use that group’s own term for itself). Hence there was a large turnover of whanau in this family. The tribal affiliations of the members were Ngai Tahu, Tainui, Nga Puhi and Ngati Toa, 54% were beneficiaries and 61% were from single parent families (Montgomery 1988).

The South Dunedin whanau catered to tamariki and rangatahi aged 5-20 years and offered support to pakeke and whanau. The tribal affiliations included Kai Tahu, Tuwharetoa, and Nga Puhi; 84% were wage earners (Figure 3) and 38% were from single-parent families (Figure 4) (Montgomery 1988).

The whole programme involved 84 active members drawn from 52 families representing, 26 two-parent families, 26 single-parent families, 28 wage-earning families and 20 beneficiary families.
The report on the programme by Montgomery (1988) concluded that:

- Wage-earners’ incomes were in the low to middle-income bracket.
- 52% of whanau members were beneficiaries.
- The complex and cumbersome tribal financial distribution system placed stress on caregivers who were clearly not involved for financial reward. Whanau members were likely to suffer stress and ill-health when the funding system was inadequate and inefficient. This was not conducive to recruiting new members.
- There was an equal number of two-parent and single-parent families involved.
- Because of its location in the South Island, the Otepoti programme was based on geographically-based whanau roopu rather than iwi-based whanau. This situation contributed to the funding problems.
- The Departments of Social Welfare, Justice and Maori Affairs needed to reorganise the financial distribution system according to the needs of the whanau roopu - it was not desirable to reorganise and alter the geographically-based whanau which had been operating since 1984.
- The development of the iwi-based whanau was likely to progress slowly whilst the geographically-based whanau would continue to grow.

In a second report undertaken by Montgomery in 1989, covering the period January 1987 to October 1988, a number of summary comments were made regarding the scope and general activities of the programme. Montgomery analysed the 213 enquiries / referrals the Maatua Whangai team received and found:

- 68.5% were from people who had no status with the Department of Social Welfare social work unit.
- 48.5% were referred on to the five geographical whanau roopu in the Otepoti catchment.
- 21.5% were referred back to their whanau / hapu.
- 7.5% were referred to the Pacific Island whanau.
- 41.8% were passed on to the social work team at the Department of Social Welfare.
- there were six geographical whanau operating in Otepoti during this period.
that within the geographical and hapu-based whanau there were 15 children on the “Unsupported Child Allowance” and 29 children who remained within their own whanau with support and monitoring from the Maatua Whangai workers (mokai). There were also 19 “State wards” for whom a generic social worker retained the social work role (Montgomery 1989:12).

The Maatua Whangai team at that time was made up of a Senior Social Worker and one social work position shared between three people. With regards to whanau development, the team had made some progress on linking clients with their whanau / hapu / iwi. They had developed a “taurahere” (tribal group living away from their tribal area) hapu register and had contacted key people from Tai Tckerau, Tainui, Maatatua, Ngati Porou, Ngati Kahungunu, Te Arawa, Aotea and Ngai Tahu. Five of these iwi held hui to establish runanga which was a key part of the kaupapa of Maatua Whangai (Montgomery 1989).

The small numbers in each hapu/iwi roopu was a contributing factor to the formation of geographical groupings. Although whanau members retained their whanau, hapu and iwi identity they were willing to work with people from any tribal / iwi group. No one was turned away because of their iwi affiliation or because they were non-Maori (Montgomery 1989).

With an eye to the future of the programme, there was a push to establish and develop new whanau and ensure the team had a community focus. The team was also to receive some generic social work and community-development training. They were told by DSW to prepare for the possibility that the Maatua Whangai Programme could transfer to the iwi authority (not defined) and that the Maatua Whangai social workers could be transferred as well (Montgomery 1989).

It is not clear from the information made available to me, whether the caregivers and staff understood that one of the aims of the programme was to transfer care and protection responsibilities of Maori children to iwi. It seems that while the mokai (an offensive way
to use the term to some Ngai Tahu people), caregivers and the Maori community expected the devolvement to iwi, the CYP&F Act 1989 appeared to incorporate Maatua Whangai principles within the Department’s institutional structure and practice framework without naming them as such.

The local programme peaked in 1988 and the Maatua Whangai team dissolved into generic social work teams or other positions within the Department during the implementation of the Children Young Persons and their Families Act, 1989. This was an important development because as far as the respondents, the departmental mokai, and the Maori community were concerned, the Act provided a vehicle for Maatua Whangai mahi to continue. This occurred to a limited degree, but the programme faded out in 1991. From the records available, there does not seem to have been a clearly defined conclusion to the programme. Hence the take of this research.

In regards to the programme’s local demise, a former Maatua Whangai programme worker stated: “It was a Maori concept in a Pakeha structure, and was never properly resourced” (Stringer 1995).

**Conclusion**

The inception of the local Maatua Whangai programme can be located within the context of a Maori renaissance that had its own regional nuances. The initial response to the programme from Maori was enthusiastic, but cautious, and its subsequent development and growth illustrates this attitude. The establishment of geographically and kaupapa-based roopu was essential to its grass-roots acceptance, development and integration into established (traditional) Maori activities and networks.
Chapter Five

DATA SUMMARY PART 1

What they actually said!

Introduction

Semi-structured, individual, kanohi ki te kanohi interviews as outlined in chapter 3 were undertaken with each of the respondents. The interviews took the form of shared conversations where the respondents and researcher discussed a broad range of issues as they related to Maatua Whangai.

The interviews took place in an environment of the respondent's choosing, and it was agreed the interviews would be taped. The kawa for the interviews was governed by the respondents. The questions were a guide only and even though all the respondents were asked the same questions in the same order, the "chat" ranged very widely but stayed on the kaupapa of Maatua Whangai. A transcript was made of each of the interviews, with the tape being listened to by only the researcher and transcriber. The transcript was returned to the appropriate respondent for alteration and/or correction.

During discussions with the respondents, it was decided that the researcher would draw the major themes out of the data and present his findings to the respondents at a focus-group hui. The following is the result of the first stage of data collection.

The data has been divided into the five general categories listed below and several sub-categories which are introduced during the following two chapters:

1. The induction into the Maatua Whangai Programme.
2. The meaning of Maatua Whangai for the participants.
3. The manipulation and use of the programme by the "Department."
4. The effects of Maatua Whangai.
5. The future implications.
1. The Induction into the Maatua Whangai Programme

A number of themes emerged with regard to the induction process and the involvement of the respondents in the DSW Maatua Whangai Programme. It is important here to remember the broad political backdrop of the Maori renaissance and cultural re-assertion, the protest movement and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal. While conservative Dunedin was a far cry from the political hotbeds of Wellington and Auckland, the respondents and their families had their own reasons for getting involved in the programme. These reasons involved a combination or interaction of a number of factors.

For one respondent involvement in the “Pine Hill Whanau” was an issue of whakapapa. In broad terms whakapapa (genealogical ties) provides human links to the past which provide spiritual links to the present and the future. This is more than just memories, and the effect that it gives is to shape the daily lives of the respondents. Whakapapa constitute rites of passage which provide a vital relationship context for Maori-getting in touch with one’s whakapapa is critical to who you are in Maoridom. In fact, there is a sense of someone being lost until they know their whakapapa links. This was critical at the inception of Maatua Whangai as there were many Maori “lost children” as a result of pre-1980 adoption practices which led to Maori children being adopted by non-Maori parents. This “colonial” approach came back “to bite us on the arse” when Maori children arrived on the doorsteps of the respondents, not knowing their whakapapa. The resurgence of whakapapa was both a contextualising and conscientising tool. Whakapapa is not a mere romanticised notion of ancestry, these genealogical links provided strength, confidence and vision to the respondents at a time when Maori had to fight for “things Maori.” When one of the respondents was asked why she got involved with the Maatua Whangai Programme she answered:

One, I live in Pine Hill and two, my family used to say they can whakapapa back thirty-seven generations on this hill. So, unbroken. Yeah, last year I was going to sell my house and my moko put a hex on it. They’re telling me now not to sell it. My parents lived round in Fea...
Street. His parents before that taua lived opposite and before that there was a great-grandfather up the top and there’s their pa at the top. And that’s where my family come from.

This is not to be misinterpreted as just a comment on location - this was the turangawaewae of this whanau for thirty-seven generations, and they could whakapapa back to a lineage of people who lived in this area.

No hea koe? (Where are you from?) No Awarua ahau. (I’m from Awarua.)

This connects people to their “bones”. The significance of respondents’ places of origin was also a determining factor in terms of induction to the programme. This is of special importance in Otago, as many of the Maori here were from outside their kainga. In the 1950s many North Island Maori ventured south in search of work in shearing gangs, the freezing works and the fishing industry. Therefore, some very tribal communities have ended up a long way from their kainga: Ngati Kahungunu, Ngati Porou, Tuhoe to name but a few. The presence of these whanau/hapu and their tribal tikanga was a source of conflict at times, but overall Mana Whenua and Maata Waka existed alongside each other in a way that was mutually beneficial.

The links to a particular kainga and coming from a common area influenced the respondents in their decisions to become involved in the programme:

Well I come from Arawhenua. That is my first port of call. I also relate back down to Otakou, down here. On the understanding I actually go there, hear everything that’s going on. But if I want to vote, I go home to Temuka.

So I worked at Maori Affairs as the community secretary so I was a wee bit of a part of all that initiation of it. And because I lived out there and _________ whanau come from Arawhenua I supported
her and my role primarily in there was to support her as well as the other whanau groups and iwi roopu groups as an emergency bed.

Whanaugatanga and friendship were also factors that united people to work together in this programme:

Probably through am I allowed to say names __________ who was probably more a friend, a whanau member, just basically through word of mouth I suppose.

The use of the term whanau has real significance in the way this group was bound together; there were higher levels of relationship that went beyond friendship. The respondents moved in and out of one another’s homes and lives in real ways:

The reason that I’ve bothered was because (a) __________ and __________ were in it and we were already sharing the kids, so that there was sometimes I’d need a baby sitter or vice versa, so that process had already begun.

For some of the respondents with previous involvement with the Department as caregivers under the rubric of fostercare, the programme was an extension of their work in the community and within their own whanau:

I honestly don’t think it did because prior to going in to the Department, I also worked voluntarily within the department as a caregiver. So, I knew all the background of anything to do with funding, children’s rights. I actually knew all that before I actually went into the department because of being a foster parent, okay.

As we had been off and on, we were caregivers. Actually I’ll go the terminology used in those times. We were foster parents for the Department. At the same time we also seemed to have other people’s
kids at home quite often. At that particular time I had five children of my own.

There was community involvement with young people in other networks by at least two of the respondent’s spouses, who worked in such roles as Maori Wardens, Court work, kapa haka, Te Huinga Rangatahi:

So in each of the different suburban whanau people were approached were people who were doing work with young people already. The base of those people, they were Kai Tahu, as well as yourself. What we used to do, because at that particular time there was a lot of glue sniffing and a lot of stuff going on. We’d all share our little resources, a bag of flour, a sack of spuds or something, or just time to sit and talk.

Location and propinquity were important factors in the establishment of the programme. Most of the respondents joined or formed roopu within the communities where they lived. These roopu were named after suburbs, for example Brockville Whanau.

Her and I lived out in the same area.

We lived just around the corner from each other.

Some of these roopu were also kaupapa-based. The Baby Whanau involved respondents across locations but was dedicated to the under-fives:

I actually started the baby whanau, along with _________ and a few of the others. It happened with _________ I had a phone call one day by___________ And she said to me, what are you doing ...........? I said, well nothing at this stage. She said to me, can you come with me, we’ve got to go down to the hospital. I said to her, what for? She said, we’ve got a baby down there. So I arrive down at the hospital and there was this mum and baby and she was refusing to leave the baby there or do anything with the baby. The baby was very ill. So _________ and
I tried to talk to her and she wouldn’t talk to us and the paediatrician made it quite plain if we didn’t take the baby, he would get Pakeha social welfare involved. So anyhow, the mother actually threw the baby at me with choice language and what have you. And I was standing there with the baby. And I said to ________, what do we do with it? And of course________ said to me, oh well take it home. So I brought that boy home. Because when we looked round there was nowhere to put him. We didn’t have any other homes. At the time I already had three other babies here and this little black fella. That’s a joke for our family. He’s still here. He came for the night. I said to my husband at the time, I rang him up at his business and I said to him, oh, we’ve got this little fella I said. He’s got nowhere to go. And ________ said, where is he? And I said, oh, he’s up on our bed. And he said, well I hope it’s just for the night. I said, yes oh yes its just for the night and its been a long night. Fourteen years later he’s still home here. But that’s how the baby whanau started. So after I spoke to ________ and a few others up in Brockville and said, we’re got a problem here. We’ve got nowhere to place our babies. And it was there I actually formed the baby whanau, and that would cover the whole of Dunedin. We had a South Dunedin whanau, but this was a special baby whanau, and I believe today that ________ and a couple of the others are still working baby whanau, because they’re the ones that have taken the babies and emergency placements. And that’s exactly what we set up that to be. So if people say things fail they don’t fail, its just that we do mahi that other people don’t know about. So that’s where the baby whanau started. We also had the South Dunedin whanau at the time. We had a Brockville whanau, a Pine Hill whanau, we had one out at Warrington, Brighton.

The induction process was helped by the attractiveness of a programme that actually “worked” and showed an ability to adapt according to the needs of young people and their whanau:

I think it was there, but when Maatua Whangai was actually inaugurated or whatever you want to call it, started, it managed to be
fulfilling. It managed to go ahead. I always found that Maatua Whangai done what I wanted it to do for me. I wouldn’t be where I am now if it wasn’t for Maatua Whangai.

There is a strong link between why people got involved and what Maatua Whangai meant to them.

2. The Meaning Of Maatua Whangai To The Participants

There is a strong sense that Maatua Whangai was a practice imbedded in traditional child-rearing and raising tikanga for Maori. Without romanticising it, the respondents were very clear about this. The approaches embodied in the programme were part of their upbringings:

Okay. When I first started with Maatua Whangai on the understanding that Maatua Whangai for me wasn’t just Maatua Whangai for me, it started back in my own home when I was a baby. Our home was always open, that was Maatua Whangai. It wasn’t a new concept to me because that’s the way all our family were brought up.

For me, within our own whanau, it started very early because we lost our mother when we were very young so that, we always knew. Probably I was eight and I had two younger than me and two older and we lived in a whanau situation because of losing our mother. And so we were either brought up by our taua or an aunt and so that for me was all we ever knew. And for us to work we had to actually look after the other parts of our family. And I can remember when someone died up at Arawhenua and my father told me that my job was to go and help wash the dishes at the marae. And that’s where I started that work. I was ten years old. Our father drummed that into us, that you know we had to live and so it was nothing for our dad to say to us, okay you go to Aunty so and so. So we’d stay there a few days. Our taua was a big influence on us. We always had other people’s children at our house. I
think that’s probably where I get it from. My dad always used to say I’m like my taua. Because that’s what she used to do. She used to just take anyone’s children. We were brought up like that and I think it might have rubbed off on me. It was just part of my life.

As well as that, in maatua whangai, which I was always led to believe maatua whangai, it’s a taonga of our people, it’s nourishing, nurturing. Whangai means to feed to nourish our people. I was brought up in that realm. My mother looked after other people’s children and I was brought up in that realm. My mother looked after other people’s children. It was just a natural way of life. They approached me.

We’ve always been maatua whangai but we never acknowledged it. When we acknowledge it that we’re maatua whangai and we’re working for the same aims for the same children, for all our children, Maori, European, or whatever, we manage to feel that the whanau-based group was all round the place. We felt more relaxed in working with the other bureaucratic organisations.

This sense of tradition allowed Maori to take ownership of something that was already theirs. Some respondents had experience under the Pakeha foster system and noted that there was a difference. The fact that Maatua Whangai was another option made it attractive:

In fostering through the Pakeha system it was different. They had their way of doing things and we had ours.

This difference in approach translated into a view of the Department of Social Welfare that created a “them and us” approach. The Department was perceived to have appropriated something that didn’t belong to it:

I had a lot of trouble trying to coming to grips with it. They put into the Department this wonderful thing Maatua Whangai. And every time I used to talk about it and say, you know, they used to say, oh this
Maatua Whangai. I used to say to them, you don’t know nothing about it because the thing is most Maori families work Maatua Whangai from the day they are born.

The relaxed feeling of being with one’s own people also contributed to the meaning each of the respondents drew from the programme:

Well, being as I would say the whanau-based thing, we found that we could actually, we felt more at ease being together as a group than having the outsiders not knowing what we knew as a whanau, as Maatua Whangai.

This drawing together or being at ease allowed the respondents to relax and be united in their knowledge of Maatua Whangai. This was the opposite of the bureaucratic approach of the Department where sometimes very clear messages were given:

Yes. Because that’s what my father always used. In that sense when we talk like that it was different. I mean, I think we look at what we knew as children and the love and the aroha that we got when we were brought up. And all these others coming in to our home to actually say what they expected from us for Maatua Whangai work, which was for me was this little box, or a fence as one supervisor told me. I wasn’t to cross the fence. Because that was the community and I was the Department.

