

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

The Journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū: what did we learn?

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Social Work
in
Social Work
at Massey University, Manawatu
Aotearoa New Zealand.

Florrie Henrietta Brooking

2018

Abstract

“Pūao-te-Ata-tū The heralding of a New Dawn”, How could a simple policy document sustain so much mana over a thirty year period of time? Being a new, young Māori social work practitioner in the late 1990s was an influential time for the researcher, and there was an on-going relevance and significance of this policy document Pūao-te-Ata-tū that was difficult to explain. It would seem that Māori were still a predominant feature in the clientele for the welfare system, yet this document pledged to address the inconsistencies in policy and practice to address those very unbalanced statistics.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was published thirty years ago – how much did it change practice in Child, Youth and Family, did it lead to the changes expected? Apart from working through policy, literature and legislation another approach was to go back to those involved with the Ministerial review committee at the time and seek their views on what their expectations were then and what their reflections are now. The findings of this thesis highlighted a clear factor that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was much more than just a policy document, it was an approach that has never been replicated but its authenticity as a voice for the people was immeasurable. There was also significance in the period in which this review took place; the social climate in Aotearoa New Zealand at the time was changing. These changing times were driven by dynamic people who took risks and approach things in an unconventional fashion. As fluid and free as change may have seemed at the time our findings were that overall change will only occur if the political powers in place support that change wholeheartedly. Pūao-te-Ata-tū although not successful in its full entirety, it may not have yet exposed its full potential; there is capacity within its powerful doctrine that its best is still to come.

Preface

This research project is influenced by my whānau, culture, work histories, age, gender and my capabilities. I will introduce and explore myself in my introduction, however my employment history triggered my desire to explore and re-visit the creation of this unique document *Pūao-te-Ata-tū: Day break: The Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. My approach to this research report was from the perspective of an ex-practitioner for Child, Youth and Family seeking to explore what made Pūao-Te-Ata-tū so different, what can we learn about its approach that will assist in ensuring there are no further injustices against Māori at a systematic level. This research explores the reflective narratives of those close to Pūao-Te-Ata-tū at the time of its inception, unfortunately not all of the committee members were approached for feedback.

Acknowledgements

Firstly acknowledgment must go to my participants without your commitment to meeting and speaking with me certainly none of this would have been possible. I am truly indebted to you for your willingness to share your history, knowledge and reflections with me.

Secondly I would like to acknowledge the supervisors who have supported me in my journey through this research, thank you for your final push across the line, Awhina English and Lareen Cooper and Rachael Selby, we made it!!!

To my past colleagues from the Department of Child, Youth and Family, our Roopu group thank you for instilling in me the passion for Pūao-te-Ata-tū may it long live on to strive for a better way forward for all Māori. To my current colleagues at Eastern Institute of Technology, for the support, encouragement and inspiration to continue when it became tough. My learning here is something that I will carry through with me on my journey and hope to support and inspire others on their journey. Thank you for the proof-reading, discussions and debates they certainly helped along the way.

Lastly and by no means the least my family, I'm speechless you have all provided me with the means for which this journey started and the motivation for which it continued. It has been a long journey and along the way I have received congratulations for my progress but that congratulations must go to you all, my children Epai and Kaiarahi for sacrificing my time with you to get this kaupapa done. Thanks must also go to my partner Lionel, my Mum and Dad for the babysitting, growling's and genuine support to complete this kaupapa. To my wider family who supported my family to support me in getting this across the finish line.

Ehara taku toa, he takitahi, he toa takitini

My success should not be bestowed onto me alone, as it was not individual success but success of a collective.¹

¹ Author unknown: As cited in <http://www.Māori.cl/Proverbs.htm>

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Preface	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Abbreviations.....	8
Chapter One: Introduction.....	9
Staging Pūao-te-Ata-tū.....	12
He Mihi.....	12
Ko Wai Au?.....	13
Chapter Two: Pūao-te-Ata-tū.....	16
Introduction	16
Terms of Reference.....	19
Membership.....	20
Recommendations	21
Appendices.....	22
Summary	23
Chapter Three: Literature Review.....	24
Introduction	24
Social Climate	24
Political Climate	26
Institutional Racism.....	27
Māori Advisory Unit Report	29
DSW background to Pūao-te-Ata-tū	30
Legislation.	31
Reviews of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.....	33
Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel.....	37
State of Care Report.....	38
Summary	39
Chapter Four: Methodology	42
Introduction	42
Theoretical Framework.....	43
Māori centred research.	44
Kaupapa Māori Approach.	47
A Narrative Approach.	49

Semi-Structured Interviews	50
Qualitative Methodology	51
Participants	52
Recruitment	53
Organising Interviews	53
Interview Questions	54
Recording the interviews	55
Data analysis	55
Ethical Considerations.....	56
Privacy and Confidentiality	58
Risk of harm verses benefits of the research.....	59
Conflicts.....	59
Summary	60
Chapter Five: Findings.....	61
Introduction	61
Interview Themes	62
The Consultation Process.....	62
The Document.....	65
Dynamic People	68
John Rangihau	69
Dame Ann Hercus.	69
Pākehā Responses to Pūao-te-Ata-tū.	70
Political Influence.....	72
Summary	75
Chapter Six: Analysis	77
Introduction	77
The Process	77
The Document.....	79
Outcomes.....	82
Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989	82
Te Punga: Our Bi-cultural Strategy for the Nineties (1994)	84
Care and Protection is about Adults Behaviour (Mick Brown Review 2000).....	87
Other Relevant Documents.....	91
Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel (2015)	93

Dynamic People	97
John Rangihau	99
Dame Ann Hercus	100
Pākehā Responses to Pūao-te-Ata-tū	101
Political Influence.....	101
Current Implications	102
Conclusion.....	103
Chapter Seven: Conclusion	105
Summary of Research	106
Chapter Two:.....	106
Chapter Three:	107
Chapter Four	111
Chapter Five	111
The Process	111
The Document.....	113
Dynamic People	115
Pākehā Response to Puao-te-Ata-tu.....	116
Research Questions	116
Recommendations	120
Glossary.....	122
Reference	124
Appendix A: Cover Letter and Advertisement for participants	132
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	135
Appendix C: Ethics Approval Letter	136

Abbreviations

DSW	Department of Social Welfare
WARAG	Women Against Racism Action Group
MAU	Māori Advisory Unit
NZASW	New Zealand Association of Social Workers
TWSWA	Tangata Whenua Social Workers Association
ANZASW	Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers
CYF	Child, Youth and Family
CYPF Act	Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989
CYP Act	Children and Young Persons Act 1974

Chapter One: Introduction

“Whaia te iti kahurangi

Ki te tūohu koe

Me he maunga teitei”

Seek the treasure you value most dearly

If you bow your head

Be it to a lofty mountain²

Thirty years ago Pūao-te-Ata-tū was published – this ground breaking document set out the changes required to stop discrimination against Māori in Child, Youth and Family. This research sets out to investigate the impact of this Report through in depth interviews with the original participants.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was published thirty years ago – how much did it change practice in Child, Youth and Family, did it lead to the changes expected? What would the original participants in the development of the Report say today? This reports sets out the answer to these questions.

Research Questions One: Explore the participants’ perceptions of the intentions of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and examine the experiences and reflections of the participants 26 years after the Report.

Research Question Two: Examine the participants’ expectations on the delivery of services to Māori by DSW and its successors as a result of the Report.

² Author unknown: As cited in <http://www.Māori.cl/Proverbs.htm>.

Research Question Three: Outline the implications for social workers, for Māori families and for Māori communities.

Research Question Four: Explore what has changed and what has been achieved as a result of the enquiry:

- Intentionally;
- Unintentionally.

This research looks at the Pūao-te-Ata-tū from the perspectives of those that were involved in the creation of the report. In 1986 a review was commissioned by the Honourable Dame Ann Hercus following the report a by the Māori Advisory Unit in 1985 into the claims that there was institutional racism within the Department of Social Welfare. Dame Ann Hercus selected John Rangihau to lead a knowledgeable team of social workers in undertaking the report that aimed to redress the discrimination that Māori were suffering through the Department of Social Welfare at the time. This task was achieved through intensive hui around the country and the process followed was so unique it has never been replicated in the last 30 years since. Furthermore, Pūao-te-Ata-tū is still deemed by many Māori social workers to be an image of the ‘ideal’ and a guiding document for how to better support Māori whānau. For this reason, I chose to go back to the original members of the Committee and ask them to reflect on:

Research Question One: Their perceptions of the intentions of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and to examine the experiences and reflections of the participants 26 years after the Report.

Research Question Two: Their expectations on the delivery of services to Māori by DSW and its successors as a result of the Report.

Research Question Three: Outline the implications for social workers, for Māori families and for Māori communities.

Research Question Four: Explore what has changed and what has been achieved as a result of the enquiry:

- Intentionally;
- Unintentionally.

It was a reflective approach in that the participants were asked to explore their thoughts pre and post the report. This chapter describes my position as a researcher and gives an outline of the thesis document as a whole.

I have chosen to use both Māori and English languages and to provide a glossary.

Staging Pūao-te-Ata-tū

Pūao-te-Ata-tū came about at a time when people were no longer complacent with the injustices of the world and as such there was an upsurge in social action demanding redress for these injustices and inequalities. This worked in support of a large number of Māori whom unfortunately had been involved in the welfare state in some capacity. The korero that was occurring during the time of the review were that an astounding number of Māori children were being institutionally managed under the guise of ‘care’ in a manner that was in strong contradiction to tikanga Māori and consequently they were being re abused and re-victimised by the state (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015)

He Mihi

Te taha o tōku pāpā

Ko Whetumatarau te maunga

Ko Awatere te awa

Ko te whānau ā Tuwhakairiora, me te Whānau ā Kahu oku hapu

Ko Hinerupe me Awatere oku marae

Kei Punaruku taku kainga tūturu

Te taha o tōku māmā:

Ko Puakemaire te maunga

Ko Reporua te awa

Ko Ngāti Rangī te hapu

Ko Ngāti Porou te iwi.

Ko Wai Au?

Given my tribal links I identify as Ngāti Porou tūturu and it is this staunchness that establishes the determination I feel in ensuring that Pūao-te-Ata-tū lives to survive another day. I bring my whakapapa to my research role, I bring my nearing 20 year history of working within the field of social work in Aotearoa New Zealand, including 11 of those years specifically under the umbrella of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and more so the Children, Young Person and their Families Act 1989. The positioning and relevance I gave to Pūao-te-Ata-tū was very much self-directed but entirely supported by my Māori colleagues. It was this experience that gave me the stance and desire to explore where Pūao-te-Ata-tū originated from and what the objectives of it were. In my current role as an educator in social work this desire was enhanced through exploring the history and development of social work in Aotearoa New Zealand and the yearning to explore the delivery and service to Māori. It seemed inevitable when seeking research options that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was going to feature within that in some capacity. I was appointed as a care and protection social worker in 1998, although some time after the publication of Pūao-te-Ata-tū my colleagues and the departmental training and policy literature all referred to this document ‘Pūao-te-Ata-tū’. As a young impressionable social worker Pūao-te-Ata-tū gave an immediate sense that it held a great sense of ‘mana’ within the realms of Child, Youth and Family.

Outline of Thesis

There are seven chapters to this thesis including this introduction which helps to set the scene for this research and its approach. **Chapter Two** provides the historical context of Pūao-te-Ata-tū highlighting that it was more than a Ministerial review; everything about it has a strong alignment and significance to Te Ao Māori me ōna tikanga. It articulates those relevant aspects of Pūao-te-Ata-tū exploring its membership, the process itself as well as the published document. This chapter aims to provide the reader with the fundamentals of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Chapter Three explores the literature relevant to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This includes exploring in detail what was occurring in Aotearoa New Zealand at the time that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was instigated including the social and political climate as this frames the context at the time that Pūao-te-Ata-tū occurred. Then there have been many reviews and restructures of the Department since Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Chapter Three will explore those in an attempt to develop a timeline.