The programme was seen as being Maori. The Maori workers of the Department were seen as being allies even though it often put them in difficult positions with their colleagues and other Maori. They were seen as being understanding of Maori needs:

Yes. And even if they do go and do some training it’s not the same as having your Maori social workers or people of the understanding that really know what they’re talking about.
Kia ora. And we worked away from the system. After say the CYPS closed, we were still working with the children after that time. From morning, noon and night, 24 hours a day.

3. The Manipulation and Use Of The Programme By The Department Of Social Welfare

There were many comments about the ways in which Maori people had been used and manipulated to sort out an issue that was not of their making. The awareness of this reliance on them by the Department contributed to the conscientisation of the respondents and they had critical comments to make about the Department’s handling of the programme. There was no criticism of the Maori Maatua Whangai workers within the Department.

The respondents’ voices were united in their comments about the Department which was perceived as taking something that didn’t belong to it and abusing it:

Totally separate because the government policy of Maatua Whangai was not for the people. They took all of the best out of it and turned it to fit the Pakeha system.

I can remember one lot of funding. A whole year’s youth and adolescent funding, it went to one particular place instead of being spread out amongst the people that were doing the work. So they got our korero, they got our structures and shut the door. The Department and the social services never realised and they still don’t realise to this day that Maatua Whangai is a taonga of our tupuna, it is our way of life and there’s nothing that can take that away from us. They’ve bastardised it, but for us as people it will still go on. The only difference is, at one stage it was easier because there was funding and we could actually clothe some of these kids, meet these children’s needs.
The Department's response hardened their resolve to succeed and establish kaupapa Maori-based services. The respondents talked freely about feeling abused by the Department in terms of resourcing:

Through Maatua Whangai a child would come to my home. Any arrangements made after that time to get anything through the system was totally different from Maatua Whangai. We weren't basically treated equal. It was harder for us to get what we needed and we thought we would be equal, whether they be Maatua Whangai children or children through the system, which I had. It was easier for me to get stuff for the children that weren't Maatua Whangai, than the ones that were. The system wasn't equal.

Okay, so here we were, these families and no money. Every time we went to the department, they would say to us, no status, no money. Foster payments, we never got anything like that. So what actually happened was with the core management, that was set up under ________ He was the chairperson. Anyhow, what we actually did, they then ________ this is when the three departments were going to pay money in. We only actually got money from two departments, which was Social Welfare and Maori Affairs. Justice came in later, but there was very little; we did get some money from Maori Affairs. That was divided up into all our whanau groups. From the day that they got that money the fights began. When I say fights, there was always squabble about money. That meant perhaps that we placed a child, we would be able to give fifty dollars you know some for kai. It was an insult really, it was a proper insult. But at least it was something.

This comment must be understood in terms of the financial status of these whanau, some of whom were beneficiaries at the beginning of the programme. Not only were these families struggling financially, but they were taking in whangai who were expensive to maintain and sometimes had special needs:
Probably the main thing in this home is that the children that I’ve taken have been special-needs children. In some way or another. I believe that’s probably where I’ve worked the best. It’s because I’ve got these children who really no one else wanted. Not all of them, but some of them. And I mean we’re talking about twenty-seven children. They’ve all been sick, they haven’t been able to find a place for them, they’ve got special needs. To me, it’s a challenge, and it’s still a challenge, it’ll be a challenge all my life with this crew I got here. They’ve never been treated as if they’ve got a problem. They’ve always been treated as “you can do it to your ability.” I’ve had to actually learn some of those skills. I would have things, they should be able to achieve this and that. But I came down to earth very early in my fostering to realise that don’t put your ideas on to them. Very early in my years of looking after other people’s children was that-do it according to what their abilities are. I learnt to cope with that. For instance, came to us and he was just a little boy who sat and stared at you, glasses hanging off his nose. He didn’t do anything naughty, couldn’t talk.

The whangai often arrived with nothing and needed everything. This placed stress on the resources of other family members and affected family relationships. Overall, funding was a big issue that dominated thought about the programme. The system operated on a 24-hour basis and whanau were unlikely to refuse anyone. The programme was made up of and worked by whanau, people with ordinary human skills and limitations:

Kia ora. And we worked away from the system. After say the CYPS closed, we were still working with the children after that time. From morning, noon and night, 24 hours a day.

In 1991 the programme ended and departmental staff were reassigned to other duties. No thanks were given, no acknowledgement of the commitment of those who had “done the work,” no celebration of all that had been achieved in the lives of many young people and their families. The respondents were left with the feeling that they had been used. One respondent celebrates the day Maatua Whangai left the Department:
The day it left the Department. That's one of them. The day that we finished up in the Department. When they chucked us out with the bath water, out of the Department. It didn't belong in the Department in the first place. I was very annoyed, because we actually only got a fortnight to do our mahi. And tell these people that we were servicing that we had to get out. They were closing Maatua Whangai down. I didn't think of that at the time. But I've come to realise that was one of the best moves the Department has ever made, was to take it out of there. And Maatua Whangai is not theirs, it's ours.

There was very little consultation by the Department over the demise of the Maatua Whangai Programme:

It was left to die. Not a slow death, a fast death. Because we weren't given the opportunity to speak our mind the way we thought, what we thought of Maatua Whangai. And they never probably ever linked it up that it was working.

There was no being informed, things just seem to slow down it was like a gradual dying off process. All of a sudden we went from two full-time and a half-time worker in Maatua Whangai and then went to a two-worker and then a one-and-a-half and then we had one worker. And she said they've developed Maatua Whangai, I have to reapply for my job but I'm allowed to draw up my own job description. The job description that she had to draw up was actually not tikanga but a generic social work position. We wrote to the director general and we had hui. We went back to the people, the core management and that everything was just devolving. The government had set a process in so fast-by this time Maori Affairs was Iwi Transition Agency and then it went to something else before Tipuni Kokiri. They had just devolved all of our workers. We were totally disempowered.

By this time, the Children Young Persons & Their Families Act (1989) had been in operation for two years, utilising many of the practice elements of Maatua Whangai such
as Family Group Conferences. There was no mention of the Treaty of Waitangi or Maatua Whangai in the new Act. Maori intellectual property had been appropriated in a way that colonised Maori yet again:

Historically, I believe what happened is that they, via their workers, milked the concept of Maatua Whangai and they incorporated it into legislation called the Children and Young Persons and Their Families Act of 1989.

They milked the concept that... It's 1970 and we've got a kid that's out of control. And we're social workers you and I. And we've been put on this case. Now we can take the child and we can do what we like. We can put the child into foster care, we can put it into a residential home, a naughty boys' home, we can send it back to its parents where it got abused. We even had the total power and control to have that child formally adopted into another family. What Maatua Whangai showed them was that there is another process of doing it. And that was, we've got this child, who do you belong to, who's your whanau? Let's get your whanau, let's get the whole lot, let's get as many as we can, cousins, aunties, uncles, brothers, friends kei te pai. We've had some thirty-odd people sitting in that room for one kid.

Because practice elements of Maatua Whangai had been taken and re-packaged in the CYP&F Act 1989 the respondents were left with a feeling of being “ripped off”:

It was stolen, no, I don't think it was, it was stolen from Maori. Not maybe, not if. It was directly taken I can't remember who it was, but somebody here in Dunedin not sure if it was________ said to me when he was making the excuse of why Maatua Whangai was going down the gurgler. Because we could feel it going down the gurgler. It was just being shut off like the doors of a mansion. He said, you don’t have to worry any more, all the things that you do, we've incorporated into the Act for you. But their Act, they owned it. So, no it was not
accidental. I think it was an accident that they discovered, having observed for years, oh, look this is how Maatua Whangai do it, this is how we do it. We were getting too good. We would have kept going regardless. What they did by that Act which is great, okay, except you’ve got social workers that hate using it. Who have been raised historically that way and they can’t cope and this is why I’m going to spit the dummy tomorrow. They have a choice, solve it with me or I’ll take it to the runanga and then iwi social services. We will compete. It will go out into the commercial market. Don’t provide what we want, we will compete.

There was a book called Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, Daybreak; that was policy that should be implemented. I can remember that the books were in the rubbish bin. They weren’t read by the Pakeha generic workers. So basically what happened was they went right through the country, they took everything from us, they took our korero time that we would have with families and children to work things out. They turned that into calling it a family group conference. The system that we’ve got now is set up on the best of what we had to offer and we had the doors closed, the funding stopped. The whole of Maatua Whangai that was in the system here, they said had to go.

4. The Effects of Maatua Whangai

The programme was more than just another form of culturally appropriate substitute fostercare. The care of often very troubled children required a deep commitment by the respondents and their whanau. Those involved were trying to keep children out of institutions like Kohitere, Hokio, Cappell Park, Lookout Point and the borstal in Invercargill. It was recognised that this kind of mahi could not be undertaken safely in isolation. One of the best effects of Maatua Whangai was the whanau-networks it created to sustain itself, while this can be celebrated it is also a criticism of the Department:
That’s dead right, because those people considered it to be their “take” and that’s how iwi Maori work. If they get into something, it belongs to them, and they drive it and they work it and they drive themselves broke over it, there is whanau arguments. But, because of the concept they fully supported it. I don’t know how they did actually. I admire those men and women that did it. Here I was, a three-person whanau out in St Clair and here are all these women, babies coming in and kids climbing out windows. They really did their bit in terms of iwi development.

When asked “what were your best memories of Maatua Whangai?” the themes identified by the respondents were very clear. The respondents remember the real support and whanaungatanga they shared:

There was nothing. And it was only from the goodness of the people that were in the whanau and with the different whanau helping whanau. I must remark on this. If we were short of something, I would ring and say to __________, have you got some clothes or whatever, or some extra kai for a family? That’s how we survived. It was because the whanau could work together. There was no money in there. There was no fighting.

The programme survived and grew out of the generosity and hard work of the respondents and other whanau involved in it. The programme has a whakapapa built out of the blood, sweat and tears that has bound those involved together:

The best part for me was the aroha, the whanaungatanga, the sense of achievement when you’ve seen some of these kids come in with their heads bowed and walked up with their heads held high. Some of the best for me was when my daughter felt isolated I suppose and left home, and the support and aroha given to me by the other members of the other whanau that I wasn’t a bad mother. And it was always the hope, I had kids at my place that I could perhaps help and somewhere,
someone was doing that for my daughter. That’s kind of the good and the bad.

It was mainly from the other whanau, like the Pine Hill Whanau, the Brockville Whanau. What we all did was if there was a crisis anywhere we all helped each other. There was you ________ ringing up, hey we’ve got food here, there was us saying we’ve got a van load of bread. It was all of that sharing and caring. And that was the support.

Financial support was basically nil.

One of the respondents also pointed out the usefulness of the training offered by the Department and associated activities as a positive outcome:

Probably the meetings we’ve had, training sessions. Training sessions were excellent with the particular trainers. And I must admit we did have a few trainers within the system that weren’t Maori, that worked for the Maori. They were there for the Maori and they’re still in the department today, and still have the same opinion. The training sessions, the get-togethers, the weekly or monthly get-togethers acknowledging when we needed some clothing for our kids that the other members of the whanau could come up with something, like a pushchair, a highchair. If we asked the department we wouldn’t have been able to get anything like that. So we were really one big family really.

The mahi was undertaken by the respondents in a kaupapa Maori way. In many cases this had a number of positive effects on the whanau and the whangai:

It was done tikanga. That was I suppose the difference to how things are done now. We would have the kids at home. If we went to the Marae, everyone went to the Marae. Everyone was considered part of the whanau. They were treated as much the same as our own kids as
they could be. Some of the things, when you talk about things that worked. We had two girls that stayed with us, two sisters. They came for three days on Labour weekend and they stayed for about two years. They started with Maatua Whangai then they got put onto status, so we got board payments for them. They had no clothes and they got these two enormous cheques we received for these girls for clothing. These two girls looked at that and they said to me, aunty we’ve talked about it and we want to take the other girls with us (raucous laughter in the background, didn’t hear the rest of her statement)... we want to take the other girls with us. We want to share.

The work of Maatua Whangai also helped establish mahi that is still going on 16 years later. The Baby Whanau is still operating:

It established me. It gave me the ability to go looking to the right people to support me within the whanau. And that still happens today.

Nearly all of the respondents mentioned young people whom they regarded as “special”. This respondent captures the stories of many young people in one description:

Some of the kids I think of, the first young person that we had through the Department of Social Welfare was a young boy whose mother had died and his seventeen-year-old sister at the time couldn’t really raise the rest of the family. The father was a railway worker and he was extremely supportive, but this young boy ended up in the Lookout Point Boys home because there was nowhere for him. This is before Maatua Whangai, so that was why we had him with us. That young man is now living in Auckland. He’s got a son who he’s bringing up himself.

_________ is thirty-five now. __________ who was my husband at the time, he had left his job at the breweries and he had gone into a PEP scheme in the forestry and he had started working with his trainees, a lot of them were kids that were getting into trouble, and he was a Maori warden. There would be a lot of kids that he would end up bringing home. This is what whangai is in some ways to me. These were kids
that were a bit spaced out of their brains. What we’d do is we’d sit down and we’d have a korero to see why they were doing this and that. And all of the kids would have their input. Some of the kids had stolen and run away from home. We had to find out who they were, and ring their parents and let them know that they were safe. After we let the parents know that they were safe. We’d then have a meeting with the parents and we’d meet with the children and everyone in the whanau who would then korero about what resolutions we could come to and how we could resolve any problems. Some of the kids that we had, we’ve all had in common. We’ve lost a lot of children by death, by accident, car accident, fire. Some of those kids have left legacies, if they’ve got children. They will never know what their father was like, apart from us who were the nurturers of the parent as a teenager. To let these children know that their fathers were special people and were doing so well.

Many of the placements made under the Maatua Whangai system have resulted in lifelong relationships and support:

Yes, just one other thing, I’m just thinking of two children, a brother and a sister who we placed with caregivers and I’m just thinking. The little girl was nine months old when she was full-time with these people and the little boy was six years old. Mother’s paranoid schizophrenic and father’s an alcoholic. Those children are twelve and sixteen and they’re still with those caregivers. We put them on an unsupported person’s benefit at that time. They’ve also got interim guardianship of both of the children. Both of the children use their caregivers surnames and with the parents that’s fine, and I look at those kids and I think that if Maatua Whangai hadn’t been there at the time, those kids could have been dumped from foster home to foster home to fostercare.

One contentious issue that emerged was that of the iwi and hapu status of the whangai. They were cared for no matter where they came from:
No. We were very firm. This was discussed with us very very broadly. We korero’d about this our late kaumatua stated that Ngai Tahu, Kati Mamoe, Waitaha would look after any taurahere roopu, it didn't matter, we would look after any children at all. Could you say to a kid that ended up on your door, I'm sorry we can’t take you because you’re the wrong iwi because you’re Te Arawa and not Ngai Tahu.

The bottom line for me is that we can look after children, another iwi can look after that child, but there is always going to be something missing, because they don't go back to their own people. I'm not saying that we and there'll be a lot that won't because they won't want them back for one reason or another and that's fine, but they should be given the option and I feel we are not just saying that if you’re Kahungunu then you go to Kahungunu, that’s not what I'm saying. But they should be followed up, this child, to see whether they want him back. Because there is some iwi that doesn't want their kids back and I've worked with that before. No, no, they're born down the South Island you can stay there was one answer and I can give you a few more things that have been said, and so we are not talking about those, we are talking about some very genuine people out there too in our Maori and a lot of them don't even know that their own whanaus are in trouble until you ring them and they find out, and I think they should be given that option right.

The achievement of being able to do this work and do it well, was felt to be worth celebrating in the lives of the respondents and the whangai and whanau involved. Although this research has not included input from the respondents’ whanau and friends, their commitment and involvement was an integral part of the whanaugatanga that took place and is acknowledged intrinsically by the respondents within this mahi.
5. The Future Implications

Respondents were asked to comment on the future implications of the Maatua Whangai Programme. What has been learned and what are the lessons to be gained from the experience of the programme?

I think personally from me what I’ve learned is that you can’t trust them, no matter what we learn from them. I believe we do learn things in the way of your career and what have you. The knowledge, the knowledge that they’ve got, and knowledge is power and that by being in there we’ve been able to take this knowledge out there to people and we would never have been able to do it otherwise. It may have been a hard road but there’s lots of things you’ve heard through the Department and I’ve done. We’ll use that, we don’t want this bit but we’ll use this bit, and I believe in that sense we have achieved things through the Department for our people.

So where to from here?

I think that that’s the only way that we can go and that if we’d done that a lot earlier we may not be in the position that we are in now. Because I actually feel that some people get the information and they don’t share it, and so we don’t get the opportunity and what you’re saying to me is hey, I’m going to share this information and that would go right back, hey information really is power and I think it’s a very good idea that we actually do that. That’s what Maatua Whangai tried to do with their whanaus which I was saying to you before. I use to find things out from the Department and take it back to the whanau and that’s what strengthened the whanau in lots of ways. But I took them back stuff I was told not to; the Department wanted to hang onto it. If it said “confidential to the Department only” I would not have shared it out. There are some things that you couldn’t share and I think we all know about different things but there were lots of things that could help our whanau that I was told not to take to them. But I did.
Are we looking at a Mana Whenua or Maataa Waka approach or an integration of both?

It's a fact of life, and I've always seen that. If they can initiate something out in the districts again and go through Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and how they could utilise those offices. Because my dream at the end of the day is with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has always been that they will be the scribes and the paper pushers, and we in the districts be the workers. We will tell them what to do. We will say, no that's a fair go.

We can do it. In terms of runanga meetings, Moeraki—that's where I'm from of course—we have decided to become proactive not because it's becoming a wee bit like the old Social Welfare out there. The Department won't drive it, we will drive it. If they come up with an initiative, if they just whisper a word like Maatua Whangai, we will go out and we will plan it, they're not going to plan it and put it all in place and whatever else you've got to do. And ring up them, this is how it's going, this is what we want. We've got a runanga development person, we'll get her in. We've got __________ and they've got fifty thousand workers up there. Then you've got this development person________ who's got to develop all of these marae in Otago. Once we've pulled all the guts of it together. Say here in Dunedin, I don't know whose umbrella it's going to come under, but you pull right the people in and you could present to the roopu options. If Ngai Tahu or whoever, iwi Maori, don't even like those options they'll pull out and decide what they want. Christchurch is the scribe and they are the Mokai up there, not down here. Because the people down here will do the work. If you and I were together and we've got all these houseful of kids, why should you go through all this goddamn paperwork when we've got whole offices of them up there. If you can put a thread of that in terms of slotting it in __________ because that's what they're doing at the moment. They've got all these magazines come up like heritage, sports, etc. and that's their job. Now if that runanga development person says like __________ if we directed her. Now we've got co-
ordinators in the marae and we’ve got a strategy plan. Now the co-
ordinator has got to drive that strategy plan and whoever
else in that office and whoever else is out there, to get our strategy plan
going. And that’s how we could do it. It’s the same for education and
health. I’ve got a real good one for health.

Some respondents would like to see the programme re-established by its rightful owners:

Maori still do own it, maatua whangai is always there for me. But
the term isn’t used within the Department. This is my term, it’s still
here.

Well, with me having been working quite closely, worked with the
iwi social workers and iwi social services and we know where the
hiccups are going to be, I would like to see Maatua Whangai was
reinstated for the Iwi Social Services. You know, like to be called
Maatua Whangai again. I mean, we haven’t got a name for our Iwi
Social Services. Why couldn’t it be called Maatua Whangai?

Emerging themes after first reading of the transcripts

(1) That caring for the young people in the programme was the most
important part of the mahi.

(2) That this mahi had its costs in terms of families, children and finances

(3) That support was negligible from the Department of Social Welfare (the
“Department”)  

(4) That the departmental (DSW) Maatua Whangai workers were supportive.
(5) That respondents formed their own support whanau and that their networks kept the system viable.

(6) That the young people who were placed in the respondents' care were often at-risk and with special needs.

(7) Some of the relationships that developed through the programme have become longterm ones.
Chapter Six

DATA SUMMARY PART 2

Reporting Back Hui (30 September 1999)

The second stage of data-collection was conducted through a hui involving all the respondents. The hui was designed to feed back the major themes drawn from the data and find consensus on the relevant issues. The research was becoming part of what Bishop (1996) refers to as "hui as a metaphor for collaborative storying."

Following the structure outlined in chapter 3, the results of the interviews and the emerging themes were presented at a feedback hui. Process (kawa and tikanga) is very important at such events, so I arrived at 6.50 pm with the kai prepared beforehand and set it up along with seating and a whiteboard and welcomed people as they arrived. One respondent was unwell with food poisoning and another was late because she had mistakenly gone to another venue. We opened with karakia and mihimihi and made a start. The first thing we dealt with was corrections to the data from the original interviews. The respondents then received the Reporting Back Document (chapter 5) and we took time to read it before working our way through it.

The following transcription provides a record of the creation of our narrative. It is organised according to the headings in chapter 5. It confirms the emerging themes and adds depth to the individual respondents’ discourses. To preserve the authenticity of the discussion at the hui I have not included a commentary to link the comments. Consequently they may appear disjointed at times.

1. The induction into the Maatua Whangai Programme.

I would like to point out it was not just the “Department,” but initially three departments and that these departments started the big movement of funding, allocating to iwi throughout all Crown services. We were asked to create iwi registers, e.g. how many Ngati Porou etc. We refused in the beginning because we didn’t know what they were doing
with the information. They wanted us to register in our Waka groups. So that we could take kids from our waka and apply to that waka for those funds. In retrospect it was the first drive to put Maori in their place as iwi groups. When you’re working at that level, we didn’t ask them what iwi they were or sometimes even if they were Maori.

They wanted it to work faster than it could work. They expected it to work overnight.

2. The meaning of Maatua Whangai for the participants.

I think they expected to devolve it out to iwi. Like “as soon as” I think with the growth of the Waitangi Tribunal. I believe my Pakeha side thought right, eventually we are going to pay these tribes off with a final settlement, that is the most logical concept I’ve heard of. How can you have a final settlement when you’ve got an ongoing contract? They will eventually pick up the cost. The day the CYP&F Act 1989 came in was the downfall of Maatua Whangai.

In retrospect even the word “Department” or departments it wasn’t. It wasn’t the department’s, it was somebody’s policy in Wellington. It was very much what they wanted to feed into us to get us to gather the information, send it back to them and see what they would do with that information.

The difference between the Pakeha and Maori system is, it’s just, I remember it being drummed into us that we could stop that drift of a child going in and then their names being recorded. That revolving door, and it was that if we took the child by that phone call on the weekend or the middle of the night by the knock at the door and the
Police they’re standing there with a couple of little kids, that somehow or other it wouldn’t be on their record.

That we could save them from having a record. You know for yourself that once a kid gets a record they buy into that crap. You know they start, it’s harder for them to dig their way out and the classic way of looking at that. When you look at mental illness and you’ve been labelled with that and ten years later someone came along and tells you that you haven’t got a mental illness, you were just reacting to these things that had happened to you.

It didn’t take long for them and us to develop. Not our boys but the system they worked under.

Another thing too is that when we were having trouble with our own kids the whanau stepped in and helped me. You know when things went bad when my dad died and my daughter just went bouncing off the walls. It stopped my child from becoming a statistic. The mahi gave us some support for our kids.

The opposite could happen too when people pointed the finger. I can remember at a hui when someone said without pointing the finger at me. Its amazing who’s looking after other people’s kids when their own kids are screwed up.

There were lots of people, non-Maori, they wouldn’t stand up in their own system. They just came quietly and supported us behind the scenes.

The meaning of Maatua Whangai as I was saying here in this very room. When ________ called that meeting to get Maataa Waka up and
running about the taurahere roopu here. He said “we’re not worrying about anyone else, we’ll get something up and running and we’ll do it here.” _________ rang me up and we were the only Ngai Tahu here.

And when this person said Maatua Whangai is just shit, just flush it away, it doesn’t belong anywhere. We’ll do this and we’ll do that. We’ll do it here. We’ll start our Maata Waka and I said what the hell does Maata Waka mean? Then I looked at _________ and we put in our apologies in for the meetings because we had some whanau mahi to do. And I just like to mention that we were the only Mana Whenua in the room and just to say I’ve heard this korero about Maatua Whangai and we are going to do this and that to it. And about Maatua Whangai it is a taonga of our tupuna. I said, you can flush your Maatua Whangai away, it’s a taonga of our tupuna. You shit on your tupuna.

There was also when you think of that other side to it. That policy was making us divide us into waka groups. Te Maori had a lot to do with that as well.

I think we ignored anything forcing us into iwi.

No, we did. But look at us what are we? Kai Tahu. It was going out into other directions, some of these other people. We were happy, we felt safe with each other. But some of the other tribal iwi were actually feeling very threatened. With each other we knew which side our bread was buttered on.

But we looked after iwi babies. Not just Maori but Pacific Island and Pakeha as well.

And the work that we did. We were secure with each other, we would ring each other up, keep in touch, share baby clothes. We were fine, we
were comfortable with each other, and what we didn’t see was that we were mana whenua at the time.

But at the time we were’t getting funding from the Department.

Because we’ve also got other links that we come together, for instance we have common elders. With Aunty _______, _______, and _______ and all the others. The Kai Tahu taua and paua still linked us more than maataa waka, as often their taua and paua are somewhere else. So we had another reason for not to be fragmented.

But I tell you that colonisation process even though we recognised that it affected our taua and paua. But we just didn’t let it get in the way, we accepted them. Just like we accepted any child. If you were Ngati Porou, so what!

Remember, can you remember when we all went up to Christchurch and spoke to_________. The one with the fob watch, you know, and said to him; “Are you telling us that when some kid comes knocking at our door we have to say to them, are you Te Arawa or what tribe are you from?” You’re telling us to tell them we can’t have them because you’re Te Arawa.

After 150 years our kids didn’t know who they were.

You heard about your Maori problems and Maori problems this and that. But for a time the children that were coming through were not our children and that was the biggest lesson for me. I suddenly began to see that there were lots of Kai Tahu children that were not following the circuit and weren’t staying at home. So I think that was a good level. We are high in the negative statistics now.
3. The manipulation and use of the programme by the “Department.”

They incorporated the structure of Maatua Whangai into the Act which is that family group conference structure. Because if you remember what it was like beforehand. A child would get into trouble. Your family had no control, no participation in the process. A social worker would determine, the police would get involved or a school headmaster. But you actually had no part of the process until you went to support them with, say, going to court. Whereas with Maatua Whangai we would sit down and we would hui together. We’d have our korero and we’d come up with some solution. And those departmental workers that came in and watched this, I think they watched it right throughout the country and then incorporated it into that new piece of legislation.

I remember _________ (Puao-Te-Ata-Tu) coming down here with his Working Party.

I can remember two department social workers brought me a kid for the weekend, he had sores on him, a nappy, shorts and a tee-shirt and on the Saturday, I got a call from this woman and she was coming to pick him up and play with him, one of the social workers had given my name out, he was part-Maori, his mother had twins as well. I had him for months.

It was meant to be for the weekend and they asked for you to have him longer, and the whole time we were doing this was to keep them out of the system.

Do you know what happened with that boy? I got really attached to that boy. It was the mum, she was really good with that boy, she could not cope with those twins; the babies. I went into the Department 4 months
later and I said what's happening with this child, because if you're going to do anything with this child you have to do it now, because I'm getting too attached to him and he was about two and a half at that time. You can't help getting deeply attached to them.

The workers within the Department they were whanau as well. They were Maatua Whangai, they were whanau. They were there to support us and we were there to support them in their positions.

When talking about a Departmental worker. What about when she needed to go home for her mother's tangi? When they had the earthquake in Te Teko. She came to me crying, she got seconded to help the people up there and they weren't going to pay her and she produced a death certificate. What a way to treat her. They were often at odds with their supervisor.

There were Pakeha people in there who'd try and give you anything, who'd go that extra mile. It costs those workers to be whanau. The two workers couldn't handle the way it was run because it was supposed to be for the whanau.

About kids with and without status; I'll never forgive them for that because you have to treat them the same. This created a lack of resources that was abusive to the kids and to Maori.

How much money went back into the main putea that was flagged for Maatua Whangai? I think we tried to work out once how many cents per child they actually paid us over the years. Per head per child per day and we are talking cents. It was pathetic.
If I can remember rightly it was seven to nine cents and that was only the Pine Hill Whanau.

Because, remember we sat down and worked out how many kids we had had and how long we had them. I know it was something pathetic, under 10 cents a night. What a pittance.

When our washing machines broke down, we repaired them. When our curtains were ripped, lounge suites wrecked, mattresses mimied on, dressers and drawers broken, kids’ toys broken, etc.

But what I liked most about Maatua Whangai was, remember, in the front room. What I did was I made all the bed bases so that the whole room was just solid bed bases and I put the mattresses on top and I went down to Para Rubber because A) I wasn’t on a benefit and B) I wasn’t working. I was using all my own money and I went down and I bought all these pillows and all these sleeping bags, they had them all these lovely yellow-patterned sleeping bags and but what I remember because I wasn’t employed by them and because they weren’t paying any money for the kids. One worker came up and said can I check on the child for some reason. Unannounced, uninvited and said “where is this child living?” and I said in this room. We were told you’re not allowed to do that. Boys had to be in one room and girls had to be in another.

Another time a social worker said I haven’t actually seen your place physically, but you can’t have all those children in such a small space, and I said, well, what am I going to do with them? I said you get me a bigger house.
Unfunded they expected us to have separate bedrooms, etc. But we had to have cramped bedrooms, bunks, the lounge was used, sleeping bags were everywhere.

That to me was the beauty of Maatua Whangai. They tried, they couldn't, to impose their strict regulations on our way of doing things and it didn't work.

And that's still going on today when we have to put extras on mattresses and people up there don't like that. Like they can come in and say you've got to have a separate set of everything for that child, like their own sheets. It's ridiculous. They came and had a look at our rooms recently, some kids top and tailing, etc.

What amazed me was they even had the audacity to put stipulations on us when we weren't being funded.

Sometimes what we really, really needed were not dressers and beds, etc, but at times sanitary pads. When you had five teenage girls that are all menstruating, they need toilet paper and sanitary pads.

Out of all the kids we had at our place, i.e. Mongrel Mob, Black Power, White Power etc, we were ripped off three times and it was by non-Maori children. I have to say one of them stole my daughter's taonga and sent it to his girlfriend to say how much he loved her. And it got returned because he got the wrong address. When we got ripped off it was not by whanau.

Most of the damage that was done in my home was done by the tauiwi children too. Most of the holes in the door, you know, kick in the door, you know, rip up in anger etc. Our kids didn't do that. They might have
gone out into public and done things but they never bit the hand that feed them. They never shit in their own backyard.

Intellectual property! They took what is our way of life and tried to put it into policy—and about Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, many of them didn’t know what it was.

When I was asked about the Department resurrecting Maatua Whangai. I said to ______ don’t go there. I put my hands out and said “look burned to the stumps.”

This thing survived in spite of the Department.

The use of the term mokai, describing our workers as mokai, as slaves. Mokai was interpreted down here as taureka. ______ wasn’t a mokai.

But isn’t that interesting with what’s gone on, how they treated the workers. We’ve forgotten about how these workers felt watching it go down the gurgler too. That’s the Department called their workers as slaves. So what do you do to slaves?

I was told that it was the name used many years ago and it was the concept we were using today. The Department took it and had another view on it about what it was.

It’s not just the money down the tubes with all the kids we had staying up there. It’s not only that, but you put everybody else’s kids “up there” and I can remember being told by DSW if they can’t afford to give you money, go see if they can give you a sack of flour or a side of lamb. I can remember having to go to several whanau and having to take them food.
It's still like that today.

But at the same time it's things like I sometimes couldn't pay the rent, or pay the electricity.

Having to learn to go and beg was a new experience for me. On our Pakeha side we are encouraged to go and get educated, and one of the problems for women was that they would get educated and have their babies and they would find it hard to get back into the workforce. Whereas we stuck there with Maatua Whangai and we didn't further our careers and at the age of 52 we are now starting to do what we should have done then.

Perhaps for ________ and ________ Maatua Whangai burned up 15 years of our lives.

But it burnt us out too, so that when we had to support ourselves, we used up whatever resources we had at our disposal. And I used up all my money from my settlement from my marriage. $100,000. I blew the lot. I think back now I should have not used that money it was for my kid’s inheritance and for my retirement. I blew $100,000 I wasn’t on a benefit and these kids didn’t come with any money. Living that life until one day- and I had quite a few kids at that stage-and I ran out of money it was just gone, and I took all the kids and we went down to Social Welfare. They stood on the corner of Social Welfare and I said to the kids “I don’t know where my next dollar is coming from” and I didn’t know how I was going to feed them and to clothe them and I said “wait there kids I’m gonna get a job” and I walked up and I knocked on the door of ________ and I said “I need a job”, and he said “when do you want to start” and I said “yesterday”. He said “its Friday start on
Monday.” I said “look out the window, and I have to feed the kids” and that’s how I got the job.

As the researcher I was asked to write a strongly-worded paragraph on behalf of the research roopu about what the Maatua Whangai Programme meant in terms of personal cost. All I could add to the narrative presented here is that this mahi was built on the blood, sweat, tears, laughter, and karakia of many whanau including the Maori workers from the Department.