The methodological approach and theoretical framework which is firmly grounded in Māori centred and kaupapa Māori approach is explained in **Chapter Four**. Furthermore investigation of the narrative approach used with the participants will be considered.

Additionally this pedagogy also supports the semi-structured interview approach. With Pūao-te-Ata-tū nearing 30 years since its inception and given that some of the original members of the committee have since passed it was essential that the approach for participants had to be targeted. Those intricacies are explored in **Chapter Four**.

The findings are set out in Chapter **Five**. The themes start to come through when articulating the participant's responses to the interview questions. The participants' voices are articulated through identified themes.

Chapter Six will analyse the information taken from the participants. The themes identified within the findings will be further expanded on and developed in the analysis. Chapter Six will strengthen the narratives given by the participants through their 'shared stories'.

Finally **Chapter Seven** will explore the conclusions of this research. The conclusions will explore the identified themes and define the key learnings' from within each theme. Also explored will be future research and implications. The concluding statement challenges those in positions of power today to truly consider a process and framework that articulates the essence of the Māori centred and kaupapa Māori approach. We are in an era of change to our current welfare system, are these newly forming changes truly going to vary from the 14 historical reviews, only time will tell.

Chapter Two: Pūao-te-Ata-tū

“The shining rays of Rā,

the Sun glistens upon the bosom of Hine Tītama,

Goddess of the dawn and day break.

Tamanui a Rangi,

the Sky God brightens Pūao-te-Ata-tū

upon the fish and canoe of Māui”

Introduction

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was developed at a time of significant change in Aotearoa New Zealand. The 1980s saw the establishment of many activist groups and calls for change in Aotearoa New Zealand it was an era where society was beginning to notice the injustice faced by Māori. This chapter introduces Pūao-te-Ata-tū, It will explain the report and provide a breakdown of the contents of that report. The context and literature around this topic will be elaborated on through the literature review. Pūao-te-Ata-tū (Day Break): Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare was a government review of the systems, service delivery and policy within the Department of Social Welfare (DSW).³ A key driver of the call for this Report was the work of a group of nine Pākehā women who formed the Women Against Racism Action Group (WARAG). They produced a report that identified institutional racism within the DSW: Tamaki-makau-rau. The overall conclusion of that report read:

³ This report is widely known as Pūao-te-Ata-tū and will be referred as such throughout this report. Referencing details will appear when direct quotes have been used.

8.1 The group's working premise that "The Department of Social Welfare practises institutional racism" has been substantiated in the four areas which were researched:

(1) The ethnic composition of staff is dominated by Pākehā

(2) The recruitment, selection and promotion of staff is culturally biased in favour of Pākehā applicants.

(3) Staff training is monocultural and ignores the issue of personal and institutional racism.

(4) The physical environment is monocultural and alienating to Māori consumers.

(New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985a, pp. 21-22)

The WARAG report only focused on these four areas although the data that the group held highlighted 12 areas of concern. These outcomes and conclusions concerned the Minister of Social Welfare, Dame Ann Hercus and resulted in her seeking a report from the Māori Advisory Unit (MAU) which was a unit within DSW that investigated the "...Department of Social Welfare's capacity to meet the demands of the Māori people in relation to service delivery" (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985b). Within the findings of the MAU report they state that:

[T]he WARAG report confirms what Māori people have been saying for decades... We the Māori Advisory Unit recommend that the Task Force to work on racism within DSW, be made up of Māori and non-Māori, that the Māori members may if need be, selected from other departments or, community and co-opt on to the working group (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985b).

These reports triggered the action that inevitably saw the furnishing of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was presented to the Minister, Dame Ann Hercus on the 1 July 1986; this was a year after Dame Ann Hercus requested the review and gave a timeframe of six months. John Rangihau led this review and it was a fitting denouement to his distinguished career. The process that Pūao-te-Ata-tū followed at the time was unique and certainly not seen in these levels within Parliament before. It involved 69 hui of which 39 were held on marae or at community halls around the country and the committee also met with all DSW staff. This consultation was wide. For example although it did not formally involve attendance at tangihanga some participants state that John Rangihau when travelling with this committee, would not drive past a tangihanga and always travelled prepared for these unscheduled events (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015; N. Baker, personal communication, April 7, 2015). The approach taken was neither prescribed nor deliberate; it was completed in a true Māori approach for all intents and purposes. John Rangihau and the committee would not select the marae to visit those arrangements were made by the Haukainga and Iwi and they would attend through invitation only, they were not going to dictate the process, this formulated a Māori-led process (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015). Furthermore upon completion of the gathering of information and prior to publishing Pūao-te-Ata-tū the committee facilitated a National Hui for two days in which “two representatives of each of the marae visited by the committee, other kaumātua, heads of Government social service departments, all regional district directors of Social Welfare Department and the Department of Māori Affairs along with Senior Head Office representatives of DSW and other Departments” were invited to attend (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986, p. 45). This was to formally advise those who had assisted with Pūao-te-Ata-tū of its findings and conclusions. The committee believed “...that an oral approach to our work was the traditional approach of Maori people to which they would respond” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986 p.17). John Rangihau was

charged with leading this review and with no framework to approach it he reverted to what he knew and took ‘Tūturu Māori’⁴ approach.

Terms of Reference

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was formed out of the identification of institutional racism within the Department charged with the care and protection of our most vulnerable, children and youth. The terms of reference for the committee at the time were very broad. They were to advise the Minister on the “...most appropriate means to achieve the goal of an approach which would meet the needs of Māori in policy, planning and service delivery” within the Department (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986 p.5). The advisory committee were given four specific tasks they were:

1. *Assess the current capability of the Department in relation to the declared goal;*
2. *Identify those aspects which militate against attainments of the goal;*
3. *Propose a strategy for overcoming problems and deficiencies identified, and;*
4. *Report with recommendation to the Minister of Social Welfare (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986 p. 5).*

Dame Ann Hercus also stated particular requirements that she wanted explored:

- (a) *Identification of Māori clients’ needs;*
- (b) *Establishing effective contact with tribal groups;*
- (c) *Appropriate direction of programmes to meet community and clients’ needs;*
- (d) *Possibilities for decentralisation and devolution;*
- (e) *Appropriate requirements and mechanisms for accountability;*
- (f) *How attitudinal change can be most effectively achieved;*

⁴Tuturu Māori-A philosophical doctrine incorporating Māori knowledge, skills, attitudes and values.

(g) *Appropriate public relations for the exercise.* (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986 p.5)

The committee had no template or framework to model from so John Rangihau had an unrestricted opportunity. He needed to propose how this could be achieved and who was going to form this team responsible with carrying out this crucial task.

Membership

This committee was made up of members who came from Department of Social Welfare, Māori Affairs and the State Service Sector. John Rangihau was very strategic in the selection of his committee membership. There were 6 committee members, Mr Neville Baker, Deputy Secretary, Department of Māori Affairs was a representative for Dr Tamati Reedy, the Secretary for the Department of Māori Affairs at that time. Mr Baker at the time was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Māori Affairs. Another member was Ms Donna Hall who was beginning her legal career and was “bubbling up out of the pools of Rotorua” (D. Hauraki, personal communication April 9, 2015). John Grant was the Director General of the Department of Social Welfare at the time and accordingly it was his Department that had been so closely researched. It is reported that John Grant was very cynical at the time about the purpose and process being followed; “...however he became one of the committee’s strongest advocates” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015). Mrs Emarina (Lena) Manuel brought a history and knowledge base steeped in Te Reo Māori and more specifically translation. She was a Welfare Officer for the DSW for many years and was well known in the Wairoa/Tairāwhiti regions. Mr Horii Brennan’s most notable role was that he was one of a group of kaumātua responsible for the establishment of the Ngā Hau e Whā Marae based in Christchurch. The late Mr Peter Boag made the sixth member of the committee and he came from the State Services Commission. Mr Boag was a very strong advocate for Māori in the many roles that he had and “...in 1977 he suggested that the high

proportions of Māori pupils who played truant, and of Māori in penal institutions, was a symptom of the failure in education” (Pickmere, 2006, p. 9). These six committee members were led by John Rangihau. There were a number of support staff also. These were a team of 4 staff advisors; Mr John (Doug) Hauraki, Mr Raoul Ketko, Mr Albert Williams and Mr Robert (Kim) Workman. The committee were also supported by a number of administrative staff.

Recommendations

Pūao-te-Ata-tu was the result of an unprecedented consultation process instigated by Dame Ann Hercus and led by John Rangihau. Pūao-te-Ata-tū: A Ministerial Advisory Committee Report presented 13 very clear and articulate recommendations, each focused on a specific area.

The first and second recommendations were similar as they were focusing on “attacking and eradicating” racism from a policy perspective across a number of sectors but also included an operational objective. Following this, recommendation three called for a new focus in the area of the Social Security Commission, the Committee were requesting the establishment of a Social Welfare Commission of which one of their responsibilities would be for the purpose of monitoring and developing the relationships between the state and Māori.

The fourth recommendation was a call to amend the current legislation; the fifth recommendation also involved legislation in seeking an equalisation of benefits through the Social Security Act. Following on from this was the recommendation looking at regional responsibility with the establishment of District Executive Committees.

The seventh recommendation focussed on Mātua Whāngai, and there was a call for this initiative to return to its original focus which was to nurture children within their family group. Following this was a call for an increase in collaboration between four departments;

Social Welfare, Māori Affairs, Education and Labour to focus on looking at improving the skill and work experience of the young and unemployed.

Recommendation nine and ten focused heavily on the staff of the DSW. Nine focused on recruitment to the agency and ten focused on the upskilling and training opportunities for the current staff. The next recommendation requested change regarding a number of issues raised by people all across the country and that was to address customer satisfaction and service. Recommendation twelve was a request seeking that the Royal Commission on Social Policy (which was occurring at the same time as Pūao-te-Ata-tū) explores the issues raised by Pūao-te-Ata-tū within their considerations.

The final recommendation called for a community based coordinated approach to the cultural, economic and social problems that cause tensions in cities and the regions. These were the 13 recommendations posed by the group and many have spoken of Pūao-te-Ata-tū's simplicity (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015 and N. Baker, personal communication, April 7, 2015) and although the number of recommendations were small they covered the necessary requirements in trying to attack and eradicate racism that was occurring at the time and also it called for the establishment of other factors to cease any future tensions and imbalances.

Appendices

Although Pūao-te-Ata-tū proposed a number of “structural and legislative changes”, it also contains a well-regarded expose’ on the cultural history of Aotearoa New Zealand contained within its appendices (Walker, 1987). Walker (1987, p. 91) states that:

“In a concise synopsis it traces the roots of Māori dependency in the historic process of colonisation. It then addresses the contemporary significance of the Treaty of Waitangi before unveiling the many faces of racism”.

The appendices provide an astute and comprehensive history of New Zealand dating from 1840 to the situation in 1986 which resulted in the institutional racism within the Department of Social Welfare.

Summary

Pūao-te-Ata-tū provides recommendations for action and key points framing the rationale for each recommendation. The writers have also, where appropriate added the individuals' voice through quotes. All consultation hui were recorded and transcribed. Also there are appendices attached which articulate the cultural history of New Zealand leading to the situation which warranted the review. The appendices also listed the individuals and agencies who provided written submissions and also the physical attendance at each of the 39 marae and community hall hui held. The information regarding the verbal and written submissions received by the committee was exhaustive and valuable. The following chapter will explore what literature has been published relating to Pūao-te-Ata-tū in a broader sense than focussing down on its successes.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

Introduction

Pūao-te-Ata-tū is a subject which influences many different disciplines as it focuses on the injustices to Māori by Government through policy and legislation. It has been studied by those interested in the Māori philosophy behind it; social researchers have investigated Pūao-te-Ata-tū's influence on society and historians have mapped its relevance in Aotearoa, New Zealand history. This literature review will highlight what is available in the research fields regarding Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Firstly it will explore what was occurring in the social and political spectrum in Aotearoa New Zealand leading up to the request for Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Pūao-te-Ata-tū was formed out of a concern raised by professionals working for DSW that there was institutional racism within the Department. Given this, it is important to examine what was occurring in the country leading up to this period of radical change. This review will also explore the legislation and policies pertaining to the (DSW) in this pre Pūao-te-Ata-tū era. This review will also explore Pūao-te-Ata-tū in more depth. It will explore the Māori Advisory Unit Report 1985 (MAU report) and examine the role that the (WARAG) report played in the triggering of the commission of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Social Climate

The 1970s was a period of great social and political upheaval around the world, including the push for indigenous equality and land rights. The Māori protest movement was the result of a culmination of grievances dating back to the signing of the Treaty [sic] of Waitangi in 1840 (Burns, 2013).

In the early 1970s, Māori were becoming over-represented in crime statistics and unemployment figures, on welfare benefits, and as clients of the child welfare service (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2016). According to Keenan (2004), "... [T]he social and

economic statistics for Māori were bleak” (p. 209). Māori also had a lower standard of living and greater ill-health than Pākehā (Dalley, 1998). People were starting to explore reasons for these statistics and they would utilise the Treaty of Waitangi as a guide to explore how they could improve the approach in dealing with these issues. These groups began to highlight both the racism within society and the institutional racism which strengthened Government and social structures (Dalley 1998). From these discoveries came a period of Māori cultural resurgence, which supported the “assertion of rangatiratanga, and an emphasis on Māori management of Māori issues and resources, be these land, health, welfare and child welfare” (Dalley, 1998, p. 262). Groups of Māori and some non-Māori in Aotearoa, New Zealand were beginning to make a stand and bring social and political issues to the forefront of the nation. Awareness and activism was prominent and growing within Pakeha and Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2016).

The period from the early 1970s to the early 1990s encompassed a time of significant change in New Zealand (Dalley, 1998). On a social level there was rising unemployment, growing inflation and increasing government involvement in the economy (Dalley, 1998). Furthermore as a nation we were starting to stand up for things we felt were wrong or unjust. The end of the post-war boom “...saw an international resurgence in class conflict and industrial militancy on an unprecedented scale from 1960 to the mid-1970s” (Te Ahu, nd). Protests, such as those against the Vietnam War, nuclear testing in the Pacific and apartheid in South Africa were becoming part of our nation’s fabric (Keen, 2017). Furthermore in 1971 a group of university educated Māori men emerged out of a conference that were offended by the confiscation of Māori lands and the degradation of the Māori language they named themselves, Ngā Tamatoa. They were established and under the leadership of Syd Jackson and were “...young warriors, who were prepared to challenge the conventional wisdom of the Pakeha establishment” (Walker, 1990).

In 1974 Waitangi Day was briefly renamed New Zealand Day. Some believe this change aided the ignition of Māori activism particularly regarding the matter of Māori land (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2014). During the following years protests escalated regarding land issues, firstly through the famous hīkoi led by Dame Whina Cooper who marched on Parliament from her papakāinga in Te Hāpua in 1975. The focus of this hīkoi was to end the alienation of Māori land. The land occupation at Bastion Point followed in 1977, when the people of Ngāti Whatua ki Orakei reacted to the Government's announcement of plans for a housing development on Bastion Point land that had been taken in 1886 by compulsory acquisition leaving the iwi group with less than a hectare of land. The images central to New Zealand history at the time were of the New Zealand Police forcefully evicting people from their land after they had staged an occupation for 506 days (Burns, 2013; McClure, 2015).

Political Climate

In 1975 Robert Muldoon became Prime Minister as leader of the National Party. Over his three terms he earned many enemies and in 1984 he called a snap election shortly following a leadership challenge from within his party (Levine & McRobie, 2002). In the period leading up to Pūao-te-Ata-tū as a country New Zealand had come out of three terms of government which were held by National, their control was concluded when a David Lange led Labour Government was successful at the polls in 1984. It was this Labour Government that cemented a period of significant change for our country that had started in the 1970s, including changes in the way social work had historically been practiced. Some claim that it seemed like a revolution, a private members bill decriminalized homosexuality, Labour gave Te Reo Māori official status, let the Waitangi Tribunal consider historical claims, reformed local government, trimmed and restructured the public service and sold state assets (Levine & McRobie, 2002).

There was a clear indication nationally that there needed to be changes at a social level and

the Labour government had received the mandate of the people in the 1984 election to make these changes. By 1990 their dominance had ceased but the changes made during that period were nothing short of revolutionary. As Lister, Rivers, and Wilkinson (1991) stated *“It needs to be emphasized that the rate and breadth of Labour’s restructuring programme was remarkable”*. Te Ahu (n.d.), states that the Labour Government “...enhanced the status of Māori culture, attracting the commitment of Māori to state institutions and satisfying Māori demands for self-determination in their own affairs”.

Institutional Racism

Given the climate that at a political level the microscope was focused on government institutions and the cultural ramifications of policy the DSW was being examined internally by some of its employees.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū describes institutional racism as:

“The most insidious and destructive form of racism, though, is institutional racism. It is the outcome of monocultural institutions which simply ignore and freeze out the cultures of those who do not belong to the majority. National structures are evolved which are rooted in values, systems and viewpoints of one culture only.” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986, p. 19).

In 1984 nine Pākehā female DSW employees published a report “Institutional Racism: DSW: Tāmaki-Makau-Rau”. These women were concerned about the level of racism that was occurring in not only Aotearoa, New Zealand but more specifically within DSW. They claimed “that the Department practices institutional racism” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985a). While they were not claiming that the individuals within the DSW held racist views the structure and framework of the Department discriminated against both

Māori and Pacific consumers and staff. Women Against Racism Action Group (WARAG) was focused on exploring power structures that oppress both women and cultures other than the dominant. Although the women focused their report and research on Tāmaki-Makau-Rau they highlighted that their claims were relevant to the DSW as a whole. Furthermore to ensure their report was framed from a solution-focused approach they made recommendations in four areas that they considered would assist in addressing the institutional racism even though they had initially identified 12 areas of potential concern (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985a). The four recommendations were the ethnic composition of staff; staff recruitment and selection; staff training; department environment.

The WARAG report is relevant as the findings are very similar to those of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and furthermore the recommendations also align with those within Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Although Pūao-te-Ata-tū was more detailed, the two documents share common concepts and themes. The WARAG report instigated the work which followed by John Rangihau and the Ministerial Review Committee.

The WARAG report begins by exploring staffing within the DSW. Referring to a speech given by Eva Rickard at an NZASW hui in May 1984, they quote her statement that:

Māori people should be responsible for looking after Māori children in trouble with the law or at home. Māori social workers should be employed in proportion to the number of Māori children in DSW care. If it's a Māori problem, it needs a Māori solution (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985a. p.18).

The WARAG report stated that it “supported this approach and further stated that Pākehā do not have the knowledge to work effectively with Māori and Pacific peoples” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985a. p.18).

The WARAG report on institutional racism then makes recommendations regarding the staffing and training of DSW staff at all levels. They also explored the physical setting of DSW offices and environments in which departmental work took place, and concluded that DSW did not give adequate consideration to the cultural appropriateness of these establishments and their facilities. The WARAG report was significant as one of the initial precursors to the Report, it highlights the thoughts and feelings of some people at the time and how the growing pressure for social change was increasing awareness of racial injustices and that it was possible for people to challenge what they believed to be wrong and unjust.

Māori Advisory Unit Report

In 1985 the Director-General of the Department of Social Welfare commissioned the Māori Advisory Unit (staffed by Malcolm Peri, Moana Herewini and Rangitiniia Wilson) to report on how they perceived the Department's "capacity to meet the needs of the Māori people in relation to service delivery" (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985b, p.6). This report was to be read in conjunction with the 'Institutional Racism' report by WARAG. The focus of this report was shifted to explore service delivery, given that the WARAG report explored the issues surrounding staffing. Given the move in focus the Māori Advisory Unit (MAU) report was more focused on the views of those within the Māori community.

One of the aspects of this report was that it explored the meaning of institutional racism in more depth than the WARAG report. The MAU report stated that it believes what Donna Awatere describes as "the invisible signs in the structures and institutions that say, Māori people not welcome keep out" (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985b). It refers to the barriers that confront Māori at a number of points in their lives, be it through schooling, job opportunities or accommodation. A point that the report explores in more detail is that of the role that culture plays in social work when working with Māori clients. It states that "They judge them by middle-class criteria, reinforced by the Department and

society and from the privileged positions of people who have options because they perpetuate the rules which uphold their privileged status” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare 1985b, p.16).

This report covers the rationale for the establishment of the Māori Advisory Unit within DSW, highlighting that the feeling and sense at the time was one of a need for change, the people from within the Department were calling for change as were those from outside of the Department, and it was by all accounts a time of imminent change. This report stated that “Fortunately there is a growing awareness of the injustices of this present system....also part of the growing realization that present and past departmental procedures have not worked” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare 1985b).

The MAU report and the WARAG report formed the foundation for the establishment of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. In the conclusion to the MAU report the Advisory Committee states that they recommend that a task force be established to work on the racism within DSW. They also request that this task force be made up of Māori and non-Māori and from both internal to DSW and external.

DSW background to Pūao-te-Ata-tū

It was clear from the WARAG and MAU report that the DSW was one institution in which significant change needed to occur. Considerable change was also occurring within DSW during the early 1980s. This included factors such as a change in language. The Department ceased to refer to its workers as child welfare workers thus seeing the instigation of the term social worker. From the mid-1980s the Department began to restructure its service. Towards the end of the 1980s there was a major restructuring resulting in the Department being separated into three business units: New Zealand Children, Young Persons and Their Families Service, Income Support Service and Community Funding Agency. This change

coincided with the enactment of the new legislation Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989. This era was claimed to have been a blizzard of legislation, restructurings and efficiency drives continued to affect the Public sector (State Service Commission, 2013).

Legislation.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū affected change through its 13 recommendations made to the Minister at the time, Dame Ann Hercus. One of its most prevalent recommendations, was recommendation four, it stated that there needed to be changes to the legislation. As a country New Zealand had not had a long history of legislation specific to child welfare. The first Act was named the Child Welfare Act 1925. Under this legislation the child welfare matters were managed by the Education Board and this legislation set about aiming to make better provision in the care and maintenance of children within the state care. These moves started to see a separation of the child welfare work from the education service. In 1948 the Child Welfare Amendment Act highlighted the separation of a Child Welfare Division from the Education role received its own government Minister. This was followed by the establishment of Department of Social Welfare in 1972 (Dalley, 1998).

One of the outstanding features of the Children and Young Persons Act 1974 legislation was “the clear divide it made between a child and a young person” (Dalley 1998, p. 264). A child was defined as under the age of 14 years and different paths and processes were charted dependent on your age. Furthermore this new legislation made it mandatory for social workers’ reports to be made available to parents whereas previously all reporting had remained undisclosed to parents (Dalley, 1998). These changes started to frame current legislation.