4. The effects of Maatua Whangai.

I had a friend who was a cop and he was killed on the West Coast. And he was really good, and he would ring me up and say something like “we’ve got a kid down here in the drunk tank or we’ve got a kid down here that we are processing. Do you want the kid?” And it was always one of our kids and away down I’d go and bring them up home. Which meant they didn’t actually process the child. It allowed us to do preventative work to keep the kid out of the system.

We were connected and our networks all had connections to this Marae.

I think it was that they realised that we weren’t just keeping these kids overnight and sending them back for them to arrest them again. We were incorporating them into our lives-look at __________.
__________, etc.

I always knew where I wanted my feet to be, with my Maori Whanau.

This was hard work, sometimes you’d have to stay up all night because they might run away.
And they’d come in so stressed, some of them would mimi the bed. How many mattresses did you go through, ah! You’d have to give your kid’s clothing to them because they were standing in patu clothes.

_________ is having a tangi as she remembers the kids who have passed on.

The next thing though is the way it has affected the way we brought up our kids and what we have done. The effect that it had on your family and the things you don’t know about when your kids come to see you and tell you things that happened. You don’t know and you have to face things and it hurts. The kids told my oldest daughter she would get a buzz off datura. We called the whanau hui, the social worker came and we had our korero. She took the datura and I said to my husband “if anything ever happens to my kids then that’s it, kua mutu.” And we called the whanau meeting. The two Maatua Whangai social workers came up and all my husband could say was because his heart was in this and that I was breaking his heart. Telling me that I was breaking his heart because I had my children as the first priority and so I backed down.

And my marriage started going down the tubes as soon as I started at Maori Affairs. It affected those relationships with those we love the best.

Coming to the country for my partner at the time, from a totally different culture and all he saw of Maori was the negative side and so we used to have rip-roaring arguments and then he literally said, “You make your choice.” And I said “There’s the door.” And there were lots of problems because he didn’t see the structural side or the positive side of Maoridom.
And things that are said because you’re trying to uplift someone else and give them strength and lifting up their self-esteem while you’re giving away the mana of your own children.

There were kids, especially babies, who were allergic to everything, i.e. they needed to sleep with you or beside you at night, needed special creams instead of soap, needed non-allergenic formula etc.

You took away your own kids’ status or mana.

But that’s what I mean, that we were fine, we were comfortable, but other members of our whanau, they weren’t comfortable. But there were others out there like ______ that I think felt threatened because what they see is what we didn’t see, was that we were actually Mana Whenua here.

I think though they’d be more threatened now because of the way things are working now with the whanau.

I tell you why I think we didn’t notice, it was because we were just too busy doing it.

We were too poor and busy doing it.

I mean look at __________, she was Tuhoe but we just looked at her as one of us. It wasn’t us, it was just some other factor in there.

That there seemed to be very little difference between mana whenua and maataa waka.
All the kids had pinched signs. And I got up one morning and I opened the bedroom door and all the girls were teenagers and the door was blocked. So I went round and looked in the bedroom window and they had pinched signs, the bread signs, the petrol signs, the ice cream signs. Some with great big concrete bases to them. How they dragged them up the hill, because they were only 13 - 14 and were walking, I’ll never know. And the Italian and I in the middle of the night, the next night. On that little truck he had, dropping off signs in North East Valley all the way up to Ross Home, dropping them off anywhere we could.

When something was working we shared it with each other, but if you did that with the Department they wouldn’t even react.

Well you remember __________. She’s tauwi. The kids brought her home because they found her asleep on the benches in the library. She used to wait until everyone else went, then that’s where she’d sleep. Well she has a job starting in London and she’s been living in Auckland over the last X amount of years. She left school and I got her a job at the Department and she stayed with the Department all this time, but she made all the effort to come back to Dunedin just to stay to say goodbye because she’s off overseas. Now that girl must be now 30, they never forget. All the way down here just to say goodbye.

What I love is if you go to a hui or a dance and a little voice says behind you, “Hello Aunty”.

Our kaumatua need to be mentioned, i.e __________ and __________. He worked very hard, got laughed about by a lot of people because he didn’t have Te Reo. The Maatua Whangai core management committee helped him grow because of us women. And that’s because when he
spoke we would sing a waiata and I don’t think that he had ever had that kind of support before.

I think that we showed him that respect that he deserved because he drove our kaupapa for us.

See, I have more respect for him than somebody who can stand up and korero Maori when it’s so rote and there’s nothing there and they don’t understand the kaupapa.

He got involved in DEKs (District Executive Committees), Hospital Board, etc. This thing has a whakapapa and different ones had something to do with it at different stages.

_______, minus Te Reo, but he was so dignified, a real gentleman. And you kind of looked up to his stature. He might have lacked Te Reo but he had all the other stuff.

This created some problems because these weren’t the things that maata waka valued, but we did.

When we stayed at the marae in Te Teko ________ brought us a truckload of watermelon.

Do you remember, there was a meeting and I think it was somewhere in town. I can see the room that it was in and there was a woman there, it was a Maatua Whangai meeting and we’d gone and _______ was there and I’m not sure if you were there. We were spitting the dummy over something and there was a Kai Tahu Taua stood up and told us the history behind Maatua Whangai. That there was another name that we used, not Maatua Whangai. Names that our Taua used long before the programme started, Whangai atawahai or tamaiti whangai?
It was amazing, some of the things that we got invited to because of Maatua Whangai. Like Prince Edward, we got invited as the token Maori. We also got invited to a do for Paul Reeves.

5. The future implications.

I’ve expressed that I won’t ever do it again. For myself, my life is too important at the moment. But I’ve always said there’s always been one person who should have Dunedin’s Community Citizen’s Award. I acknowledge my total admiration for her dedication for what she does.

Kia ora!

I do it differently now. My experiences mean I do it totally differently to what I did then. Not Social Welfare’s concept of maatua whangai but my concept. I’ve got it, it’s at home, maatua whangai is there.

If somebody wants to resurrect it, I would support, but I couldn’t do it again. But what happens to the next generation of kids?

Conclusion

The respondents’ voices said a great deal more than what was actually said in the interviews, especially about the personal cost to them. There were several additions to the initial interviews. My tuakana/teina role became apparent as I struggled to keep up with the respondents.

There were several moments that stand out from the evening of the hui:
- This mahi had a whakapapa.
- The young people who had died and our tangi over them.
- Our discussion on confidentiality and blanking out people’s names.
- The idea of a roll of honour or some other form of acknowledgement.
The appropriateness of a call, from one of the respondents’ whangai,

One respondent spoke of blowing $100,000 and still wearing second-hand clothes.

The Waiata

The Karakia

One respondent was acknowledged as she still whangaied children 18 years later. "The mana of her mahi goes forth before her."

It was obvious that, because of one of the respondents was absent and the hui had lasted only 3 hours, that the group needed more time to reflect on their experience. It was agreed that another hui would be arranged when the research had been written up and marked. The recipients took the document away to re-read and digest it. Everyone enjoyed the relaxed atmosphere, finger foods and fresh coffee.

The following Monday I spoke to the respondent who was almost over food poisoning and dropped off the report back document to her. We spoke briefly and I arranged to speak to her later in the week after she had read and digested the document.
Chapter Seven

ANALYSIS

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth isn’t outside power, or lacking in power; contrary to a myth whose history and functions would repay further study, truth isn’t the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power.

(Foucault 1980:131)

Introduction

The term, or process of, discourse analysis can be understood in a number of different ways, but for this work Foucauldian theory of power and knowledge as outlined earlier will be utilised. To restate briefly, Foucault conceives discourses to be sites of knowledge and “regimes of truth” (Foucault 1980:131). These regimes of truth act as “the true” not necessarily because they are true in an absolute sense, but because they, through their interaction with power, are inextricably linked with the battle for truth (Walker 1997).

In regard to the Maatua Whangai Programme and the respondents, their “truth” has never been asked for, let alone examined to any great extent. The aim of this study is not to villify the “Department” in terms of finding culpability (although that may happen), or to romanticise a Maori past in terms of child protection practice. But it is important to “temper” the “official discourse” with the “truths” of those who do not have the opportunity to control the discursive context. Truth is “the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true” (Foucault, 1980:132). Therefore a discourse emanating from a powerful body sets in place what is true (Walker 1997). One of the major objectives of this thesis is to present another discourse (that of the respondents) alongside other “truths,” such as those of Puao-Te-Ata-Tu and commentators like John Bradley(1994) and Leland Ruwhiu (1995). Such a definition moves away from an analysis of language (Foucault 1970) per se towards an analysis of power.
I believe that one's point of reference should not be the great model of language and signs but that of war and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than a language: relations of power, not relations of meaning.
(Foucault, 1980:114)

By discussing semantics in terms of the “Maori” and “Pakeha” interpretations of certain words or concepts—for instance, Maatua Whangai, Tamaiti Whangai or Atawhai, fostercare - it would be very easy to direct the discussion along the lines of “authenticity” or “essentialist” notions of what is or what isn’t a “Maori way” of doing things. Such a procedure would be incidental to the discussion of the relationship in terms of the “power” accorded to the discourse itself and notions of dominance implied in it.

In a discursive field such as the perceptions of caregivers regarding their role in the Maatua Whangai programme, there are competing discourses with some discourses having greater power than others (Weedon, 1987:35). The power to dominate such a discursive field is constantly under challenge—nowhere more so than in a new field or where powerful new players enter a field (Walker 1997), as with Maatua Whangai practice and its’ accompanying theories of child protection. It is therefore necessary to examine the discourse of the respondents to identify their version of the truth, and the way that such “truth” is embedded in institutions, in this instance the departmental or “official” version.

In conceiving discourses as knowledges that compete for the status of truth within the regime of truth (Foucault 1980), we accept that “discourses function as the true not because they are demonstratably true in an objective sense but because they come to be accepted as true” (Elizabeth 1997). Discourses also offer differing ways of conceptualising the same concept or object, in this case seen in the difference between “fostercare” and “tamaiti atawhai.” Within any discursive field some discourses have greater power than others to dominate that field (Weedon 1987 & Elizabeth 1997). In addition, the power of a discourse to attain and maintain such dominance is constantly
under threat (Walker 1997).

This chapter seeks to bring together and analyse the results of the study by utilising three strands or steps: data analysis, explanation and interpretation, and then moving ahead to future and possible solutions.

**Step 1: Data Analysis**

Firstly, the themes emerging from the interviews, which were then restated and confirmed at the reporting-back hui, are summarised as follows:

- That caring for the young people in the programme was the most important part of the mahi.
- That this mahi had its costs in terms of families, children and finances
- That support was negligible from the Department of Social Welfare (the "Department")
- That the departmental (DSW) Maatua Whangai workers were supportive.
- That respondents formed their own support whanau and that their networks kept the system viable.
- That the young people who were placed in the respondents' care were often at-risk and with special needs.
- Some of the relationships that developed through the programme have become long-term ones.

Secondly, these results will be discussed in terms of questions raised in the research design phase of the study. In the research design component, use was made of Ruwhiu's (1995) discussion of some of the "key conceptualisations that underpin Tangata Whenua knowledge development, research and mahi in the area of social and community work practice" (ibid: 22). This research has interpreted Ruwhiu's ideas in seeking to analyse Maatua Whangai in terms of three major elements that impact on tangata whenua: knowledge, practice and power.
These issues were discussed in the light of two important documents specifically addressing Maatua Whangai. Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (1986) was examined to see if, from a caregiver perspective, the recommendations regarding Maatua Whangai were implemented and to what extent. Similarly Bradley’s (1994) review of the national programme is also examined in the light of its local implementation from a caregiver perspective. Data on each of the four major research questions will be analysed in terms of the new information gained from the research.

Maatua Whangai as a Tangata Whenua Programme

1. **Knowledge**

Were tangata whenua “philosophies and experiences utilised to provide a conceptual framework” (Ruwhiu 1995:22) that was ordered into a theoretical framework, in this case one used to underpin the Maatua Whangai programme?

It has already been claimed in this review that the ability to “define” Maori social structure by Maori has been destroyed by the (Pakeha) hegemonic structure imposed upon the Maatua Whangai respondents. The terminology used in the Department’s presentation of the programme and the meaning ascribed to it was critical in terms of the meaning that the respondents derived from the programme. Did this come up in the data for the respondents too?

Initially the respondents seemed to feel that their traditional tikanga was recognised by the Department:

As well as that, … They approached me (see pg.81).

Personal experience of the programme however lead them to the view that their kawa, tikanga and whanaungatanga networks had, in fact, been appropriated by the Department:

Totally separate because…the Pakeha system (see pg.83)

…So they got our korero, … meet these children’s needs (see pg.83).
The respondents saw the Department as distorting tikanga because the Department saw their involvement in terms of foster care - that seemed to be the major need of the Department at the time.

On the positive side, both the Department and respondents provided evidence of the capacity-building which occurred through Maatua Whangai by developing networks in the Maori community:

...What Maatua Whangai ...that room for one kid (see pg.87).

But in terms of a theoretical framework, the Department and the participants clearly had different understandings:

I had a lot ...day they are born (see pg.81-82).

The respondents knew that although some of the official documentation regarding Maatua Whangai used tangata whenua philosophy, imagery and experience, this was not a true indicator of how much the Department allowed the programme to be underpinned and managed by these concepts. There did not seem to be any overarching Maori paradigm that was based on traditional Maori knowledge, so that while the attempt was genuine the outcome at a policy level was still superficial:

There was a book ...they said had to go too (see pg.88).

For much of the time, some of the departmental and Maori Maatua Whangai participants were talking past each other. Pakeha thought of the programme as fostering with a Maori name, where the starting point for discussion was fostering; whereas Maori thought in terms of Maatua Whangai based on traditional tikanga, where the starting point for discussion was far more than fostering.

It is clear that the respondents claimed ownership of the tikanga and subsequent stories as part of their familial experience. In the section regarding the meaning of Maatua Whangai to the respondents, they speak very clearly of it as part of their upbringing and traditional tikanga. This attitude is also consistent with the literature review and the statistics gathered from the Maori Women’s Welfare League. These stories were part of their familial narratives:
Okay. When I first ...family were brought up (see pg.80).

This then was “the way that all our family were brought up”. The exact extent of tamaiti whangai care in a contemporary setting is not known from the information I have been able to find, but the stories in the literature review and the narrative from the respondents suggest it was practised widely.

Wetekia Ruruku Elkington [1879-1957] like the rest of Maori society practised the concept of Maatua Whangai. Often people would whangai children to give them a chance at a better life.

The custom in those days was that the first-born was adopted by the father’s parents and the second-born by the mother’s parents – my younger brother... (Hippolite 1995:207)

This form of caring for children started here when Maori arrived on their waka and is confirmed by Mead (1994) in traditional stories that from Maori literature and the familial stories that are passed down from generation to generation.

Whakapapa stories of maatua whangai were common, and all of the respondents had a family story about their childhood experiences of maatua whangai from the 1940s-1960s, even before the Maori renaissance. The fact that their traditional childcare practices had been recognised by the Government as a social resource, combined with their own familial experiences and keenness to see the programme established, set the scene for the appropriation of the tikanga to achieve the Government’s goals. There is no evidence in the literature to suggest that such an appropriation was undertaken purposefully or with malice, but it was certainly interpreted this way by the respondents.

This appropriated and bastardised version of maatua whangai was then taken back to its traditional owners and sources. The respondents re-appropriated this colonised view of maatua whangai and put it back in a traditional context. But, the respondents lacked control of the resources necessary to ensure support for the newly-constituted programme. However they did manage to exert some control over social work resources.
Edward Said, (1978 cited in Smith 1999), was quoted in chapter 4 in reference to the “Western discourse about the other.” His analysis of the representation of the East (indigenous peoples) by the West is pertinent here. Said notes that information was “collected, classified and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized” (pp.1-2). To adapt Said’s analysis, the respondents were told who they were, based on someone else’s cultural paradigm. The respondents then reclaimed this analysis, based on their own tikanga.

The origins of Maatua Whangai lie in the traditional and familial experiences and tikanga of Maori. The idea for the programme came from the Hui Whakatau and was then suggested to the Government. Traditional tikanga was then combined with traditional or government child protection policy to form the Maatua Whangai Programme. The Government incorporated and assimilated the tikanga into its structure and in so doing tore out the heart of the Maatua Whangai Programme. The Maatua Whangai Programme was a colonised version of the tikanga, but Maori were glad to get whatever they could – they felt their mana was acknowledged and for once, in the Pakeha system, they were the experts.

The use of the term “whanau” seemed to serve a Pakeha agenda of using cultural forms to achieve government results. This was not necessarily a barrier to the success of the programme as the most important issue is the usefulness of whanau roopu to the respondents and the meaning they gave to those roopu.

The respondents agreed with Bradley (1994:187) in that the fundamental philosophical base of the kaupapa (“direction”) of the programme was not in keeping with Maori whakapapa-based (genealogical) community concepts. The kaupapa treated Maori as a homogeneous group rather than as heterogeneous iwi. It assumed that being Maori (race) was enough for the purposes of the programme and ignored the importance of placing a child or young person within the their extended whanau, hapu and iwi (ibid:187):

I think personally ...the Department for our people (see pg.94).