The WARAG report was published in 1984, the MAU report was published in 1985, and Pūao-te-Ata-tū was presented in 1986. In November 1989 the Children, Young Person and

Their Families Act (CYPF Act) was passed. At the time this legislation was described “as the most advanced bit of social legislation of its time in the world’ (Dalley 1998, p. 264; Keenan, 2004). The CYPF Act transformed children’s welfare services, and became a model for other countries” (Dalley 1998, p. 264). The CYPF Act’s distinctive and innovative approach was its focus on families and whānau groups having a strong role and responsibility for all their members. The focus was to make the disruptions to families and particularly the children as minimal as possible and social workers were to be seen as coordinators or facilitators within this process. The focus shifted to one of empowering families, whānau and communities. The emphasis was on advancing the well-being of families and the well-being of children and young persons as members of families, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family groups. Furthermore the CYPF Act opened avenues for devolution of social service provision to Iwi or cultural groups. For example, under the CYPF Act legal orders regarding the custody could be obtained for iwi social services, cultural social services or directors of child and family support services.

The CYPF Act also distinguished further between the role of care and protection of children and the role of youth justice, or as Dalley (1998, p. 265) states “differentiating between children as victims and children as threats”. There were now clear and purposeful processes for children’s welfare and youth justice.

Another key feature of the CYPF Act was the introduction of legislated family group conferencing. In line with finding a culturally appropriate approach to the welfare work in New Zealand this approach was considered to work with Māori values, culture and beliefs not against them (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1994).

Reviews of Pūao-te-Ata-tū

Pūao-te-Ata-tū received attention from its inception through to the 1990s, but interest in it has tapered off. One key planning document that followed the Report is ‘Te Punga O Matahorua’. Te Punga is a Child Youth and Family Strategy document which some see as being a representation of a second part of Pūao-te-Ata-tū (Keenan, 1999). Te Punga was accordingly titled Te Punga – Our bicultural strategy for the nineties and was published in 1994, its’ focus was to “set out an overall Department of Social Welfare framework for bicultural development” (Department of Social Welfare 1994, p. 4). It was produced as a means of regaining the cultural drive similar to that brought about by the Pūao-te-Ata-tū Report (Keenan, 1999). In this document, Margaret Beazley, the Director-General of the Department of Children, Young Persons and Their Families Service at the time acknowledged that many in the Department of Social Welfare at the time “...have been very disappointed in the apparent waning of commitment to Pūao-te-Ata-tū over the past few years” (Department of Social Welfare 1994, p. 16). She stated that the structural changes implemented in the wake of Pūao-te-Ata-tū had not endured even a decade and that “she could not envisage how the Department could provide sensitive and fully accessible services to the people of New Zealand without a strong bicultural awareness and the application of the principles underlying the Treaty of Waitangi, Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the State Sector Act of 1988” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare 1994). This raised an interesting concept in that the prevalence of Pūao-te-Ata-tū is something that slowly diminished with time, as opposed to the theoretical pedestal that some see its relevance at today. Te Punga highlights that throughout this journey Pūao-te-Ata-tū needed other interventions in order to keep it ‘current’.

A number of scholars wrote of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. One of these was Harry Walker of Ngāti Porou descent; in 1995 he was a lecturer in Social Work and Social Policy at Victoria University in Wellington. He supported the view in Te Punga that the essence of the Report

was being lost in contemporary social work. Walker provided a statement when asked about his thought on Te Punga he stated that his belief at this time was that Te Punga would ensure that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was "...hidden within the depths of the bureaucratic sea...never to see the light of day..." (Walker 1995). Although he expresses some concern about the relevance of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, he does go on to state that it was a "policy document for the people" and he reinforces its status in New Zealand social work history by stating that "Māori have not and will not forget it. It is truly a policy document for the people. It will not go away" (Walker, 1995, p.13).

Another New Zealand academic who was writing about Pūao-te-Ata-tū was Danny Keenan, unlike Walker, Keenan's background was history. He was of Ngāti te Whiti and Te Atiawa descent and at the time of publishing this article he was a lecturer in history at Massey University. His history is in the Department of Māori Affairs, and Social Welfare. He provides a brief history and reflection on Pūao-te-Ata-tū. He lists that his intention of the document to highlight "...how that [Pūao-te-Ata-tū] document might be seen in the context of its time..." (Keenan, 1995, p. 11). This reflection highlights that the substance of the report is not in dispute. Keenan confirms the link between Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 by stating that the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989 "...was substantially developed out of the report with recommendation 4..." (Keenan, 1995). The publication of Pūao-te-Ata-tū saw Iwi Māori wanting "...greater input into the new legislation to ensure that they were granted more influence in the care and protection process" (Keddell, 2007. P. 50). Nash (2001) also states that not only does the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 come out of recommendation four but that the Report strongly influences the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989. This connection is important to this research as the Act determines policy, which drives practice.

There are links made between Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989, through the committee participating in the review of the historical Children and Young Persons Act 1974 this permitted the Committee to submit information pertaining to their principles regarding the change needed. Also, accordingly, there are links made between Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Family Group Conference process, although family group conferencing was not specifically introduced in Pūao-te-Ata-tū the concepts and principles of whānau decision making were very much thought of in the development of the CYPF Act.

Family Group Conferences, unlike Pūao-te-Ata-tū, have been subject to many studies both nationally and internationally. Many of these studies discuss the lack of empirical research into the Family Group Conference (FGC) model (Connolly, 2004; Levine, 2000; Brown 2000). Another prevalent area some researchers discuss is the strong international interest in our locally developed practice model (Brown, 2003). Maxwell, Robertson, Thorn and Walker (1995) completed a study which explored the outcomes of intervention under the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 which concluded that the CYPF Act and more specifically the sections surrounding Family Group Conferences really put New Zealand on the map internationally regarding social work practice approaches. However, they state that there was a lack of recognition of the research required to continually examine this process.

Another theme that Connolly (1994) discusses is that of Matua Whāngai. Mātua Whāngai is seen as being a half-way point between a service of institutional racism and a culturally appropriate service. It is a step up from the previous Pākehā dominated processes and leads into more Māori “friendly” whānau decision making processes. Connolly (1994) states that the vision for the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act was that it be “...culturally relevant and not undermine the cultural strength of whānau, hapū and iwi...”

Under a major restructure in May 1992 the Department of Social Welfare was put into business units of which child welfare came under the umbrella of New Zealand Children and Young Persons Service (Ministry of Social Development, 2014). In 2006 Child, Youth and Family became a service line of the Ministry of Social Development (Ministry of Social Development, 2014). The Ministry of Social Development has over the years published reports and information regarding its various initiatives and practice models. Doolan and Connolly (2010) state that the “hopes of Pūao-te-Ata-tū manifest themselves in the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989”. This highlights that the CYPF Act is the organisational response to the expectations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Furthermore this article states that cultural issues have been at the heart of practice changes in New Zealand.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was instigated out of concern for the impact that policy and service delivery was having on Māori children and families. Understandably, Family Group Conferences (FGC) appear to take the lead in this area as the main approach to addressing the issues for Māori families. Many of the reports on Pūao-te-Ata-tū, even those published by international researchers, refer to the Māori cultural aspect of Pūao-te-Ata-tū of being whānau decision making.

Internationally, researchers who have studied our social work history have discussed how Family Group Conferences came out of Pūao-te-Ata-tū as a means to address concern for the overrepresentation of Māori children in non-family state care (Ryburn, 1992). Family decision making and its founding concepts were not new to social work.

The formal social work origins of Family Decision Making are found in the 1984 New Zealand Government initiative Mātua Whāngai (Foster Parents). This arose as a result of Māori people desiring to have their children and young people taken from state institutions and returned to their families of origin (Walker et al., 2000, p. 61).

This study states that Māori were disadvantaged in a system that was aligned and valued as the historic Pākehā-Tauīwi model. This new radical proposed decision making system sat outside the parameters of social work within the DSW, which up until this stage had been very individualist and authoritarian and accordingly the social work role was due to have a makeover. Ryburn (1992) believed the role as social workers was not making decisions but rather facilitating decision-making, by producing information, resources and expertise which will assist the family group.

Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel

Despite Pūao-te-Ata-tū being produced in the 1980s the key issues around the Department and its care and responsibility to Māori remain. In reviewing the journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū it would be appropriate to explore the current Child, Youth and Family review ordered by current Minister of Social Development Minister Anne Tolley around providing "...a programme level business case focussing on the desired future state of Child, Youth and Family" (Tolley, 2015a). Although a review was ordered it was not intended to focus on institutional racism, however issues faced by Māori pre Pūao-te-Ata-tū are still prevalent today. The Minister of Social Development Minister Anne Tolley has requested a review of the Child, Youth and Family system and within the 18 points she makes outlining the scope of this review is a point that states the panel must consider "How to ensure that the new operating model delivers better outcomes for all Child, Youth and Family clients, and particularly Māori" (Tolley, 2015a). There were concerns noted about this review following Minister Anne Tolley's announcement in early April 2015, two of the primary issues were that her 'independent panel of experts' excluded any social workers and Māori representation. Minister Anne Tolley stated that "(F)or the sake of vulnerable children, we must do better, and we need a very clear strategy that focuses on the needs of children, rather than the needs of the system," the Minister has also confirmed that this is going to be a

complete overhaul (Tolley, 2015a). Child, Youth and Family figures highlight that of the 5133 children currently in the Custody of the Chief-Executive of the Department of Child, Youth and Family 58% are Māori compared to 29% who are Pākehā (Child, Youth and Family, 2015).

“Child, Youth and Family’s commitment to improving its responsiveness to mokopuna Māori is set out in its strategic vision mā mātou, mā tātou, which builds on the foundations laid by Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the CYP&F Act 1989. The Act and Pūao-te-Ata-tū paved the way for changes to statutory social work that would lead to more culturally appropriate services and delivery for Māori children”(Office of the Chief Social Worker, 2014).

Given her Office of the Chief of Social Worker discussed the significance of the fundamentals of Pūao-te-Ata-tū to any new approach to social work Minister Anne Tolley clearly, through both her terms of reference and through her panel of experts selection, has totally disregarded the necessity for a Māori voice even though the final report states that “...Māori children and young people are twice as likely to be notified to CYF compared to the total population (Modernisation Child Youth and Family, 2016. p. 7). Nothing from within Minister Anne Tolley’s current documentation highlights any relevance to Pūao-te-Ata-tū, in a sense according to this current position Pūao-te-Ata-tū has died.

State of Care Report

The Office of the Children’s Commission published a report into the functioning of Child, Youth and Family; the Office went about meeting with stakeholders, staff and clients in a bid to make improvements for children in state care (Office of the Children’s Commissioner, 2015). The report discusses how it found “...*pockets of excellent practice within Child, Youth and Family, it also highlights inconsistencies in the care and service provided to children*” (Human Rights Commission, 2015). This report examined Departmental reports and spoke

with children to provide some conclusions. These findings were also passed onto the CYF Expert panel in an attempt to assist them with their review. The key findings coming from the report were:

- *Issues of workforce capacity and capability mean practice is not consistent*
- *Child, Youth and Family is not sufficiently child-centred*
- *Child Youth and Family do not know if children are better off as a result of their intervention as they are not measuring outcomes reliably, and*
- *Alongside children's immediate safety, CYF needs to focus on improving their outcomes.* (Human Rights Commission, 2015).

Many agreed and welcomed the report including the Social Development Minister, Anne Tolley she stated that it "...highlights the concerns which led to my decision to completely revamp CYF. After fourteen reviews we need to say enough is enough" (Tolley, 2015b).

One of the findings of this report relevant to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and what it had set out to achieve was that "*Cultural capability in not given sufficient priority*" (State of Care Report, 2015, p. 25). The report discovered that although there were "*promising policies and frameworks*" that overall cultural capability was not filtering down to the delivery of services to mokopuna Māori.

Summary

There was a staged approach to this literature review, firstly exploring the climate within Aotearoa New Zealand leading up to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. The themes at the time were a period of activism where people were gaining a voice and fighting for things they believed to be immoral and unjust. They were demanding action and change; this also became evident within our Government as the period of unrest was followed by an ousting of the National government in 1984, setting the path for a Labour Government to effect significant social change.

One of the themes in this period of discontent was reflected in a report by nine Pākehā women employed by the Department of Social Welfare at the time which discussed what they found to be a culture of institutional racism within the DSW: Tāmaki-makau-rau. They completed research but made it clear that their findings were not specific to Tāmaki-makau-rau but present across the country. The report was published and the group highlighted that they had limited resourcing which hindered their ability to research in more depth, they would have preferred to cover 12 areas, instead they could only focus on four. They gave very clear and detailed recommendations and rationale for these. The Māori Advisory Unit was formed within the Department of Social Welfare and they were contracted to report on how they “...perceive the Department of Social Welfare and its capacity to meet the needs of the Māori people in relation to service delivery” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985b, n.d.) The MAU reports findings supported the WARAG report and they presented their findings to the Minister at the time. Both these reports established the need for an official investigation and in July 1985 the Minister of Social Welfare at the time, Dame Ann Hercus requested to the Pūao-te-Ata-tū committee to “advise her of the most appropriate means to achieve the goal of an approach which would meet the needs of Māori in policy, planning and service delivery” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986, p. 5). The outcome of which Nash (2001, p.39) reports is a “succinct and eloquent in its expression of Māori experiences of assimilationist policies which, it argued, fostered dependence and diminished tino rangatiratanga”.

The literature focus then moves to what has been written since Pūao-te-Ata-tū was published and the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act was enacted. A major piece within this literature search is the publication of Te Punga, which was established as a means to try and re-activate momentum into the change that had originated with Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Furthermore in 1995 there were a number of national academics who had completed some relevant journal articles reviews of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Finally literature was explored regarding Family Group Conferencing a process that came out of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act.

There is not a lot of literature specific to Pūao-te-Ata-tū, while much has been written regarding Family Group Conferencing and also reviews of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act. Both of these are identified as leading documents and processes within the social work realm and as such have attracted much attention. But little has been explored regarding Pūao-te-Ata-tū itself which is a social policy document that still has a place in our social work institutes of today as it still remains as one of our most influential policy documents in New Zealand's social history.

In the following chapter the methodological approach to this research project will be explored to provide a framework for the exploration of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the ethical practices around this research project.

Chapter Four: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the research approach and design, including methods of data collection and data analysis used. The chapter outlines the rationale for adopting a Māori centred and qualitative research approach, using in-depth semi-structured interviews as the primary method of data collection.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū emanated from a Ministerial Enquiry following complaints to the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) about the delivery of services to Māori by its own staff. Pūao-te-Ata-tū outlined 13 recommendations with an over-riding expectation that all forms of racism within DSW would be addressed. There were a number of people involved either directly as members or advisors to the committee. Separate to the committee for which there were seven other staff involved in some capacity included staff advisors, editorial staff, executive officer, support staff and the Komiti Whakahaere ⁵ whose role it was to work closely with John Rangihau and the Minister of Social Welfare to assist in implementing the recommendations of the Report. For this research people involved in these various roles were sought and interviewed. This research explores their accounts and reflections as insider views of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

The purpose of this research is to:

- Explore the participants' perceptions of the intentions of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and examine the experiences and reflections of the participants 26 years after the Report.

⁵ Komiti Whakahaere: This was a committee set up to assist John Rangihau and the Minister at the time to implement the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

- Examine the participants' expectations on the delivery of services to Māori by DSW and its successors as a result of the Report.
- Outline the implications for social workers, for Māori families and for Māori communities.
- Explore what has changed and what has been achieved as a result of the enquiry:
 - Intentionally;
 - Unintentionally.

Theoretical Framework

In research there are many facets to consider. Having a clear methodological approach ensures that the research project has been considered, debated, discussed and a suitable approach selected. Research in itself is a substantial undertaking and methodological design is critical to the success of the research. This includes research purpose, research approach, research questions and research design. Within different research contexts there are further issues to explore such as participant selection, and a methodological approach that will assist in cementing data analysis and presentation of data. There is also a responsibility to explore and fully apply the ethical principles of both the Massey University Code of Ethical Conduct and a Māori-centred approach.

The methodological approaches covered will be qualitative research focussing primarily on research theory. The relationship and exploration of Māori-centred research will clarify and signify the role that Indigenous Māori play in this research project. Furthermore a Kaupapa Māori approach will be discussed and its relevant points articulated. The scope of narrative

theory will then be applied to the research project, followed by attention to interviewing as a method, in particular the benefits of the semi-structured interview.

Māori centred research.

Māori centred research involves Māori on all levels within the process, which complements the approach undertaken in this research. Furthermore the participant group has a multi-cultural composition, thus making a Māori centred approach more applicable. With a Kaupapa Māori approach there are some similar key concepts. “The purpose of knowledge is to uphold the interests and the mana of the group” (Pere & Barnes, 2009, p. 454).

One of limitations with this approach is the non-Māori involvement (Cunningham, 2000). Cunningham (2000) describes the lack of non-Māori involvement as “Research where Māori are significant participants and are typically senior members of research teams, also where Māori analysis is undertaken and which produces Māori knowledge, even though it is measured against mainstream standards for research.” Although there is an authentic Māori approach within this research there are aspects of mainstream involvement dispersed throughout the research process. Mainstream in this sense relates to the principal or dominant influence on our research, from being supported and managed by a non-Māori tertiary institute and guided by the ethical requirements of this institute also. This aspect can potentially add to the already well-established uncertainty that many Māori have regarding research as much social research has historically tended to emphasise negative statistics (Carpenter & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2008). This heightened concern and anxiety over the involvement of mainstream approaches to Māori research sits in historical transgressions to Māori. Mikaere (2001, p. 29) states that “...Pākehā colleagues saw no problem with conducting research *ON* Māori.” Being Māori and facilitating a research project that explores concepts of race and culture is supported when looking at research from a Māori centred approach.

In framing a Māori centred approach to data analysis Cunningham, (2000) states that this will involve a marriage of Māori methods with contemporary research tools. As with a Kaupapa Māori approach this methodological approach also places the importance of Māori in that it emphasises that “Māori data can only be converted to Māori knowledge through a Māori analysis. A Māori analysis places Māori experience at the centre the theoretical base” (Cunningham, 2000, p.6). Thus Māori knowledge or whakaaro must be interpreted through a Māori lens. This is reminiscent of a proverb by Ta Apirana Ngata:

E tipu e rea mō ngā rā o tō ao

Ko tō ringa ki ngā rākau a te Pākehā

Hei oranga mō te tinana

Kō tō ngākau ki ngā tāonga a ō tīpuna Māori

Hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga. Ko tō wairua ki tō atua, Nānā nei ngā mea katoa.

Grow and branch forth for the days destined to you

Your hands to the tools of the Pākehā for the welfare of your body

Your heart to the treasures of your ancestors as adornments for your brow

Your spirit to god, who made all things (Ngata, n.d.).

In essence the relevance of this proverb relates to using the Pākehā research tools in conjunction with Māori knowledge for the advancement of Māori people. Furthermore this approach allows Māori to contribute to mainstream research disciplines which ultimately assist in achieving the goal of progression of Māori development (Foster, 2007).

Jahnke and Gillies (2012, pp. 501-504) refer to six phases of Māori centred research.

- Principle of whakapapa: this recognises and utilises whakapapa of the researchers in the selection of participants. Although in mainstream research this can be viewed as a conflict of interest, within Māori society this provides a sense of accountability to the whānau. This principle was relevant in all aspects of the engagement with participants as the researchers cultural identity/whakapapa was were a foundation for discussions and deliberations.
- Principle of Māori language and customs: this recognises the need to have researcher able to speak Māori thus ensuring that the information was not compromised in translation. The understanding of Te reo Māori is vital as terms such as mana and mauri have a contextual understanding that is enforced through knowledge of Te Reo Māori.
- Principle of relationships: also known as whānaungatanga allows for whānau making connection with researchers and having a clear understanding of the purpose of the research.
- Principle of exemplary host: also known as manaakitanga a key Māori concept. Manaakitanga is to care for support and nurture. As researchers there needs to be a level of hospitality, care, nurturing and respect when working with participants. Manaakitanga was practiced in this research project through simply tasks like the provision of refreshments and participant selecting the venue for the interviews to occur.
- Principle of reciprocity: also known as koha allows for the common practice of koha.
- Principle of guardianship and care: also known as kaitiakitanga. This relates to ownership of the information, knowledge as such in that as a researcher we are mere guardians. This means that researchers need to conserve preserve, foster, shelter and protect the knowledge and information that is shared.

The principle of host or manaakitanga replicates Smith's concept of "Manaaki ki te tāngata" (2012) regarding the ethical considerations when approaching research from a kaupapa Māori methodology.

A further principle that has a parallel philosophy is that of kaitiakitanga which is comparable to Smith's ethical concept of Kia Māhaki or to be cautious in your research (2012). In reference to this term of being cautious as Māori it is working with understanding, forethought and compassion. Furthermore Jahnke & Gillies' (2012) concept of kaitiakitanga also fits with Smith's (2012) concept of kua e takahia te mana o te tāngata-ensure that you do not trample on a person's mana. Smith's seven ethical principles will be explored further in ethical considerations as they are used as a framework for the ethical context of this research.

Kaupapa Māori Approach.

Bishop (1996) states that Kaupapa Māori research emerged in the 1950s and 60s in line with rapid urbanisation leading to the revitalisation of Māori communities. He also outlines further growth in the 1970s and 1980s, which led to a movement of political consciousness promoting cultural aspirations, preferences and practices (Bishop, 1996, p. 11). Kaupapa Māori research is a significant focus of this research project given the comprehensive inclusiveness of Māori. The concept of "... by Māori, with Māori and for Māori" (Smith, 2012) is synonymous with Kaupapa Māori research. Penetito (2011, p. 39), states this notion is based on three factors: firstly it helps to explain the way that things are for Māori: secondly it gives Māori the confidence in current and future developments and finally it is a means by which Māori create our own scholars. This perception of Kaupapa Māori Research explaining 'the way things are' helps to understand why one would use Kaupapa Māori research as a methodological approach. Mikaere (2011) states that Kaupapa Māori research was developed as a means to retrieve some space within an arena, which until now had been

completely dominated by western practices. Mikaere also argues that Kaupapa Māori research explores the validity of research on Māori by non-Māori and that “... the emergence of the Kaupapa Māori Research ... demanded processes that were empowering of Māori and questioned the validity of research that had been conducted by those outside the culture (2011, p. 30)

Furthermore in exploring this concept of Kaupapa Māori research methodology one needs to understand the concept of Kaupapa Māori. Smith states that, “there is so much in whom and what we are ... Kaupapa Māori transcends most institutional disciplines of knowledge.” (2011, p. 11). This thing they call Kaupapa Māori, “it was what it was ...it is what it is...it will be what it will be.”(Smith 2011, p. 10). Penetito (2011) states that Kaupapa Māori is not a one-stop shop but it is a participatory, action orientated research approach. Pihama affirms that Kaupapa Māori theory “... seeks to return to the old ways of thinking in order to interrupt some of the processes of colonisation.” (2011). Furthermore Mikaere (2011) also refers to the involvement of the colonisers in the understanding of Kaupapa Māori research by arguing that the inclusion of and use of the term research still aligns with the constraints of westernised research theory. This exploitation by Western researchers is also referred to by Bishop who “claims that the colonisation of Aotearoa/New Zealand and the subsequent neo-colonial dominance of Pākehā majority interest in research has resulted in the development of research into people’s lives that addressed concerns and interests of the researchers own making” (1997). Smith, does not limit Kaupapa Māori to theory but does state that it is “a practice, it’s a way of thinking about everything we do in research” (2011, p. 10).