The knowledge of and power associated with Maatua Whangai had specific effects on the respondents. Foucault’s (1980) ideas of “the productive function of power-
knowledge” were discussed earlier (chapter 4) and provide a theoretical rationale for this part of the study. It would seem that it was the Department’s intent, whether accidental or purposeful, to “regulate” the respondents by describing, defining and delivering acceptable and standardised forms of Maatua Whangai knowledge and practice and educating the respondents accordingly. The Department had the power to define (Jackson 1994) what was useful and valid knowledge regarding Maatua Whangai, and then to produce generic grand narratives about Maatua Whangai (in the form of social policy). These narratives were used in turn in normalising the respondent’s practice (integrated into the CYP&F Act), and in appropriating the interpretive potentialities of tikanga and kawa to oppress the respondents (Bishop 1995):

The day it left ... And Maatua Whangai is not theirs, it’s ours (see pg.86). 

So the programme was always a Pakeha tikanga, albeit overlaid with a Maori gloss

2. Practice

Were Tangata Whenua narratives or stories (examples of the indigenous theoretical paradigms that underpin appropriate forms of knowledge acquisition) utilised in the delivery of the Maatua Whangai Programme? (Ruwhiu 1995:22)

As we have seen, Tangata Whenua philosophical perspectives on social and community work practice have a different philosophical base to those based on Western developmental pathways. (Ruwhiu 1995:22):

Practices in social service delivery are obviously not based on Maori cultural resources. If they were it would mean that Western Euro-centric explanations or understandings must be secondary to Tangata Whenua explanations or understandings for working with Tangata Whenua immersed in their culture. Likewise, for those who are whanau mokemoke, considerations of Tangata Whenua become crucial in terms of dealing with loss of heritage and culture based on cultural invasion strategies by Western Euro-centric colonisers. (Ruwhiu 1995:22).

The respondents agreed with these comments by confirming the results stated at the beginning of this chapter.
Ruwhiu argues that “the evaluation of Maori [Tangata Whenua] social service programmes must take into account the Tangata Whenua theoretical paradigms that exist in terms of giving accurate explanations for the outcomes desired and observed” (Ruwhiu 1995:22). This view is consistent with possible future service directions mentioned later in this chapter, where it is envisaged that Maori be in control of the funding, monitoring and evaluation of services for Maori.

I would concur with Ruwhiu (1995) that the theories that inform Maori social service delivery practices must emerge from Maori’s own philosophical foundations as indigenous peoples of Aotearoa. The validation of this knowledge provides Maori with the absolute right to determine the most appropriate responses to maintaining good Maori health and well-being (Ruwhiu 1995:22).

Far from providing resources to determine appropriate practice, the Maatua Whangai Programme seemed intent on saving money. Bradley (1994) has already noted that “the State’s co-ordination of the project mistakenly assumed that the community was a healthy and well-serviced reception system for children in need of alternative community care. What was soon realised was that whanau, already weakened and at risk themselves, were being relied upon to care for delinquent and seriously abused Maori children” (ibid: 187).

The department’s attitude seemed almost to be consciously exploitative given the socioeconomic situation of Maatua Whangai o Otepoti caregivers (chapter 4). The respondents were representatives of a group that comprised 52% beneficiaries and with an equal number of two and single-parent families this makes a clear statement about the ability and capacity of the respondents to be able to undertake this mahi. This attitude was combined with the koha mentality of the Department, which was criticised by Bradley (1994) and in the Puao-Te-Ata-Tu report (1986). The effect of this experience on the whanau and the whangai was and still is one of the major issues talked about by the respondents.

From the perspective of the respondents the amount of funding was exploitative:

How much money went back into the main putea that was flagged for Maatua Whangai? I think we tried to work out once how many cents
per child they actually paid us over the years. Per head per child per day and we are talking cents. It was pathetic.

If I can remember rightly it was 7 to 9 cents and that was only the Pine Hill Whanau.

Because remember we sat down and worked out how many kids we had had and how long we had them. I know it was something pathetic, under 10 cents a night. What a pittance.

When our washing machines broke down we repaired them. When our curtains were ripped, lounge suites wrecked, mattresses mimied on, dressers and drawers broken, kids toys broken, etc.

This situation supports Bradley’s (1994) argument:

“Because of the aroha and manaakitanga involved, whanau who took in additional whangai seldom asked for financial or other assistance. This system of using whanau support and care was further abused by a unwritten social work policy regarding placement of children with whanau. It was believed that whanau were obligated to care for their own and therefore not entitled to board payments, koha grants or other forms of financial assistance. The policy of lesser entitlement to relatives continues today. Therefore, little consideration was given to strengthening Maori whanau who became increasingly less able to provide alternative care but could not decline to care for their own relations. This was another way in which Maori children began being placed with at-risk whanau. The alternative was to place children with non-Maori foster parents, whom it was easier to resource. (Bradley 1994: 188)

The situation was the same with respect to training. Training was often not provided to departmental Maatua Whangai workers and mokai were expected to work in isolation,
often unsure of what was happening from district to district (Bradley 1994:188). But those same workers provided some excellent training for the respondents as caregivers for the Department, even though they were in some cases untrained themselves:

Yes. And even if they do go and do some training it’s not the same as having your Maori social workers or people of the understanding that really know what they’re talking about.

Kia ora. And we worked away from the system. After say the CYPS closed, we were still working with the children after that time. From morning, noon and night, 24 hours a day.

There were difficulties in the relationship between the DSW Mokai (a contested term in Te Wai Pounaamu: where it means slave) and their departmental supervisors. Some district offices expected Mokai to continue their usual casework responsibilities as well as carrying a Maori case load and extra responsibilities. In some cases their presence was used as an opportunity to transfer cases over, resulting in some caseworkers having to decline their responsibilities for working with growing caseloads including Maori clients. The Mokai often had to maintain at least three roles which included the traditional generic casework role; providing social workers with appropriate caregivers for their Maori clients; and the ongoing community work role of strengthening whanau (Bradley 1994:188). Other roles which were not mentioned by Bradley (1994) include that of “taking care” of the tikanga and kawa needs of the organisation and its often Pakeha staff. This culminated in a phenomenon which in its negative form was referred to as “rent a powhiri,” when Maori staff were wheeled out to undertake departmental requirements. Mokai were also expected to continue their Maori community responsibilities; Maori had particular expectations of them that were sometimes in conflict with their departmental responsibilities.

A lack of Maatua Whangai senior social workers meant that Mokai were provided with professional supervision from a fairly narrow if not monocultural perspective. Mokai were in receipt of supervision in terms of the traditional casework role but their positions were basic grade and considered lowly in status. There was no clear career path for Mokai or prospects for promotion from this role within the organisation (Bradley 1994:188).
As Bradley noted, departmental policy at the time was that “child-based whanau could only receive financial support if they were legally under the custody or guardianship of the Department (for example as a Children and Young Persons Act 1974 section 11 or guardianship order). A conflict in principles was seen here between wishing to keep children out of the system and having to sign them into the system before this could happen” (Bradley 1994:188-189). This was also seen as an unfair way to treat both the child/young person and caregivers as it meant funding was unavailable unless the child/young person had “status” with the Department, and lead to an attitude of exploitation on the basis of aroha.

In summary Maatua Whangai was never understood in the Otepoti area as Maori intended it to be, but was usually interpreted simply as fostercare.

According to the respondents, tangata whenua paradigms were not used to evaluate, develop and adapt the programme locally while departmental workers undertook their own evaluations, there did not seem to be any overarching system designed to undertake this task

3. Power

The question must be asked: did the Maatua Whangai Programme utilise authentic and valid Kaupapa Maori practice, knowledge and power to address the issues about a programme that makes use of Maori peoples’ lives? Did the approach utilised by the Department place with Maori the locus of control over the issues of:

1. initiation
2. benefits
3. representation
4. legitimisation
5. accountability
From what has already been said it is clear that power and control of Maatua Whangai lay with the Department. Formally, that was the case as authority was never ceded to iwi or the appropriate Maori groups in the region. But it was substantively the case, too. As far as the respondents were concerned, funding control was retained fully and solely by the Department:

That support was negligible from the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) (see pg. 118).

That the Departmental (DSW) Maatua Whangai workers were supportive and were considered to be one of us. (see pg. 118).

The Department was evaluated and reviewed by the report team and to a limited degree Tangata Whenua paradigms were used to do this, as the team visited marae and undertook discussions using tikanga and kawa. The result was the report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (1986) which made a series of thirteen recommendations. Recommendation seven is especially pertinent as it is about Maatua Whangai.

“We recommend that:

(a) the Maatua Whangai programme in respect of children return to its original focus of nurturing children within the family group;

(b) additional funding be allocated by the Department to the programme for board payments and grants to tribal trusts for tribal authorities to strengthen whanau/hapu/iwi development;

(c) the funding mechanism be through the tribal authorities and be governed by the principle that board payments should follow the child and be paid direct to the family of placement, quickly and accurately, and accounted for the Department in respect of each child. The programmes should be monitored for suitability of placement and quality of care;

(d) the level of the reimbursement grant for volunteers be increased to a realistic level” (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986: 35).

Were the recommendations from Puao-Te-Ata-Tu regarding the Maatua Whangai Programme ever instituted locally, and to what degree?
From the perspective of the respondents, the answer seems to be “no.” The first recommendation (a) was that in respect of children Maatua Whangai should return to its original focus of nurturing children within the family group. The respondents have made comments earlier regarding the poor status of the programme.

The second recommendation (b) referred to additional funding being allocated by the Department to the programme for board payments and grants. It is clear from the respondents that this did not take place while they were participating in the programme:

Through Maatua Whangai a child would come to my home. Any arrangements made after that time to get anything through the system was totally different from Maatua Whangai. We weren't basically treated equal. It was harder for us to get what we needed, we thought we would be equal, whether they be Maatua Whangai children or children through the system, which I had. It was easier for me to get stuff for the children that weren't Maatua Whangai, than the ones that were. The system wasn't equal.

Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (1986) had tried, through these recommendations, to gain control of the programme for Maori. This is clear in recommendation (c) which recommended that board payments should follow the child and be made through the tribal authorities.

But, according to the respondents, these recommendations were never implemented, Maori were never able to control the programme’s implementation as funding mechanisms were still controlled through DSW branch offices and local committees were dependent on what they were given.

There was a huge amount of “consultation with Maori” at a procedural level (Culpitt 1994), but the Crown controlled the programme’s finances and was restricted by its own adherence to the Public Finance Act 1989. The Department’s ability to fund initiatives such as Maatua Whangai under the Act have been restricted-the slow establishment of iwi social services is a further example (Bradley 1997). The structural issues involved are still to be resolved. (See Bradley 1994, Cockburn 1995).
In summary, each of the five issues raised earlier indicate that Maatua Whangai was not a Tangata Whenua programme.

1. Initiation
The concept of the Maatua Whangai Programme was initiated by Maori at the Hui Whakatauira. The programme itself however was initiated by the Department with some consultation with Maori.

2. Benefits
Both the Department and the respondents have benefited from the Maatua Whangai programme, but the costs have been mainly borne by Maori.

3. Representation
Was there an adequate depiction of social reality for both the respondents and the Department in the conduct of the programme? The evidence would suggest that while the Departments’ views were represented in the policy and practice of Maatua Whangai, the views of the respondents and other caregivers were never taken into account.

4. Legitimation
The Maatua Whangai Programme was legitimated through departmental social policy and practice, and by local core management committees, and by the respondents and their whanau.

5. Accountability
The Department was accountable to its two partners, Maori Affairs and Justice. The respondents were in turn accountable to the Department. There is very little evidence to suggest that the Department had any formal accountability to the respondents, for example through the local management committees.
Step 2: Explanation & Interpretation

This analysis of the Maatua Whangai programme and the ways in which knowledge, practice and power has remained with the Department now needs further explanation. Major questions include the following:

1. If the Department was determined to be fully in control of the programme why did it go through with what appeared to be a charade of Maori control? Why bother with Maatua Whangai at all?

2. Was the failure of the management and resourcing of Maatua Whangai inevitable? Will governments always act in this fashion and how can they be made accountable?

3. How can what happened be explained? And what are some possible solutions for iwi Maori?

1. Why Maatua Whangai? Why do it at all?

The suggestion made here is that Maatua Whangai was a response to the failure of departmental fostercare for Maori in the face of the demands of the Maori renaissance. The strategy employed by government in response to Maori needs and problems has changed over recent years. The Hunn Report approach of the 1960s, with its focus on assimilation, was superseded, rhetorically at least, by a policy of ‘integration’ in the face of growing Maori assertiveness. However, Maatua Whangai was conceived in the middle of the Maori renaissance. Maori found themselves drawn to one another within urban settings, based primarily on their ethnicity but also on their common oppression by the dominant culture and a shared sense of injustice (Shannon 1998). There was perhaps fear and concern over the loss of language and culture—this is something Maori share from the North Cape to the Bluff (Potiki 1996). The Ratana coalition with the Labour Party, while initially useful to Maori (in the fields of welfare and work) was not ultimately successful.
as, from the 1950s onwards, Labour was rarely in power and when in power did not seem to advance the cause of Maori or address Maori grievances (Walker 1990).

Young, educated Maori began to organise themselves in groups such as Nga Tamatoa which took a much more direct confrontational approach to campaigning for power through protest action and a reaffirmation of their culture in the face of educational pressure to drop it (Shannon 1998). At first acting alone, this group joined with more traditional and older members of the national Maori community (Walker 1990).

Further alienation of Maori land through instruments such as the 1967 Maori Affairs Act galvanised Maori resistance and culminated in a hikoi from North Cape to Wellington, encapsulated in the slogan “not one more acre of Maori land” (Walker 1990: 214). Maori were particularly vulnerable to the effects of the 1970s depression. As a result of massive Maori urbanisation (Bradley 1994) and being brought into the urban labour markets in the 1950s and 1960s, the lowly position of Maori and their failure to achieve full labour market integration was evidenced by disparities in unemployment rates. The previous integration (during the 1950s and 1960s) of Maori into the urban workforce collapsed in the 1970s and was followed by a renewed growth in unemployment with a high concentration amongst Maori and Pacific Islanders (Shannon 1998). This affected social relationships in New Zealand producing an explosive growth in terms of protest and simultaneously increasing demands for social service provision. This in turn provided the basis for the re-emergence and growth of Maori politics and posed a significant threat to social integration in terms of New Zealand’s cultural make-up (Barber 1989 cited in Shannon, 1998). The occupations of Bastion Point and the Raglan Golf course were part of a strategy of direct protest to prevent further land sales and losses that followed the 1975 hikoi (land march). The protest movement was now part of the daily news and its pressure created vigorous protests at Waitangi on a number of issues. These included the call to, honour the Treaty, and followed by the claim that the Treaty was a sham, finally reverting to claims for honouring the Treaty as part of a new sovereignty strategy. Land occupations and marches, the “stop the tour” movement of 1981, the Waitangi Tribunal, indigenous people’s rights issues, the rebirth of Kohanga Reo all added to the

Another major factor in the conscientising process was the over-representation of young Maori as clients in government institutions, especially the Justice and Social Welfare Departments (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986).

The racialisation or superficial "Maori-ification" of policy by Government in response to the Maori renaissance was an integral part of colonial care discourses where Maori are considered in need of "saving from themselves." The colonising project continues as it is seen as being in the best interests of Maori spiritually, materially, culturally and morally (Narayan 1995: 133-134). Maori continued to be classified as a race and defined as a problem (McLennan et al 2000). This was "crisis management" (Matahaere-Atariki 1996) at work. Culpitt (1994) discusses the conservative nature of such reforms and their inherent inability to redress inequalities in New Zealand society. According to Matahaere-Atariki (1996:3) the rush to find a grand solution to social services for Maori has in fact repeated the original offence of viewing Maori as "the problem." This situation leaves the power and control of resources in the hands of non-Maori, while at the same time maintaining a rhetoric of partnership and biculturalism (Matahaere-Atariki 1996:3).

The creation of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 and its extended jurisdiction in 1985 was a belated recognition of the power and strength of protest among Maori. And it followed the failure of the earlier "racialisation" strategy where (social democratic) responses to Maori claims sought to find solutions in purely cultural supports and the provision of support for programmes like Maatua Whangai and Taha Maori. Initially, the growth of both significant levels of social problems and the outburst of protest among Maori had led to new policy attempts to achieve social integration on the basis of 'racialisation' of the issues as matters of cultural identity through anti-discrimination legislation, the Waitangi Tribunal, sponsorship of Maori culture, and so on. Since then, Pakeha policy has been largely reactive, responding to Maori initiatives (Shannon 1998).
On the basis of this analysis, the Department’s response to the Maatua Whangai Programme must be seen as a form of cultural racism. Perhaps much of the government rhetoric about a Treaty partnership is obscuring new forms of social control (Spoonley 1990) and what Freire (1972) would call “false generosity:”

Any attempt to soften the power of the oppressor in deference to the weakness of the oppressed almost always manifests itself in the form of false generosity; indeed the attempt never goes beyond this. In order to have the continued opportunity to express their generosity the oppressors must perpetuate injustice as well (Freire 1972: 21).

The Maori experience of health and welfare initiatives were seen as “a curious blend of assimilation, paternalism, integration and exploitation. Most legislation included institutionalised improvements for Maori” (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:10) Yet often the same legislation reinforced the unequal status of Maori by containing special restrictions (Bradley 1994:186). For Maori, Government policy regarding Maori is and was a site of resistance against the hegemony of the dominant society. This kind of cultural racism is entrenched and has its basis in the 19th-century belief in the cultural superiority of Europeans. It is a direct result of colonialism and imperialism, and remains embodied in the ethos of the dominant group and hence in the minds of individuals within the group (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986: 25). Its most apparent form in New Zealand is in the assumption that Pakeha lifestyle, culture and values superior to those of “other” New Zealand cultures, particularly those of Maori and Polynesian peoples. It is significant that, according to the respondents, Maatua Whangai was funded at a second rate level.

The assumption that in New Zealand Pakeha values, beliefs and systems are “normal” is one of the most common forms of cultural racism. Maori values, beliefs and systems are placed in the category of “exotic.” Providing for Maori cultural preference thus becomes an “extra.” I accept the analysis that holds that any attitude which sees provision for Maoritanga as anything other than a normal ingredient of our national culture is
essentially racist. The underlying notion of superiority is the most damaging aspect. It is seldom overtly stated, but constantly implied in advertising, education, and the marketplace (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:25). Maatua Whangai was viewed in terms of funding as “exotic” or an “extra” in exactly this way.

As I demonstrated earlier, the “trickle-down theory” is alive and well for Maori in Aotearoa. But what is trickling down is not equity, empowerment and social justice, but oppression, economic hardship, and dispossession of the powerless. In this case the respondents.

An optimistic view would hope that governments would change their approach to partnerships with iwi or Maori but, if the “fiscal envelope” is an accurate indicator, the Crown is still saying to Maori, in a paternalistic way that extends the imperialistic colonising project: “this is who you are” (Said 1978). So will governments always behave this way? Yes, because government will always allow a certain amount of ‘procedural change,’ if forced to (for example by the Maori renaissance), that will address the need for consultation with Maori (Culpitt 1994) at a minimum level. And a certain level of racial animosity, reflected at the ballot-box is inevitable in a democratic society going through cultural change (Fleras and Spoonley 1999:182). Personal, cultural and institutional racism were all part of the challenge which led to a Maatua Whangai response.

Personal racism may effect individuals or groups and is often conveyed in jokes, disparaging comments, beliefs and the distribution of opportunity (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986: 25). Racism was rife amongst DSW and the broader community at the time of the programme (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986). There were several comments in the data that indicated that the respondents were treated differently. While no-one labelled a particular social worker as racist, respondents noted that they were treated “differently” by some people.

It is clear that government has failed to make “substantive” changes on Maori issues, that
is not just consultation about decision-making but the content of those decisions (Culpitt 1994) to ensure structural change that would bring about equality of outcome, not just equality of access. (Culpitt 1994). Change must take place at both levels to combat institutional racism.

From the respondents’ perspective institutional racism was observed from its effects; there was a bias that automatically benefited Pakeha, while penalising Maori (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:25). This was and is manifest in nearly every negative social indices. It was obvious from their point of view that the Department did not serve Maori interests well and that Maori disadvantage was viewed as being a result of Maori not grasping their meritocratic opportunities.

Maatua Whangai was part of the hegemonic practice entrenched in government policy, in that, the programme validated those systems of practices, meanings and values which provide legitimacy to the dominant society’s institutional arrangements and interests, to the extent that they saturate the consciousness of most of the people, most of the time (Gramsci 1994). This form of power was won through ideological dominance (McLennan et al. 2000). While Maatua Whangai was part of a response seeking to retain Pakeha hegemonic practice, it was also a failure in terms of its Pakeha goals of emergency management of a supposed Maori problem. Maori saw how the programme was being treated as “second class” and this had a conscientising effect, which led to further reflection and action. The respondents learned to perceive social, political and economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality (Friere 1972).

One example of “going further” was the Puao-Te-Ata-Tu report which noted that:

...the central State’s chosen administrators supplant traditional leaders; the State’s agents impose new structure; legal-judicial processes replace the traditional tribal law; and most significantly, permanent government forces enforce the new rules ... Weaving a fine bureaucratic net about traditional society, they impose regulations, restrictions and obligations
upon the people ... For the Maori, political modernisation resulted in a systematic and unrelenting assault on their traditional society (Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986:7-8).

This is part of a post-colonial narrative that is both an analytical approach and political position which critiques the processes and impact of colonialism. It is inclusive of attempts to establish new, non- or anti-colonial institutions and identities (McLennan et al 2000:194). Post-colonialism does not mean "after colonialism" and usually involves a critical understanding of the experiences and effects of colonialism, as well as resistance in various forms (McLennan et al 2000:208). This is the task for those involved in the care of Maori children in the new millennium.

For all these reasons, gaps in social equity continue to grow but there has been a backlash against government's special policy for Maori of "closing the gaps" mainly as a result of an attempt to invert the meaning of racism. Instead of being used to refer to the classification of others in racial terms and then to discriminate against them, some members of dominant groups use the term racism as a way of describing anything which takes into account minority ethnic or indigenous group practices and identity (McLennan et al 2000:206). In a sense the backlash against Maori being singled out for 'extra' or 'special' help is correct from a Maori perspective as well. Increasingly the issue for Maori is that if they are to escape hegemony and cultural racism, they need to do it for themselves. The majority group or dominant culture may think they are being excluded and want to use racism as a slogan to attack the supposed privileging of minority and indigenous groups (McLennan et al 2000:206). In that case the definition of the "victim" of racism is reversed. In fact, the empirical evidence demonstrates the nonsense of this position. Ethnic and indigenous groups may have been recognised more widely in policy terms, but the sociological research demonstrates that they continue to face disadvantage in a way that has never been the experience of majority groups, such as Pakeha. "A crude but reasonably consistent measure is to say that the rate for Maori/ Pacific Islanders [of any negative index] will be twice to four times that of Pakeha rates" (McLennan et al 2000:206).
Multiculturalism is used to promote the idea that we are “all one people” and refers to a process of engaging with diversity as “different yet equal.” It advocates that people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds can live together with their differences without causing conflict or incurring a penalty (Fleras & Spoonley 1999:223). Multiculturalism incorporates a celebration of differences as being worthwhile in their own right or for the community at large. “As official policy, multiculturalism is defined as a doctrine and set of practices for promoting an inclusive society by dealing with diversity in a proactive manner” (Fleras 1994, cited in Fleras & Spoonley 1999:223). Multiculturalism has been tried but this didn’t work - so bicultural frameworks have been developed as an alternative.

According to Fleras and Spoonley(1999:236), Aotearoa irrevocably embodies a bicultural partnership between signatories to the Treaty, with its guarantee of collective rights that are viewed as superseding the relatively new multicultural rights of recent immigrants. The continual dismissal of biculturalism in favour of a commitment to multiculturalism is viewed by some as irresponsible, and by others as controlling. Walker (1995: 292, cited in Fleras and Spoonley 1999: 236) rebukes both multiculturalism and immigration “as a polite plot to distract or dilute, it is 'a covert strategy to suppress the counter-hegemonic struggle of the Maori by swamping them with outsiders who are not obligated to the Treaty.' Reference to New Zealand as multicultural provides critics with an excuse to dismiss Maori claims to special treatment” (ibid:236).

According to Mulgan (1989, cited in Fleras and Spoonley 1999) it would be unfair to advantage Maori when some cultural minorities may be able to make a case for special consideration and concessions or are prospering without special assistance. This “we are all in the same boat” mentality or the claim that there is a “level playing field” in New Zealand is torpedoed by Mead:

We are very fond of the term 'multi-culturalism' which sounds very good but is really a smokescreen under which the battleships of the Pakeha world maintain their hold on power and wealth. For the ordinary citizen the question is readymade for diversionary questions.
such as: What about the Greeks? And how about the Vietnamese and Samoans? How about their languages? Most of these strategies of avoidance are aimed at creating distance between us and issues of Maori-Pakeha relations (Hirini Moko Mead, cited in Fleras and Spoonley 1994:236).

Jackson (1994) has suggested a two chair model where Maori sit on one chair as tangata whenua and tauiwi on the other chair in a shared form of sovereignty. This notion seems especially important when we consider the shape and future form of recalibrated post-settlement relationships. Bi-nationalism is an option according to Fleras and Spoonley (1999), and is defined as:

the formal acknowledgement of two fundamentally different peoples (or 'nations') as equal and autonomous, each of which is sovereign in its own right yet shares societal sovereignty by way of multiple but interlocking jurisdictions. Bi-nationalism entails a recognition of two majorities—that is, two dominant cultures embodied in distinct societies and an equal partnership. In a spirit of power-sharing across all institutions from education to the media. It also connotes the idea of two fundamentally autonomous political communities, each of which is “sovereign” in its own right, yet sharing in the sovereignty of society at large (see Asch 1997). Power-sharing is the key. All internally divided societies that have attained some degree of stability demonstrate a style of governance that is anchored in the principle of sharing power rather than being based on competition (Linden 1994; Editorial 1997b). Precise arrangements for sharing power vary from one context to another, but most involve patterns of structural adjustments related to territorial integrity, statutory provisions, the division of jurisdictions, electoral concessions, or executive decision-making (Fleras and Spoonley 1999:240).
To ensure governments change their behaviour we need to be moving towards multiculturalism within a bi-national framework (Fleras and Spoonley 1999). This approach is consistent with the post-settlement relationship that is developing between some iwi and Pakeha. But might this option be constructed as supporting a Pakeha solution which is in itself part of a hegemonic colonial structure?

**Step 3: Future and Possible Solutions**

How can this situation be resolved and what are the possible solutions for iwi Maori? How can we explain the possibilities and policies for change in the social services field.

**Tino Rangatiratanga: Iwi Control and Self-Determination.**

While the racism described above may seem unstoppable, there are good reasons for suggesting that it can be changed. It is all a question of power. Firstly, the Maori renaissance has certainly meant that Maori have become a force to be reckoned with. They can no longer be simply ignored. They have strength and have used it and need to continue to use it. For all its faults, Maatua Whangai was part of a dynamic process of government and Maori interaction on the way to tino rangatiratanga.

The critical involvement of Maori perspectives in the CYP&F Act 1989 was, as noted earlier, one of a very strong series of initiatives at the time. Especially important was the 'New Dawn' Report, 'Puao-Te-Ata-Tu,' of the Advisory Committee to the Minister of Social Welfare. The recommendations of this report have broad goals of attacking racism and specifically of developing programmes involving equitable resource-sharing and cultural recognition for the Maori people within the social services system - especially those delivered by the Department of Social Welfare.

However, its specific recommendations were directed not at paternalistic positive discrimination such as "Closing the Gaps" addressed, but at democratic Maori control of welfare. Thus decision-making committees with a majority of community lay members (Maori and women's representatives especially) were suggested, with executive powers
over the Department of Social Welfare at national, district and institutional levels. The significance of this report is that the basic thrust of the recommendations were over control of the welfare system and structural changes in the forms of control exercised by the Department of Social Welfare. The report was partly implemented, with district executive committees set up in each Social Welfare district - but they clearly became too powerful and were abolished (Shannon and Walker 1998). As with Maatua Whangai the failure of this attempt at power sharing illustrates again the impossibility of true empowerment under such a regime.

Thus the fate of Maatua Whangai exemplifies the limits of recent changes in government legislation regarding social welfare provision. While such initiatives may be seen in a positive light, as they represent the first steps on the road to empowering Maori communities as well as giving them autonomy (which has not been their experience since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840) (Spoonley 1990), they do not go far enough. The process begun by Maatua Whangai has not stopped. The pressure for change has intensified and the CYP&F Act 1989 was one response—the Act has deepened the awareness of cultural sensitivity and encompasses traditional Maori social structures of whanau, hapu and iwi, and other Maori values and beliefs.

The CYP&F Act 1989 has emphasised that when Maori young people are in need of care and protection Iwi and Cultural Social Services (mandated under s396 CYP&F Act 1989) have a fundamentally important role as the basis for an effective and appropriate social service response.

In recent years there has been a grassroots, groundswell by Maori to whakapaakiri (strengthen) whanau and to promote growth at a hapu or organisational level. Existing services are expanding, albeit slowly. Maria Samuels, a social worker for Te Whanau o Waipareira Social Services, states:

"The Maori community has delivered social services forever. We have done it out of the backs of our cars, our homes and at the cost of our
families. This has been driven by our own cultural imperatives and by disasters wrought on us by urbanisation. This delivery has to be acknowledged and is still going on regardless of “social workers” and their institutions. What has changed however is that there is now an attempt to capture, harness and develop this energy in the formation of “formal” social service structures delivered by our community and (under) funded by the state (1995:39).

The process for establishing these services is being restricted by resourcing and this needs addressing urgently. One of the major criticisms of the State is its inability to moderate the inequalities of the market place at the same time as it has created and sustained disadvantage for Maori (Spoonley 1990). What Maatua Whangai and other initiatives have demonstrated is the State's inability to represent Maori interests effectively.

Even with more consultation and the introduction of tikanga Maori, the State still controls social service provision for Maori. Colonialism is still the interpretive power that defines Maori social service provision. How then can the State construct a Maori social service policy and delivery system without reproducing the original gestures of colonialism (Culpitt 1994)? The solution for Maori does not lie in looking to organisations like the Department of Social Welfare - who historically, has not addressed the issues well.

What is clearly needed is structural change where community power means that resources are fully controlled by Maori. This kind of structural change is based on Article 2 of the Treaty and on tino rangatiratanga.

Without such change, cultural promotion and positive discrimination come up against a brick wall. With such change, they are unnecessary, as Maori people will have the power to achieve the desired results for themselves. Democratic consumer control of welfare for Maori will enable the reclamation of traditional Maori society at all its familial and organisational levels. The system proposed here is traditional to Maori and iwi, but has only recently received widespread recognition with Treaty settlements and iwi control.
Such a system means:
- Maori people being able to choose traditional and proven Iwi/Maori-based structures for the delivery of their social services should they prefer;
- Resource allocation to iwi/Maori-based structures, taking into account the capacity building necessary and the needs of the Maori client group;
- Development of Maori management and accountability structures so that they develop the capacity to take on a variety of service functions.

Iwi Control and Development

Over time, official consultation with Maori has more and more foregrounded iwi concerns and iwi patterns of social organisation as the model for general progress in the narrower area of conventional social policy. The Tirohanga Rangapu (Partnership Perspectives, 1988) and Te Urupare Rangapu (Partnership Response, 1988) reports on the Maori Affairs Department (now Te Puni Kokiri) suggested a radical devolution of administrative roles to iwi (tribal) authorities, paralleling similar action in education and health. This was to be undertaken in the light of a series of other initiatives, which incorporated a Maori perspective or mode of action. Unfortunately a change of government in 1990 halted this progress. However, Maori are too powerful to ignore and iwi settlements continued.

All of these ideas indicate that the real basis of networks for Maori are those built up from kinship - extending the whanau into the hapu and the iwi. However, it can be claimed that these changes have not gone far enough. While they may have resulted in more culturally sensitive and effective services for Maori, these are really no more than what is available to all citizens and thus fit under Article 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi, where all citizens are to be treated equally with respect to rights.

Such services do not give control. What they miss, crucially, is the issue of 'tino rangatiratanga' under Article 2 of the Treaty. In this respect the decisions of the Waitangi Tribunal and its recommendations to government (albeit still only
recommendations) have changed the shape of Maori/Tauwhi relationships over recent years. The growing strength and assertiveness of Maori has resulted in many findings of compensation for injustices done to iwi through the failure to honour *tino rangatiratanga* as guaranteed in Article 2 of the Treaty. The government has recently (1995) attempted to resolve all such claims through an offer to all Maori, the so-called "fiscal envelope" - which was widely rejected by hui throughout the country.

While the centrally important concept of *tino rangatiratanga* and its definition continues to be debated among Maori, a recent New Zealand Maori Congress (inter-iwi gathering) discussion paper attempted to define *tino rangatiratanga* as essentially equivalent to *mana*, the ultimate expression of authority and power from a Maori perspective. Perhaps the most accurate English equivalent is "self-determination" as the term "captures a sense of Maori ownership and active control over the future" (Durie 1995). *Tino rangatiratanga* is also a term, which captures the principles of diversity, unity and autonomy within Maoridom (Potiki 1996).