A Kaupapa Māori research approach has been identified within the methodological approach because the research focus is steeped strongly in tūturu Māori. To be tūturu Māori is to be staunch and steadfast in your approach as a pure Māori approach. Five of the six participants in this research are Māori and the researcher is Māori. The one participant who isn’t Māori

married into and became firmly ensconced in the tuturu Māori world. Kaupapa Māori research will provide an umbrella for which all knowledge and information from this research project should manifest. But this research still rests within a mainstream university setting.

Bevan-Brown defines pertinent points of Kaupapa Māori Research as “...focused on areas of importance and concern to Māori people. Kaupapa Māori Research should result in some positive outcome for Māori.” (1999). This brings relevance to the purpose of research with Māori. The purpose of this research project is to give those responsible for instigating significant change in service delivery the opportunity to reflect on that period of concentrated change and articulate their thoughts, understandings and feelings of that time, something that historically has not yet been fully explored. The intention is that by researching the participants’ beliefs and exploring their expectations, this study may discover components and new learning that will assist the development for Māori in the future.

These two methodological approaches, Māori centred and Kaupapa Māori approaches have some clear parallels. This examination of these theories has highlighted their relevance to this research and that this research utilises a Māori centred approach. It also acknowledges the significance influence and principles of a Kaupapa Māori methodology.

A Narrative Approach.

A further consideration when exploring the methodological approach of this research was that of the narrative approach. A narrative approach can be a focus which is applied at the beginning of a research project or the methodological relevance may not present until the analysis stage (Gilbert, 2008). This study explored the reflections, memories, stories and narratives of those research participants who were selected specifically for their role in the creation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its implementation. A narrative approach relies on examining how the participants interpret events and how their values guide them (Merriam, 2009).

Furthermore narrative exploration can stimulate reflective thought or reflective thinking can stimulate narrative production (Bold, 2012). Consideration must be given to a narrative approach as the data specific to this research are the participants' narratives.

Symbolic interactionism directs that one must view and consume the story or narrative as being a social production (Gilbert, 2008). Symbolic interaction works on the assumption that a person's actions result from their interpretation of the situations that they are confronted with in everyday life (Tracy, 2012). It explores the development of narratives as involving three key players: the producers, or the research participants; the coaxers or researcher and the consumers or receivers of the research, social interactionism explores the involvement of all of the participants in assigning different meaning to the narratives (Gilbert, 2007).

The intention and focus of the data gathering from this approach is to interview to elicit narrative responses (Bold, 2012). This approach also aligns with the semi-structured interview method. Bold (2012) states that researchers of social contexts usually choose to interview people when they are interested in their lives and/or experiences, which is appropriate to this study. With this narrative approach it also leads to an ability to consider a person's account with the political and social activity at the time (Bold, 2012). Part of this study's intention was to explore the social and political scene leading up to and post Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the participants' narratives or accounts would assist in exploring the social and political context at the time. Squire (2008) also supports the linking of a participant's account to a point in history and refers to this as event centred narratives.

Semi-Structured Interviews.

Shank (2006) states that semi-structured interviewing is linked quite strongly to qualitative research. Galletta (2012) states that "A key benefit of semi-structured interviews is its attention to lived experience while also addressing theoretically driven variables of interest"

(2012, p. 53). Working from a semi-structured position this approach encompassed the qualitative methodological approach and also supports the interview questions providing a structure but allowing for the altering of the sequence of questions or further questioning to probe for further or more relevant information (Gilbert, 2008; Mills & Birks, 2014). Shank (2006) states that there are different models of semi-structured interviews and he starts with the critical questions and same question for each interviewee. The approach taken for this research needed the ability to take the questioning in different directions led by the participant yet it was essential to remain resolute to the key interview questions. The semi-structured interview approach allowed this flexibility.

The interview schedule comprised 14 questions grouped into three areas of focus. These focus areas were listed in chronological order to assist with the recollection for the participants. These questions will be covered more explicitly in following sections. The intention was that all questions within the first area were asked before moving forward. This allowed the participant to move with the expected flow of the chronological order. Galletta (2012, p.24) states that “There is a great deal of versatility in the semi-structured interview, and the arrangement of questions may be structured to yield considerable and often multi-dimensional streams of data”. The semi-structured interview approach can relate to the complexity of the research topic whilst still providing the flexibility of having one or several interviews. It also provides the opportunity for both the participant and researcher to engage in a free flowing dialogue with selected guidance (Galletta, 2012). The focus of this research aligns with this method in that it allowed for the exploration of the participants’ perspective and it made visible their voices (Galletta, 2012; Moyle, 2014).

Qualitative Methodology

This research explored a Ministerial report aimed at driving urgent change through its recommendations within the Department of Social Welfare. The benefits of this research are

to capture a time of significant change in our history from those responsible for making it, this may provide guidance for future projects regarding how to approach such an undertaking, or provide a personal perspective of what is involved in an effective social change approach. It is these exciting concepts that inspire such a project. Furthermore participants' perspectives regarding questions such as: have we addressed all forms of racism that was prevalent pre the Report may inspire other work.

In exploring the concepts surrounding this research topic a qualitative research approach was the most suitable given the research questions? Qualitative research is also focussed on empirical inquiry (Shank, 2006). Qualitative research is grounded in the systematic empirical pursuit of meaning (Shank, 2006). The philosophy of qualitative research is the view which underpins the school of research that begins with the assumption of multiple, socially constructed realities (Tolich & Davidson, 2011). The key features of a qualitative research approach are that it attempts to create an understanding of a social reality and cultural meaning whilst focusing on events or interfaces. Tolich and Davidson (2011, p. 33) clarify the reasons for research from a qualitative perspective is "to understand and describe meaningful social action". All of these explanations of qualitative research are firmly embraced in the pathway of this research approach.

Participants

The participants could only come from a small group of relevant personnel. The participants were selected because they had significant roles on or for the Advisory Committee. The participant selection resulted from a search of publicly held records, primarily the Pūao-te-Ata-tū Report itself.

Recruitment

Six participants were identified through public records the names of all committee and associated parties are published within Pūao-te-Ata-tū, online searches were completed to look at the current roles held by these members and suitability to participate was considered. This revealed that some members had passed and some had retired. One was approached and failed to respond. If any participants declined and the research was in a position where all committee members had been approach and declined it was possible to seek a further group or individual who had been involved in the Committee work and development of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. It was decided to seek these through Aotearoa New Zealand Association Social Workers (ANZASW) and Tāngata Whenua Social Workers Association (TWSWA). Although the advertisement was quite general the cover letters were more specific to the type of participant that was required for this research. The research sought "...people willing to be interviewed who were either involved with the original committee or were involved with the implementation of the recommendations" (Appendix A). Four of the six participants were members on the committee two participants were involved in different projects with DSW in National Office at the time.

Organising Interviews

The process of ethical approval required that thought and consideration be given to the means of conducting the interview whether face-to-face or via some electronic means. Thought and consideration was given on the type of information and a kanohi-ki-te-kanohi approach was not only the best means of gathering information but also in keeping with the methodological approach (Shank, 2006; Smith, 2012). Given the nature of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū and how part of its significance sits in the 69 hui that were held around the motu conducting these interviews kanohi-ki-te-kanohi was seen as essential. Furthermore the selected participants were in manageable regions in terms of distance for the researcher. The researcher travelled

to Rotorua and Wellington to complete interviews as well as 2 interviews which were conducted in Tairāwhiti. All interviews were conducted in venues selected by the participants. The meeting places varied dependent on the participant's availability, some occurred in their homes, cafes and workplaces. One participant met with the interviewer twice in the second interview the participant also provided some material to support the research.

Interview Questions

The interview questions covered three different focus areas. The first of these was the participant history and background. The rationale for this is that framing their background is relevant to the overall research and understands the participants' contextual history. These questions focused on exploring their role at the time of this report, and how they became involved. It was also pertinent to ask them to explain their views about what was occurring in the Department of Social Welfare and other government departments in the period leading up to this Report (Appendix B).

The second area focused on their expectations of what could be achieved if Pūao-te-Ata-tū was adopted and who would benefit from the recommendations. In a sense this requests the participants to explore what they believed could have been achieved from this report. To make it more systematic they were asked to breakdown those achievements and focus on the intended achievements for social work; families and Māori.

Finally the participants were asked to explore how the recommendations in Pūao-te-Ata-tū were actioned and how they then impacted on changes in social service provision and the views of mainstream New Zealand. It is important to remember that Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out of an era where institutional racism was ingrained in the Department of Social Welfare and also reflected in society (Dalley, 1998; Nash, 2009). Furthermore racism had been linked to

the poor social outcomes exhibited by Māori at the time in the areas of education, crime, child abuse, infant mortality, health and employment (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1986). Thus exploring what mainstream New Zealand society's beliefs were at the time would assist in looking at society's motivation for change.

Recording the interviews

All interviews were recorded on two devices to ensure that there was limited risk of losing the data. The researcher completed and provided typed transcriptions of the recorded interviews to the participants for approval as a true and accurate transcript of their interview. Gilbert (2008) states that although a verbatim transcription means you have not lost any data, this gives the researcher the advantage of ensuring that the full context of the participant is captured. Participants were also offered a summary of the research findings when the research was completed. The transcripts were all approved without amendment. All recorded and written information was stored in accordance with Massey University's Code of Ethical Conduct requirements by remaining in a locked cupboard. All of this data will be destroyed following examination of the thesis.

Data analysis

Mills and Birk (2004) provide a definition to an analysis framework that includes three stages of data analysis: preparing and organising data, coding data and finally the presentation of data. This aspect of data collection is where a focus on the researcher becomes evident. Shank (2006) refers to what he calls "participation and the mirror" thus as researchers we will inevitably view others' lives against that of our own. This is relevant also for when analysing and organising data, he discusses the need for researchers to allow the participants world to be different from the researchers. The participants completed semi-structured interviews which were recorded.

The next progression in the data analysis was coding. Coding is the labelling of data segment using a term that captures the researcher's interpretation of this essential meaning (Mills & Birks, 2014). The methodological coding approach is that of latent coding or semantic analysis which is the identification of themes or common topics that appear through the participants recorded discussions (Shank, 2006). Mills and Birks (2014) recommend organising findings into some model or structured form provides an analysis strategy for the researcher. The latent coding approach was used, thus identifying underlying and implicit meaning in the content of the transcribed summaries (Lawrence-Neuman, 2011). This involved reading and re-reading the summaries of the recorded discussions and identifying common themes or topics. These themes or topics were then grouped and refined and selected quotes were used to illustrate each theme. The findings were grouped into a series of five key findings: *The Consultation Process, The Document, Dynamic People, Pakeha Response to Pūāo-te-Ata-tū and Political Influence.*

Ethical Considerations

The researcher was clear about the obligations and requirements for ethics and ethical standards (Coney, 1988). Researchers have a commitment to ensuring that they have considered and attended to every possible occurrence when undertaking research with people. Researchers must take into consideration all risks of harm and evaluate the benefits of the research against these risks.

Two key ethical frameworks underpin this research. As a social worker in practice my ethical boundaries are cemented by the ANZASW (Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers) Code of Ethics (ANZASW, 2008). This code also provides a context to the ethical foundation regarding research. Discussion and guidance through the research supervision process was also important to the design of this research. The Code of Ethical Conduct and procedures of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee were approved on the 25 May

2014 and were fundamental to the research. The ethics application gave the opportunity to ensure all pertinent points had been considered and that the research was safe to proceed. The approved application is provided in full accompanied by the approval letter. (Appendix C)

In applying Kaupapa Māori approach to ethics Smith (2012) utilises seven key concepts which signify the researchers approach to this research task.

- *Aroha ki te tāngata*: a respect for people. One must at all times maintain the respect of all people, participants included but also the respect of those other persons named or referred to during the implementation of this research project. A further consideration here was how support was to be provided or offered to the participants taking into consideration the venue of the interview. Participants were offered the opportunity to have a support person attend the interview with them if they so required, this was discussed with them when negotiating the interview times. Recalling the situation and climate at the time could have raised some emotive points for the participants and the interviewer needed to have an awareness of and plan for this.
- *Kanohi kitea*: face-to-face. As stated previously when discussing the interview process kanohi-ki-te-kanohi is an approach not only favoured by Smith (2012) but also Shank (2006). Given the narrative and the Kaupapa Māori approach there is a sense of compulsion with this approach. In supporting this approach all applicants were interviewed kanohi-ki-te-kanohi.
- *Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero*: look, listen, speak. This is evident and is something Smith (2011), discusses in where she refers to interviews from a Kaupapa Māori perspective are very much lead by the participants.
- *Manaaki ki te tāngata*: to be hospitable. This kaupapa is instilled as Māori from a young age. The researcher can recall when manuhiri arrived that the task was to make

the cups of tea and prepare the kai for the manuhiri. This is something very evident in Māori whānau, hospitality was focused on kai. When looking at the Pōwhiri Poutama model the sharing of kai also represents visitors or manuhiri moving from an area or tapu to noa (Karena, 2014).

- *Kia Tūpato*: be cautious. As with aroha ki te tāngata proceed with caution, working and moving forward through this project in a thoughtful and purposeful manner.
- *Kaua e takahia te mana o te tāngata*: do not trample on ones mana. Furthermore progressing through the research with purpose and respect should ensure that all peoples mana remains intact. This was involved by allowing the participants to lead the discussions, although at time it may not have been beneficial or linked to the research it was the participant's process.
- *Kia māhaki*: maintain humility. Smith (2012) summarises this as not flaunting one's knowledge.

One of the challenges of this approach primarily regarding *kanohi-ki-te-kanohi* and *manaaki ki te tāngata* was that an interview was held in a cafeteria at the request of the participant and the recording was very difficult to hear with the background noise, so consequently at some stages a researcher may need to lead certain aspects of an interview.

Privacy and Confidentiality

The privacy of the participants was an issue given the small group involved in advisory positions on the Committee and the fact that their names were published with the Report. It was difficult to be able to offer anonymity and ensure that their identity would remain confidential. So given the very public nature of their role in the Report and their careers it was impossible to guarantee anonymity. The participants are very prominent figures and have public profiles currently. It could be quite easy to make links between their comments given

here and also other settings. All transcripts and written data were saved on a password protected device.

Risk of harm verses benefits of the research

Pūao-te-Ata-tū investigated “...the most appropriate means to achieve the goal of an approach which would meet the needs of Māori in policy, planning and service delivery in the Department of Social Welfare” (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1986, p. 5). The terms of reference for Pūao-te-Ata-tū came out of various studies investigating the structural disadvantages of people based on race. Many of the proposed risks of harm were regarding a very sensitive subject, racism. One identified risk was that participants revisiting the social context of the time could experience some anxiety. In exploring the risk of harm to others consideration needs to be given to the Department of Social Welfare (as it was known at the time) as the allegations were that it was condoning institutional racism. Based on this the information gathered could be very critical of the Department (DSW) and possibly individuals within it. However, Pūao-te-Ata-tū itself covers much of this criticism and is therefore already in the public arena. A further mitigation is that this work was completed in 1988 and is now somewhat historical.

The researcher ensured that she acknowledged the emotions that could surface for the participants having to reflect back on the time of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, the roles they had at those times and how re-visiting the relationships may conjure up emotions. At no stage did any of the participants express any adverse effects of reflecting on the time of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Conflicts

An identified conflict for the researcher in this project was that the researcher was once an employee of the Children, Young Person and Their Families Service, starting in 1997. This employment began within 10 years of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and soon after the enactment of the

Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989. This conflict was discussed and recognition of the experiences was explored in supervision.

Summary

A qualitative methodology based on a Māori centred approach, informed by narrative theory offered the researcher the opportunity for collecting rich data for this research project. With this methodological approach applied at all stages this research explored some of the common themes to emerge from the participants. With the data analysis process I will extract and investigate these themes within the context of the social and political change that was occurring at the time in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Findings

Introduction

“I still think Pūao-te-Ata-tū is important, if that committee were to reconvene with existing members they will find exactly the same thing that they found when Pūao-te-Ata-tū was first produced. They will find exactly the same thing; there will be the structural impediments.”

(H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015)

This research focused on the experience of six people close to or involved in the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. Four of the participants were either members of the committee or staff advising the committee. The other two participants secured roles within the Department of Social Welfare, National office employed in roles involved with the implementation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This chapter will examine the themes that evolved from those interviews, namely regarding their reflection on Pūao-te-Ata-tū, both historically and where they see its relevance today.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū was conceived out of the discovery that the Department of Social Welfare was institutionally racist, which was brought to the forefront of discussion in the political realms by the WARAG report. All participants’ discussions were central to the kaupapa of institutional racism, stating that “...it challenged racism but it didn’t change it” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015). Although Pūao-te-Ata-tū was always seen in a positive light for the benefit that it brought to Māori and Aotearoa New Zealand as a whole, many argue that it did not fully achieve what it set out to achieve but the participants agree that it was unprecedented in naming the issue, institutional racism. Baker describes institutional racism as:

It's when somebody is running an institution and is not caring about the background or culture of the people that are involved. (N. Baker, personal communication, April 7, 2015)

It was the findings of both the Women Against Racism in Action Group's report Institutional Racism in DSW (WARAG) and Māori Advisory Unit Report 1985 (MAU) reports that led to Dame Ann Hercus establishing the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. H. Walker states (personal communication, May 21, 2015) his belief that “...*institutional racism is still very healthy within Child, Youth and Family today*”.

Interview Themes

There are five compelling themes that participants explored; the first theme is the *Consultation Process* and pathway that Pūao-te-Ata-tū created. Following this are discussions pertaining to Pūao-te-Ata-tū: *The Document*. The third theme is called *Dynamic Individuals*. This is followed by the discovery of *Pākehā Response to Pūao-te-Ata-tū*, which explores the perspectives of staff employed by the Department of Social Welfare. Finally, the *Political Influence* and its strong relevance to the progress of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was an additional theme which highlights how the support and direction taken was motivated by the political powers at the time.

The Consultation Process

Participants all reflected on the consultation process that was unique to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. It involved 69 hui held over an eight month period with 2,954 attendees and 1,691 submissions. The approach that John Rangihau took to this review was unique and had never before been approached in this manner, as indicated by this participant “...there was no previous template about consultation on this level, nothing, no experience; no western country had ever done

this, at all” (W. Tait-Rolleston, personal communication, March 27, 2015). One can start to appreciate the task that lay ahead and the thought and preparation that needed to occur to complete this unique task? The well managed administration of this process was the work of three administrators, Ms Moana Herewini, Mr Te Ao-te-Rangi McGarvey and Ms Waereti Tait-Rolleston. The process that these hui followed was intensive. As D. Hauraki (personal communication, April 9, 2015), stated:

The actual consultation was very well done. I was involved with some of the planning from that but we had a couple of administration officers for that Waereti (Tait-Rolleston) was one, Hare Williams was one and the late Te Ao-te-Rangi McGarvey. Towards the end there were sessions held here in Wellington about the report and that's when we brought in Tipene O'Reagan and we talked about general themes and that. It was bloody demanding and at the same time all of the scripts were being transcribed so when it came time to write the document you had them all there.

This approach also highlighted something for which John Rangihau was renown and that was “...his phenomenal intellect. John Rangihau was the Chairperson of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, he was approached and requested by Dame Ann Hercus to head the committee and he accepted. He had a Polynesian memory steeped in oral tradition” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015). This process and sheer volume of work completed over a very short period of time highlights the oral history. All hui were captured through audio recordings. Kim Workman discussed a number of hui he attended with John Rangihau to review Matua Whaangai, before the Pūao-te-Ata-tū consultation process. No attendance list had been kept but John Rangihau was able to sit down and go through all the different hui from Invercargill to Auckland and recite who was in attendance. This is an example of his knowledge and expertise in oral recounting. John Rangihau was also very personable. K. Workman (personal communication, April 9, 2015) recalled that:

...as we travelled he would capture an audience when he started talking about the purpose of the review we have audiences with departmental social welfare staff and a lot of them were really hostile anti- this whole thing ...very basic thinkers. One incident that demonstrates his oratory was this meeting we had in Whanganui when a guy was attacking him right from the outset an older man then John starts talking about this history of Pākehā and Māori relations he spoke for ¾ of an hour at which stage this guy was in tears seeking forgiveness from John.

John Rangihau utilised this particular experience to the advantage of the group and offered for this man to join the contingent on its next consultation hui in New Plymouth where he could talk to those present about his experience. The consultation group travelled periodically over a nine month period visiting different areas and completing hui in Departmental Offices, on marae and in other community based meeting hubs. K. Workman (personal communication, April 9, 2015) talks about the diversity within the committee membership:

“The group was a disparate lot. There were people like Lena Manual, a kuia of some renown, Hori Brennan a colourful guy from the South Island he was Ngati Tuwharetoa but lived in the South Island, Donna Hall she was more ‘fiery’ then than she is now and she’s fiery now. They all had their own views on things but John was able to draw them together quite well and get them talking. He understood that while there was all this diversity of opinion he had these other stakeholders he had to contend with.”

D. Hauraki (personal communication, April 9, 2015) also describes the consultation process and how involved it was. He highlights the intensity of the meeting schedules and the magnitude of hui that was undertaken in a small timeframe:

“In terms of the trips they were one of the most demanding work times of my life. We went to Gisborne overnight on Wednesday, Thursday morning at 8.30am we meet with half the staff of the office [D.S.W.] and the second half of the day we meet with the remainder of the staff, and we finished our day at 4.30pm. We then drove to Ruatorea arriving at 6.00pm we sat for Dinner then after Dinner our hui began. We met through the night as the people had come and wanted to continue. We had breakfast in the morning and drove back to Manutuke met at Whakatō Marae till after lunch. That afternoon we came back into Gisborne to do a community consultation at Te Mokai Trust with dinner. We then slept at Whakatō Marae and travelled through to Māhia in the morning to attend the tangi of Doug Sinclair and to consult with the Takitimu people. Our day finished with two staff consultation hui in Hawkes Bay.”

These comments show that attending 69 hui in an 8 month timeframe was onerous and involved additional hui such as tangihanga that were not necessarily part of the consultation process but are important in te Ao Māori.

The Document

The second theme from the interviews is regarding the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report itself. Some of the participants discussed the simplicity of the document stating, “...it’s simple really, it’s not complicated (W. Tait-Rolleston, personal communication, March 27, 2015) and “...it challenged the institutions. What was so smart about it is they had all these hui and they only had 13 recommendations, that’s its beauty it was very simple” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015). The participants found the beauty and contextual significance of the document was its simplicity that participants attributed that to the writing team headed by Sir Tipene O’Regan.