All such definitions are, of course, essentially contested as to their implications, and whether or not they constitute an appropriate vehicle for action (e.g. involving iwi or not). However, specific iwi have undertaken settlements of various types; the Waikato iwi of the Tainui waka and Ngai Tahu of the South Island (Te Waipounamu) have achieved settlement, with the Crown and other iwi considering similar arrangements.

The full implications of these developments are unclear at this stage but if they involve substantial self-determination by Maori—either as an overall ethnic group or as iwi-based upon cooperative ownership and runanga decision-making, then they would qualify as examples of the empowered socio-economic approach outlined earlier. This model's proposal for decision-making and resourcing through networks also matches the relationships embodied in iwi, especially as they develop networks and structures for both productive and service operations. I use the example of Ngai Tahu in their traditional iwi territory of the South Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand.
The Ngai Tahu Alternative.

The process of iwi-based reinvigoration can be illustrated by the Ngai Tahu iwi. Ngai Tahu is a tribal group (iwi) whose traditional geographic boundary covers some 90% of the South Island of New Zealand. Membership in the tribe is based on whakapapa (ancestry) and blood ties.

In the past, Ngai Tahu has incorporated a number of whanau and hapu level decision making bodies including both iwi and government-initiated structures (in line with other government created bodies such as trades unions). There has been a thread of resistance and protest against land alienation and exclusion from rangatiratanga from as early as 1849 when the first claim was lodged with the Crown. Ngai Tahu has named this struggle “Te Kereme” (‘the claim’). The Government response to these protestations has been a series of enquiries and judicial hearings that spans one hundred and thirty years.

It was not until the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in its present form, in the mid-1980s, that Ngai Tahu had the prospect of once again owning huge assets in the name of the Iwi. Since then Ngai Tahu have slowly built themselves up financially. They have growing interests in fishing, forestry, property and tourism as a result of the multi-million dollar settlement with the Crown.

Ngai Tahu also became a recognised legal identity under the Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu Act (1996); previous to this, tribes had not been recognised by the Crown as legal entities. This Act gives the iwi legal status to act independently of government. Such limitations had been built into the Trust Board arrangements, which are still the case for other iwi. Te Runanga (the central council) of the iwi is made up of eighteen permanent seats, each seat representative of a papatipu runanga, i.e. a traditional council or village site. The delegate is elected by the local runanga body. There is a Chief Executive Officer who is responsible to Te Runanga for the management of an executive body which is split into two parts, the Holding Company and the Development Corporation.

Under the Holding company Ngai Tahu has a number of businesses operating and at
different times have made a healthy profit. However, the ultimate goal is that Ngai Tahu will eventually create enough revenue to subsidise the social development activities of the Ngai Tahu Development Corporation which is its primary role.

The objectives of the Ngai Tahu social development plan include the following:
1. To acknowledge and work within the boundaries of the identified areas of social development as approved by Te Runanganui o Ngai Tahu and endorsed by iwi during Hui-A-Tau.
2. To formulate social policy that will meet the requirements of social development and be approved by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.
3. To ensure that all policies are enhanced by Tikanga Ngai Tahu.
4. To develop policies that will provide effective and efficient delivery of services;
5. To develop policies that will provide suitable processes for monitoring and evaluating and review.
6. To ensure that Maata Waka, under the kakahu of Ngai Tahu, will receive equitable delivery and services as stated under Article III of the Treaty of Waitangi.

It is notable here that not only are social development activities to be undertaken by the Iwi, but that they are taking over traditional welfare state functions (goals 1, 2), setting the tone and style according to their own ideas and customs (goal 3), and accepting responsibility for Maori from other iwi who live within the Ngai Tahu region (goal 6).

The Development Corporation presently has initiatives operating in health, education, employment and welfare. The bulk of the resources to fund these initiatives has come from the government, along with purchaser/provider contractual arrangements adopted by the national government, opening up opportunities for Ngai Tahu to provide a service for their people that makes appropriate cultural considerations part of the delivery. There is considerable funding being utilised by Ngai Tahu for the provision of services to Ngai Tahu children and their families. A strong move away from institutional and foster care has meant that the primary focus for these programmes has been traditional marae. An
example is the Tipu Ora health programme for mothers and children that provides home care from conception to five years. The basic principles of these programmes operate under Maori custom and traditional family (whanau) structures.

Many other examples could be cited, but the important thing to note is that Ngai Tahu are suddenly more in control of the delivery of essential social services to their own people through contractual arrangements with the government. They were also in the position in 1995 to invest $250,000 of their own money into education programmes. This included language and culture programmes as well as university and polytechnic student grants. There is also a coordinated approach, undertaken with local training establishments, to provide specialised training to meet the unique educational and employment needs of Ngai Tahu.

For those seeking to rehabilitate some form of social support and provision to Maori, the Ngai Tahu initiatives seem both effective and committed to the empowerment perspective. This suggested building of institutional or network capacity in a 'context dependent' fashion through local negotiation with 'intermediate forms of governance' as the source of 'institutional thickness' (Amin & Thrift 1995:55) and sound very much like the type of structures being developed by Ngai Tahu.

However, it must be stressed that the Ngai Tahu approach is not merely a romantic and localised one. They utilise government funding, using the contractual rhetoric of the New Right against it, as a way of getting control and management of their own services, but they also have significant power to resist the erosion of these services since Article 3 of the Treaty demands the Crown provide equity. This provides an important lever for iwi.

This approach by Ngai Tahu, however, based upon iwi territory, is controversial as it does not seem to relate, at least at face value, to Maori who do not live within the territory of their own iwi or who cannot trace a whakapapa to a particular iwi. Some of the institutions and groups, which have developed out of the Maori renaissance, seek other routes, based on other theories, to tino rangatiratanga or self-determination.
Possible Solutions For Maori

Changes are necessary to ensure a more equitable basis for the relationship between Maori and the Crown. While Article 3 of the Treaty demands that models be put in place immediately within Crown purchasing agencies to ensure iwi input, we would contend that ultimately, under Article 2, a structure needs to be developed that would move the "seat of power" involved in monitoring, evaluating, assessing, and resourcing groups working with Maori from the government departments to Maori themselves.

What the Maatua Whangai case tells us is that this relationship must be based on Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi and on traditional Maori social service delivery structures. In dealing with deep-seated problems, Maori must be able to develop initiatives that provide procedural equality (empowerment) which will then lead to substantive equality (content and distributive nature of those decisions) for their own service provision (Culpitt 1994). Maori must be in control of knowledge, practice and power through iwi/hapu structures.

In terms of power relationships there could be three main players in the area of Maatua Whangai practice and theory. The use of a trialectic creates a discursive field or an arena for multiple discourses and in so allows for a shifting of dominance. In this case it is proposed that Ngai Tahu form partnerships with both the Maori service providers and the Crown to move towards a situation where "the autonomy of the iwi be returned to the iwi".

A possible structure for Te Waipounamu, may look something like this (but decisions are up to local communities and Ngai Tahu!).
Incorporating an appropriate locally-controlled community structure to monitor, evaluate, assess, develop, provide training and resourcing for Maori service providers.

Trialectic Analysis

It is appropriate to use trialectic logic (Kelly and Sewell, 1991) for the analysis of such relationships. Unlike binary logic, with its emphasis on choice between two competing factors, or dialectic logic, which seeks resolution of a tension between two factors (thesis and anti-thesis, producing synthesis), trialectic logic is able to highlight power relationships where three or more irreducible elements are in a state of permanent tension. Such a dynamic is potentially important in regard to Maatua Whangai in as it could limit the ability of any of the players to control the field of practice and what passes as ‘truth’ in that field of practice. The inclusion of local iwi / Maori service providers and Ngai Tahu in the relationship would be a way of keeping the field of practice local (“think global, act local”) as well as honest. There is no resolution envisaged, just shifting of the power relationship between the three elements and the surrounding environment - permanently competing discourses in shifting relationships of dominance where a single final resolution is unlikely (Walker 1997). Rather than offering a ‘solution’ as such, trialectic logic alters the way in which a problem is perceived. Trialectic logic ‘holds three (or more) factors together, and it is out of the context of their relationships that new insights into social realities can emerge…’ The idea that Maatua
Whangai from the perspective of caregivers is just one of those new insights that can emerge, adds to ‘truth’ in a way that will hopefully change the dynamics of the discourses and the relationships of the main players (Walker 1997).

The differing discourses of the three players would establish accountability, not as ‘truth’ but as competing discourses, where the element of competition nature of the discourses is understood to be inherent in the relationship at its inception.

The development of a Maori structure for social service provision is what Mason Durie (1995) refers to as both Parallel Maori and Independent Maori institutions with the underlying principle being tino rangatiratanga. Such an institution would eventually become responsible for the monitoring, evaluation, assessment, development and resourcing of Maori social service provision. While the Maori infrastructure necessary for the development of these services is itself being harnessed and developed, current provision of services to Maori must be monitored by Maori. It is suggested that in Te Waipounamu (the South Island), this should be undertaken by Ngai Tahu in the form of Treaty of Waitangi audits in welfare, health, and education as part of the approval process to provide services under section 396 of the CYP&F Act 1989.

If Maori are ever to be in a good position to reverse some of the effects of 150 years of colonisation, the pathway ahead will include client-based empowerment and community control of their social service policy and delivery. A possible scenario could include the development of a Maori system, parallel to a community-controlled system, that contracts directly with the Crown utilising strategies similar to those already employed by Ngai Tahu.

**Conclusion**
This research began from the Maatua Whangai experience of caregivers as a way of shedding light on the development of tangata whenua social services.

To move beyond the problems of the past and present, it has been suggested that the
successful operation of a policy of empowerment requires the development of participatory networks of iwi decision-making and control of resources. If change is based on democratic, decentralised and participatory iwi/tangata whenua control, then the options and possibilities in New Zealand /Aotearoa seem to open out. The possibility of efficient, effective and preventive services for Maori children and families, indeed for all Maori citizens, is clearly within reach. Permanent kin-based networks of cooperation could clearly be much more effective social service tools than nationally-dictated and often inappropriate policies and funding decisions.

These new networks are apparent nowhere more than in iwi action for self-determination -tino rangatiratanga-in all areas of life. The example and developing reality of iwi decision-making and control of both economic resources and social services is not only an emerging possibility but also a beacon and marker for what can be achieved and the options open to all New Zealanders.

The change has already begun, in Maatua Whangai and its failure, in the CYP&F changes of 1989, and in the iwi development efforts of the Ngai Tahu and other iwi, for example, Ngati Porou and Ngati Kahungunu. What is required is that these continue. 'Empowerment' is indivisible, it cannot successfully exist in one area of life (e.g. child protection) if people are systematically deprived of their power to act in other areas. The converse, of course, is also true. Empowerment in one area can serve as a bridgehead (Trojan horse?) to extend empowerment into other areas. It is important therefore not to bemoan the restrictions or failures of Maatua Whangai or the CYP&F Act or other empowering measures, but to build upon them and upon the frustration engendered by their limitations. A broad constituency can be developed to both build networks and to force the structural changes needed.
Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

This thesis has been an exploration of the discourses of the Maatua Whangai provision of foster care through the Department of Social Welfare from a Maori caregiver perspective. These discourses and other historical material define Maatua Whangai provision and the power relationships it involved within a colonial construct. The study further identifies the methods by which dominance was achieved by departmental officials and the resistance to this dominance by caregivers.

**Background To Maatua Whangai o Aotearoa**

Maatua Whangai set out to alleviate the concerns of Maori regarding children in alternative and institutional care. In doing this, however, the Department captured and redefined what Maatua Whangai meant to both Pakeha and Maori, moving it away from its original purpose. Maatua Whangai was first repackaged to meet departmental needs and then sold back to its constituent and stateholder groups, especially iwi Maori.

Local response to the scheme was supportive at first as Maori caregivers saw the need for a dedicated fostercare scheme for Maori young people. In 1986 however a strong critique of government (departmental) practices towards Maori was issued in the form of a report, Puao-Te-Ata-Tu. This report strongly critiqued government institutions (considered to be monocultural and Pakeha) that usurped traditional Maori practices and left Maori with the bitter effects of personal, institutional, and cultural racism. It challenged the State and its role in social services practice of having total control over the Maori children in its care. This thesis has utilised the ideas generated by Puao-Te-Ata-Tu in order advocate shifting power from State control to a recognition of an iwi/hapu voice in matters regarding the care of Maori children.

In some ways the recommendations of this thesis could have been achieved by the State if it had implemented the recommendations of Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, especially those referring to the Maatua Whangai programme and the care of Maori children.

**Maori Knowledge and Maatua Whangai**

In the face of multiple understandings of Maatua Whangai and fostercare, this thesis has sought to define and clarify a number of contentious terms. To do this I utilised parts of...
the conceptual framework developed by Mead (1994), specifically He Whare Ngaro, He Whakamahana, Nga Whanaungatanga, He Whare Pukapuka, He Waka Pakaru, He Whanau Pakaru, and “keeping grandparents young.” This framework speaks of Maatua Whangai using traditional concepts, thereby basing the care of Maori children within traditional whanaungatanga relationships and responsibilities. In addition to this framework the discourses of various Maori people were utilised and outlined to illustrate it. Each story is different; the beauty and love expressed in them is a common thread, which makes them “whai ora,” that is living and flowing, especially to those who are whanaunga to those people.

Maatua Whangai O Otepoti

The design and conduct of this research involved collecting discourses from individual caregivers within Maatua Whangai O Otepoti. A detailed record of these discourses was obtained through individual (kanohi ki te kanohi) interviews and through collective means by way of hui.

These discourses explored five basic categories:

1. The induction into the Maatua Whangai Programme.
2. The meaning of Maatua Whangai for the participants.
3. The manipulation and use of the programme by the “Department.”
4. The effects of Maatua Whangai.
5. The future implications.

The above categories were then summarised and analysed and fed back to the hui which confirmed the following emerging themes:

- That caring for the young people in the programme was the most important part of the mahi.
- That this mahi had its costs in terms of our families, children and finances.
- That support was negligible from the Department of Social Welfare (the “Department”).
- That the Departmental (DSW) Maatua Whangai workers were supportive.
- That respondents formed their own support whanau and that their networks kept the system viable.
• That the young people who were placed in the respondents' care were often at-risk and with special needs.
• Some of the relationships that developed through the programme have become long-term ones.

Finally, the analysis of these discourses led to possible solutions to the issues and concerns raised by the respondents within the above themes. These solutions are based upon Tino Rangatiratanga principles centred on concepts of iwi control and self-determination, that would return foster care to a pre-colonial concept of Maatua Whangai and Tamaiti Whangai as used traditionally by Te Tai Tokerau and others.

Further, this movement to iwi control and development is located within the current emancipatory approach of Maori, but specially (due to location and context), Ngai Tahu.

**Conclusion**
Reforming the relationship between Maori and the State is essential to the development of iwi-based services to care for Maori children in this part of Te Wai Pounaamu and more generally Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Subaltern roles by Maori within government agencies are being challenged and are no longer being tolerated by Maori. These roles have led to a continuing disenfranchising of Maori as the 'Closing the Gaps' report illustrates (Te Puni Kokiri 2000).

A new solution must be found that attempts to equalise the power relationships between the parties to the Treaty and returns power to those who actually do the work. This must be undertaken in a way that validates traditional knowledge and tikanga rather than commodifying it under the guise of prescriptive contracting between Maori and the State.
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Appendix 1

The Treaty Of Watangi- Te Tiriti o Waitangi


Preamble: Her Majesty Victoria Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland regarding with Her Royal Favor the Native Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and anxious to protect their just Rights and Property and to secure to them the enjoyment of Peace and Good Order has deemed it necessary in consequence of the great number of Her Majesty's subjects who have already settled in New Zealand and the rapid extension of Emigration both from Europe and Australia which is still in progress to constitute and appoint a functionary properly authorised to treat with the Aborigines of New Zealand for the recognition of Her Majesty's sovereign authority over the whole or any part of those islands. Her Majesty therefore being desirous to establish a settled form of Civil Government with a view to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence of the necessary Laws and Institutions alike to the Native population and to Her subjects has been graciously pleased to empower and authorise me William Hobson a Captain in Her Majesty's Royal Navy Consul and Lieutenant-Governor of such parts of New Zealand as may be or hereafter shall be ceded to Her Majesty to invite the Confederated and Independent Chiefs of New Zealand to concur in the following Articles and Conditions.

Article the first.

The Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand and the separate independent Chiefs who have not become members of the Confederation cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty which the said Confederation or Individual Chiefs respectively exercise or possess, or may be supposed to exercise or possess over their respective Territories as the sole sovereigns thereof.

Article the second

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

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

William Hobson Consul and Lieutenant Governor

Article the fourth

The Governor says that the several faiths (beliefs) of England, of the Wesleyans, of Rome, and also the Maori customs shall alike be protected by him.
The Treaty of Waitangi The official Maori Version

Ko Wikitoria, to Kuini o Ingarangi i tana mahara atawhai ki nga Rangatira me nga Hapu o Niu Tireni i tana hiahia hoki kia tohungia ki a ratou o ratou rangatiratanga, me to ratou Whenua a kia mau tonu hoki to Rongo ki a ratou me te Atanoho hoki kua whakaaro ia he mea tika kia tukua mai tetahi Rangatira hei kaiwhakarite ki nga Tangata Maori o Nu Tireni-kia whakaaetia e nga Rangatira Maori te Kawanatanga o te Kuini ki nga wahi katoa o te Whenua nei me nga Motu-na te mea hoki he tokomaha ke nga tangata o tona Iwi kua noho ki tenei whenua, a e haere mai nei.

Na ko to Kuini e hiabia ana kia whakaritea te Kawanatanga kia kaua ai nga kino e puta mai ki te tangata Maori ki to Paketa e noho ture ana.

Na, kua pai to Kuini kia tukua ahau a Wiremu Hopihona he Kapitana i te Roiara Nawi hei Kawana mo nga wahi katoa o Nu Tireni c tukua aianei, a mua ki te Kuini e mea atu ana ia ki nga Rangatira o te whakaminenga o nga hapu o Nu Tireni me era Rangatira atu enei ture ka korerota nei.

**Ko to tuatahi**

Ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki ki hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki to Kuini o Ingarangi ake tonu atu te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.

**Ko te tuarua**

Ko te Kuini o Ingarangi ka wakarite ka wakaae ki nga Rangatira ki nga hapu ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani to tino Rangatiratanga c o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa. Otiia ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wahi wenua e pai ai te tangata nona te wenua-ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mona

**Ko te tuatoru**

Hei wakaritenga mai hoki tenei mo te wakaaetanga ki te Kawanatanga o te Kuini-Ka tiakina e te Kuini o Ingarangi nga tangata Maori katoa o Nu Tirani ka tukua ki a ratou nga tikanga katoa rite tahi ki ane mea ki nga tangata o Ingarangi.
Ko te tuawha

E mea ana te kawana ko nga whakapono katoa o Ingarangi, o nga Weteriana, o Roma, me te ritenga Maori hoki e tiakina ngatahitia e ia.

A literal English Translation of the Maori text. (Sir Hugh Kawharu)

Victoria the Queen of England, in her kind (gracious) thoughtfulness to the Chiefs and Hapu of New Zealand, and her desire to preserve to them their chieftainship and their land, and that peace and quietness may be kept with them because a great number of people of her tribe have settled in this country, and (more) will come, has thought it right to send a chieftain officer) as one who will make statement to (negotiate with) the Maori people of New Zealand. Let the Maori chiefs accept the governorship over all parts of this country and the islands. Now, the Queen desires to arrange the governorship lest evils should come to the Maori people and the Europeans living here without law. Now, the Queen has been pleased to send me, William Hobson, a Captain of the Royal Navy, to be Governor for all places of New Zealand which are now given up or shall be given up to the Queen. And she says to the Chiefs of the Confederation of the Hapu of New Zealand and the other chiefs, these are the Laws spoken of.

The first

The Chiefs of the confederation and all the Chiefs- who have not joined that confederation give absolutely to the Queen of England for ever the complete government of their land.

The second

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

The Third

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

William Hobson
Lieutenant-Governor
The Fourth

The Governor says that the several faiths (beliefs) of England, of the Wesleyans, of Rome, and also the Maori customs shall alike be protected by him.
Appendix 2

Maatua Whangai: The Perspectives Of Caregivers
Question Guidelines

Maatua Whangai Caregivers (client participants)
1) Demographic information – age group, sex, participant suburban roopu
2) What connected you to a suburban Maatua Whangai roopu?
3) Why and when did you start this kind of mahi (work)?
4) Tell us about some of the children you have whangaied (fostered)
5) What are some of your best and worst memories concerning the Maatua Whangai programme.
6) What are your thoughts in regards to the role of the Department of Social Welfare in over-seeing the programme.
7) Where did your supports come from and what were they?
8) What worked? What didn't?
9) Where to from here? What are the necessary ingredients for any further kaupapa Maori based initiatives to provide care for Maori children.
Maatua Whangai : The Perspectives Of Caregivers

INFORMATION SHEET FOR Participants.

Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa
Mihi mai ki tenei roopu
Mihi mai ki te kaupapa o Maatua Whangai
Natemea he kaupapa tino whakahirahira ki a koutou
No reira tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa.

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.

What is the Aim of the Project?
The aim of this project is to identify the experiences of caregivers in relation to the implementation of the Maatua Whangai programme within the Department of Social Welfare and compare and contrast these with the official departmental version. While much has been written from a departmental and academic perspective, very little is known of caregivers' perspectives.

What Type of Participants are being sought?
The participants will be caregivers drawn from the Dunedin Maatua Whangai whanau / suburban based roopu (groups). These roopu include caregivers from other suburbs who are connected by hapu / iwi.

The rationale for this is based on the fact that when the programme was instigated, these suburban based roopu (groups) were an essential part of the initial programme structure. Individual caregiver and focus group hui interviews will be drawn from these whanau roopu (groups).

Participants are male and female caregivers, aged between 30-60 years from the Dunedin Maatua Whangai Programme.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to participate in kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) interviews. These will take place at a venue of your choosing and will take approximately 1 hour plus kai which the researcher will provide.

You will also be required to attend a hui to discuss the information (your anonymity is assured) provided by all the participants. This hui will form a broad analysis of the emerging themes from the data, may take a whole day and will end with a celebrational hangi.

This is an opportunity to tell your story about Maatua Whangai. This korero may unearth some long forgotten memories which need to be
worked through before we can "move on" to better things that are Kaupapa Maori.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?**

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?**

The data collected will consist of your stories, thoughts, and feelings in regards to Maatua Whangai.

The data is being collected to achieve the following objectives:

- To identify strengths and weaknesses of the Maatua Whangai programme.
- In order to make suggestions for how Maori social services can substantively respond to Article 2 & 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi.

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 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.

**The use which will be made of the data and who will have access to it**

The information will be made available to the participants who will be given the opportunity to check the transcripts of interviews to ensure they are accurate. If a participant has problems with reading, at the end of the session the audio tape will be made available to them to listen to and change anything they see fit before transcription. A copy of each participants transcript will be returned to them on request.

All interview material will be labelled with codes which do not identify individuals. Information on codes will be kept secure and confidential to the researchers. All information will be kept in the researchers office in a locked cabinet. On completion of the reporting of the study, the original data will be stored by the Community and Family Studies Unit as required by the University. The following people will have access to the information but only the researcher will know the anonymity codes:

1) Researcher: Shayne Walker
2) Supervisor: Dr P. T. Shannon
3) Supervisor Dr R Bishop.
4) Kaumatua: Kuao Langsbury

Results of this project may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant.
You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, 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.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**

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

Shayne Walker  
Department of Community and Family Studies  
Telephone Number: 4795271

Dr Pat Shannon  
Department of Community and Family Studies  
Telephone Number: 4797666

Dr Russell Bishop  
Department of Education  
Telephone Number: 4798616

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Otago.
Maatua Whangai: The Perspectives Of Caregivers

CONSENT FORM FOR Participants.

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. 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 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.
4. in the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I am reminded of my right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that I may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to myself of any kind.
5. the data [audio tapes] will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project 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;
6. I understand that the results of the study will be treated in strict confidence and that I will remain anonymous. Within these restrictions, results of the study will be made available to me at my request.
7. any personal information gathered during the study will not be passed on to anyone for any other purpose.
8. the results of the project may be published but my anonymity will be preserved.

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant) (Date)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Otago.
SOCILOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF AOTEAROA (NEW ZEALAND)
CODE OF ETHICS

Purpose of the Code of Ethics

This code of ethics has a regulatory function but, for the most part, provides
guidelines for ethical behaviour and decision-making with respect to research,
teaching, publishing and professional conduct. Ultimately, individual
sociologists must take responsibility for their ethical behaviour.

This code is not a fixed document. Its revision is an ongoing process.

The context of ethical judgements

The social and political context in which ethical judgements are made by
sociologists is important. Due regard should be given to the following:

(i) The social world is plural, contradictory and conflictual. It is hard to
establish that there exists a singular, non-contradictory "public good".

(ii) Relations of power are involved in all sociological pursuits.

(iii) Sociologists should recognise research as not neutral and should make
explicit their epistemological postulates and assumptions.

(iv) Sociologists study sociological problems and topics rather than people
per se; people should not be treated as objects in the process of doing
research.

(v) Research has effects at a wider social level, as well as on individuals,
and these should be addressed.

(vi) The Treaty of Waitangi has implications for both the production and
dissemination of sociological knowledge.

Ethical Statements

3 Sociologists' responsibilities and obligations to colleagues, and hence to the
discipline, are based on the vital benefits of peer review of research and
scholarship and on the desirability of maintaining accessibility to research.

4 Sociologists should report results honestly, avoid actions that will violate or
diminish the rights of research participants or clients and avoid raising false
hopes.

5 Researchers have a responsibility to raise ethical issues with all research team
members prior to and while undertaking research.

6 Researchers should protect the welfare and privacy of the people or
organisations participating in the research. People and collectivities do not have
an absolute right to privacy in their public capacity.

7 Researchers should protect privacy where appropriate by adequately disguising
personal identities in written and oral reports of the research and by discussing
only data germane to the purpose of the research.

8 Researchers should not reveal information received in the course of the research
where an assurance of confidentiality has been promised.

9 Researchers should inform research participants and funding agencies of any
limits of confidentiality and anonymity.

10 Researchers should respect the right of funding agencies, hosts institutions and
publishers to be given adequate information about the research and to have their
contribution acknowledged.

11 Researchers have a responsibility to maintain high standards of competence and
to maintain knowledge of current information and methods in the areas they are
researching.

12 Researchers should make full and honest disclosure, in both written reports and
to researched participants, of financial and other forms of support of their
research.

13 Researchers should give an account of their methodology and report the
limitations of their research design.

14 Researchers should ensure that information of interest to individuals, groups and
organisations be made available in a timely, acceptable and accessible manner.

15 Any claims or conclusions presented by the researchers ought to be supported by
the evidence.

Research participants

16 Wherever appropriate, informed consent should be sought from those
individuals directly involved in the research to be undertaken. Thus, researchers
should:

- inform participants about the purpose and nature of the research and its
possible implications for them.

- make it clear that all have the freedom of choice to participate or not. This
includes students.

- make it clear to research participants from whom formal consent has been
obtained that they may withdraw that consent at any time.

17 Researchers should attempt to anticipate and avoid possible harm to participants.
However, where harm occurs, researchers have an obligation to take all possible
steps to minimise such harm, and to account for their actions.

18 Research participants are entitled to receive appropriate feedback on the
outcome of research; researchers should make provision for this.
Contractual Research

19 Before the research starts, the researcher should clarify with the client:
- the right of the researcher to use the research results commercially or
otherwise, or to publish research and information independently from the
client.
- the nature of the responsibility and liability of the researcher regarding the
use made of the research results by the client once the research is completed.

20 When working for a multiplicity of clients which can be or are in competitive
positions, the right to use information and results across projects should be
carefully defined beforehand.

21 When research results are published independently by the researcher, the
institutional context within which the research took place should be made clear.
This includes the objective of the client organisation, the nature and extent of
funding and the role of the client in framing and defining the research.

Teaching and Student Research

22 Ethical consequences outlined in this document apply equally to student research
and ethics should be included in the training of sociologists.

23 Teachers are responsible for the ethics of any research required of undergraduate
students.

24 Supervisors have a responsibility to discuss with each graduate student the ethics
of that student’s research.

25 Students retain ethical responsibility for their own actions. Students should take
account of the advice on ethics provided by their teachers and supervisors.

26 Supervisors and teachers have a responsibility to ensure that the community is
not misused as a student resource. They must take care not to exploit groups
through repetitive and burdensome demands.

27 When student research is funded by outside agencies, supervisors have a
responsibility to ensure that a suitable research contract is agreed upon which
provides appropriate remuneration, explicit agreements as to ownership and the
use of data produced, and protection against unethical pressures.

Authorship

28 Sociologists must acknowledge all persons who contributed significantly to the
research and publication process.

29 Material taken from published or unpublished work must be identified and
referred to its author(s).

Procedures and Conventions

30 This Code of Ethics has educational as well as exhortative and regulatory
dimensions. We acknowledge that a major goal envisaged in the development
and promulgation of this Code of Ethics is the enhancement of our collective
knowledge of ethical issues and sensitivity to the various ways in which such
issues may arise; and we affirm the responsibility of our Association to promote
the development of such knowledge and sensitivity among all sociologists
whether or not they are members of the Association. A resource group, whose
names will be published annually in the Association’s newsletter, will be
available for consultation by members throughout the year and will be
represented at annual conferences of the Association.

31 When a sociologist who is a member of the Sociological Association of
Aotearoa violates ethical standards, sociologists who know first-hand of such
activities should, if possible, attempt to rectify the situation. Failing an informal
solution, sociologists should bring unethical activities to the attention of the
Executive of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa. An Ethics Committee, a
sub-committee of the Executive, will be appointed to consider the matter and
will forward a recommendation to the Executive of the Sociological Association
of Aotearoa (New Zealand) for consideration. The recommendation may or may
not be one of the following actions:

(a) Apply no sanctions.
(b) Suspend the membership and attendant privileges of a member for a
period to be recommended by the Ethics Committee.
(c) Request the resignation of a member.
(d) Terminate the membership of a member.

In every case, including when the Committee concludes that the activity
discussed was not unethical, a report is to be made to the membership outlining
the issues and describing the criteria by which the conclusions were reached.

A member of the Association may ask the Ethics Committee to consider (and the
Executive Committee to make a statement on) the ethical standing of work
presented as “sociological research”, or by people identifying themselves as
“sociologists”.

Ratified by Sociological Association
of Aotearoa (New Zealand), Annual
General Meeting, 7 December 1990
Glossary

Please note This glossary is a record of Maori words used in this thesis. Some that are used are not included in this glossary for they only appear once or are explained within the text or are better understood within their context. Most of the words used in this thesis have many meanings, however the meanings described here are those that make sense within the text, and are the meanings the author or speaker intends. In accordance with that, there are no meanings “that step outside the usual discursive practice of modern Maori” (Bishop 1995: 258). To inform my understanding of the meanings detailed here I have referred to William’s Dictionary of the Maori Language. I have decided not to use macrons or double vowels to indicate vowel length because as text, the intention of the Maori terms is not compromised by lack of pronunciation guidance. In terms of dialects I have also chosen not to use the Kai Tahu nuances as to do so may confuse the reader and avert their mind from the content.

ako: teaching/learning
ariki: chief
aroha: love in its broadest sense
atua: god
awhi: helping
hapu: sub-tribe, usually linked to a common ancestor, or pregnant.
hui: ceremonial, ritualised meeting
iwi: tribe, or ko iwi, that is bones
kai: food
kaitiaki: guide or look after
karakia: prayer/chant, recited to clear the way for a new activity
kaumatua: respected elder
kaupapa: agenda
kawa: protocol
koha: gift
korero: speak, talk
kuia: female elder
kura: school
Kura Kaupapa Maori: Maori medium primary schools

mahi: work

mamae: sadness or pain

mana motuhake: absolute power

mana whenua: Maori people whose whakapapa is rooted in the local arena are said to be responsible for the mana of that area

mana: power

manaaki: hospitality, caring

Maori: indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand

marae: ceremonial meeting place

mata waka: Maori people living in an area, whose whakapapa is rooted in another area.

mihi: ritualised self introduction

mokai: slave, captive

mokopuna: grandchild

Pakeha: New Zealander of European descent

pakeke: older adult

paua: grandfather (Kai tahu dialect)

powhiri: ceremonial rituals of welcome and introductions

rangatira: chief

rangatiratanga: chiefly control

ropu: group

runanga: tribal council

take: subject for discussion

tamaiti whangai/atawhai: child in foster care

tangata whenua: indigenous people

tangi: funeral or crying

taonga tuku iho: treasures past down to the present generation from the ancestors.

taonga: treasures, including physical, social, cultural and intellectual.

taua: grandmother

tauiwai: foreigner
tautoko: support

te reo: Maori language

Te Kohanga Reo: Maori medium pre-schools

tika: correct

tikanga: customs, values, beliefs and attitudes

tino Rangatiratanga: self-determination

tipuna/tupuna: ancestor

tohunga: expert

tukana/teina: older/younger

waiata: song

wairua: spirituality

waka: canoe, used here as meaning that waka that is of significance to the identity of a
particular whanau, hapu or iwi and usually mentioned in a mihi

wairuatanga: spirituality

whaikoreo: ritualised, ceremonial speech making, oratory.

whakapakiri whanau: strengthen whanau

whakapapa: genealogy

whakawhanaungatanga: establishing relationships

whanau: extended family

whanaunga: relative

whanaungatanga: relationships

whangai: to feed

whenua: the land, and afterbirth