The fact that the discussions and submissions from this consultation process could be grouped into 13 recommendations was a benefit to progressing the goal of developing "...an approach that would meet the needs of Māori in policy, planning and service delivery in the Department of Social Welfare" (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1986) and Baker states the Committee "...delivered a report to Government that was accepted in its entirety and that was probably fairly major" (N. Baker, personal communication, April 9, 2015). Another social policy document that was significant in the arena of social welfare was Te Punga which came out in 1994. One participant described how Te Punga was produced by Margaret Bazley as the "bi-cultural strategy for the nineties" (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015). Harry Walker stated that at the time he was asked what he thought of Te Punga and he said "Te Punga is the anchor that was dragging Pūao-te-Ata-tū to the bottom of the sea never to be seen again". This represented his thoughts on what the introduction of Te Punga symbolised for Pūao-te-Ata-tū. He believes that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was very well written but also acknowledged very briefly given its value and significance. H. Walker discussed how he has used Pūao-te-Ata-tū overseas during workshops internationally to highlight its significance in attempting to eliminate institutional racism. He utilised it to highlight how Aotearoa New Zealand have a Government that has acknowledged and accepted institutional racism.

There were different variables regarding what participants' thoughts were about the success and progression of the 13 recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and these discussions centred primarily on the rationale behind why it did not progress to its fullest potential. Some participants reflected on the idea that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was looking too successful so became a threat to the Government and accordingly its recommendations were not advanced as anticipated.

"My impression is that it went the way of almost every other Māori initiative over the last century...Māori volunteer war effort this was a great example of a Māori

initiative which was about recruiting Māori for the war effort and the production of food and materials to support the war. And then it started to take on a life of its own it became about welfare too so they appointed welfare officers who were appointed to look after the wives and children left behind whom were struggling and this started to look like it was going to work and when anything look like it was going to work Governments have repeatedly made sure that they stopped resourcing it or they stopped supporting it in some way, I think Pūao-te-Ata-tū was a bit like that” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015)

“In terms of collaborative initiative Pūao-te-Ata-tū was the guiding light but because it was Māori developed and developed in New Zealand it didn’t get traction but if someone had written it in America or India they would have gone, this is the best thing since sliced bread” (D. Hauraki, personal communication, April 9, 2015).

“If Māori got too pushy or non-Māori got too pushy about injustices their whole system would start coming in on you...There were a number of things that really were positive but became dangerous to the system. And so they chopped them. I’ve always believed that we should never get carried away we’re a minority group of people so we need to know that anything that happened only happens because the majority of culture says it should.” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015).

D. Hauraki (personal communication, April 9, 2015) also felt there was some responsibility on the staff stating:

“If your employees like something they will promote it if they don’t they won’t be blatant about it but they will put systems which detract from the organisation doing what it’s supposed to do and that’s what happened. Whenever you fronted senior

management they would espouse affinity and support but the minute you walked out of the room you would hear a different story.”

N. Baker (personal communication, April 7, 2015), advised that although Pūao-te-Ata-tū was accepted in its totality without any requested or proposed changes, when it came to the recommendations he stated that:

“we talk about the implementation of the recommendation and this is where it fell over and at that time social welfare was very keen to show that they were in charge but they kept staff within the bureaucratic control within the department ...John Grant got replaced by Margaret Bazley and I actually blame her for the fact that Pūao-te-Ata-tū didn’t make a lot of traction and why because she lived in a monocultural world herself and her management style was monocultural...what they did was draft some children and young person’s legislation that used a lot of Māori words like whānau and that but it didn’t mean anything”.

Dynamic People

Leading up to and during the consultation hui for Pūao-te-Ata-tū people talk of the “...passionate’ people ... who were speaking out loudly [and] determined to change the power structure within the Department of Social Welfare” it is these people that we need to acknowledge when looking at this attempt to address institutional racism within the Department of Social Welfare. (S. Johnson, personal communication, February 11, 2015). An echoing commonality during these interviews was the names and chronicles of two individuals whose actions, visions or directions were at the heart of this period of change not only within the Department of Social Welfare at the time but also within society.

John Rangihau.

One of the people that sit at the pinnacle of Pūao-te-Ata-tū is John Rangihau. His history set him up in a strong position for the role of chairing this Committee. The participants report that they have been fortunate to have experienced a man whose oral knowledge was unsurpassable. John Rangihau was much sought after in that higher tier consultancy position due to his wealth of knowledge and charismatic demeanour. Dame Ann Hercus would have been well aware of Rangihau's credentials when she approached him to chair the Committee. Workman reflects that:

“...it was here that I met John (Rangihau)...as we travelled around the country I got to know John very much and I loved the guy he taught me so much he was very generous with his time and he had a vision for a bi-cultural sector he had a huge reputation with a lot of politicians who sought his advice ...John Grant from DSW, David Otten and Jim Callaghan from Department of Justice those people were people that sought his help...” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015)

Dame Ann Hercus.

Another pivotal person in this era of change was Dame Ann Hercus, appointed Minister to Social Welfare under the Labour government from 1984-1987. Dame Anne Hercus spearheaded the campaign that resulted in Pūao-te-Ata-tū. H. Walker (personal communication, May 21, 2015) states that some of the wonderful things about Pūao-te-Ata-tū are that it “...acknowledged racism within a government department; that they haven't done much about it is another issue, it was a tribute to those involved including Dame Ann Hercus who was a very brave Minister at the time”. Dame Ann Hercus was a Minister during a time of imminent change; Labour took over the leadership of the country that had been preceded by a Muldoon-lead National government for three consecutive terms in Parliament. Dame Ann Hercus's role in acknowledging the monocultural process that was occurring within the

Department of Social Welfare at the time was nothing short of courageous. Dame Ann Hercus's role in this period was crucial and fundamental to not only in the development of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its role in attempting to address institutional racism but also in the task of trying to execute its recommendations. D. Hauraki (personal communication, April 9, 2015) states "...if Ann Hercus didn't drive it, it wouldn't have gone anywhere". Hauraki reported that the participants acknowledge and were enthusiastic by the recognition that Pūao-te-Ata-tū gave to the racism faced by Māori on an institutional level but within that same excitement is aggravation that it did not go further in addressing racism at that level. He also links this back to the political influences and the key people involved at that time claiming that "As soon as Dame Ann Hercus finished it just swayed back to the racist institute that it always was" (D. Hauraki, personal communication, April 9, 2015).

Pākehā Responses to Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

During the consultation period there were 1424 verbal submissions given and evidently within those were lots of grievances regarding the past. D. Hauraki (personal communication April 9, 2015) recalls some of his Pākehā colleagues response to the verbal grievances aired:

"When you went to urban area like Auckland there was always the radical element but it was the skills of members like, John Rangihau, Neville Baker and Albie Williams, because Pākehā members of the committee always tended to react. We told them you don't have to keep on reacting these fella will carry on so we had the tell them to just shut up and let them have their say".

As a result of this resurgence in Māoridom, the participants saw Pākehā break into two groups, those that sympathised with Māori and those that "...felt they were falling victim to this Māori wave" (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015). The sympathisers were strong in their positions and this is described in a story regarding a Māori Unit that was

formed in the Lower Hutt, Department of Social Welfare Office in the early 1990s. This unit, although in a new era of bi-culturalism, raised a disturbing amount of controversy. Some of the Pākehā sympathisers forfeited their senior positions within the Lower Hutt office to allow Senior Māori staff to be appointed, although as Walker points out “...*what is ironic is that they gave up their positions and Māori didn't get the job*” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015). This controversy came to light following a leak to the media regarding the recruitment process of the Wellington Office of the Department of Social Welfare. There was a threat that they (Māori Units) were operating separatist racial policies and they were forced to close by both Dr Cullen ⁶who was the Minister of the Department of Social Welfare at the time and the Director-General for the Department at the time John Grant. Clearly deep concern had developed about this unit and for example people were being asked to give their perspective on the situation, as described by H. Walker:

“I went out to the Hutt to this community meeting and these people were rapt with the unit in the Hutt. They asked me what I thought and I said well seeing I'm in a Māori unit in Head Office how can I disagree with a Māori Unit in the Hutt...I received a call from the press about this unit and I said one of the difficulties is if you see two Māori people in a government department it's a Māori unit and if you see two Māori people out in the street it's a Māori gang.”(H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015)

Pākehā staff were becoming concerned at this revival of Māoridom. H. Walker (personal communication, May 21, 2015) also discusses Māori clients being given Māori social workers and recalls:

⁶ Dr Cullen became the Minister of the Department of Social Welfare in the 1990s following Dame Ann Hercus.

“It was tricky because Māori whānau and clients were used to not having an option and when these units started to come about people would say you’ve got to give people a choice, you have to ask them. Well when there were only white people you didn’t say then that they should have a choice.”

Political Influence

When examining the on-going progress and development of Pūao-te-Ata-tū over the years the participants identify one significant element in determining its success or failure to implement Pūao-te-Ata-tū has been dependent upon the political power at the time. The participants highlight that Dame Ann Hercus as Minister for the Department of Social Welfare and her approach was prominent in the production and initially the progression of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. However this progression was reduced when Dr Michael Cullen took over as Minister in 1990 following the Labour Party’s re-election in 1987. At this same time there were some elements within Parliament who were concerned with what was occurring within the Department of Social Welfare at the time, H. Walker (personal communication, May 21, 2015) stated that “Winston Peters actually raised our Treaty booklet ⁷in Parliament and said there were some radicals who actually wrote these and they were employed in the Department of Social Welfare”. In contrast the Director-General of the Department of Social Welfare had a different view;

“John Grant, Director-General of the Department of Social Welfare he was a real disciple of John Rangihau, he loved him dearly, he really called on his expertise constantly and I think mainly because John wanted to change what was happening desperately”(K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015).

⁷ He was referring to a series of booklets that the Māori development Unit of the Department of Social Welfare produced without the appropriate approval.

This is supported by W. Tait-Rolleston's (personal communication, March 27, 2015) account of John Grant's development and learning during the consultation process,

“he [John Grant] and I went for a walk along the beach in Gisborne during the consultation there, he was shattered, just shattered to think that people were just ignorant of this country's culture and that he had made these decisions, it wasn't his brief but he was part of a sector that sent children from North to South without consultation, tamariki grew up in the South Island without knowing who the hell they were...it was his acknowledgement that he did something wrong and something different needed to happen for change.”

John Grant according to N. Baker (personal communication, April 7, 2015)

“was somewhat sceptical he was a bureaucrat, but after we started to travel he started to soften as he could see the degradation of young people and believed that his Department was somewhat responsible for that process and he became one of the more forceful members of the team.”

Benefits to the Government

One of the key rationales behind the need for the review and one of the key features of the recommendations coming out of the review were based around boys and girls homes which were operated by the Department of Social Welfare. These homes became quite controversial, especially due to their role in disestablishing Māori children's connection with their haukāinga.

“I went to Burwood and the matron there had a young girl taking paint off the wall with a pin and she was two days there doing that and really it was to break her

spirit...we knew then that there was a lot of abuse.” (N. Baker, personal communication, April 7, 2015).

These institutions were also costing the Department in terms of their operational costs.

“The irony was that the emotional drive by Māori whānau to have their children back was a convenient out for the Government to close the institutions...it was just an irony that the desire to save on spending coincided with mātua whāngai where people were saying give our children back.” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21, 2015)

A further issue causing controversy about these homes was regarding the negative outcomes they had for the children and young people placed there as illustrated in the following comment:

“From the whānau perspective it was painful really, a lot of those whānau came to the meetings... and they just unloaded it was a very therapeutic opportunity for people and the pain on how they were treated by the system, the way their children were treated, the fact that they came out of those institutions and 90% reoffended within 12 months, they had mixed up children who had offended with children that lacked supervision or care so there was no demarcation around that, there was evidence of sexual violation in the institutions so you had all these damaged kids coming out of the institutions and the end the evidence showed that if you looked at the children and young adults in prison at any one time 70% of them have child welfare experience, that history perpetuated itself.” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015).

Summary

The overarching relevance of institutional racism is evident throughout these different themes and there are key elements of it in the personal experiences and stories told. In summary this chapter furnished the themes that were manifested through the interviews with the six participants who have been well ensconced in the social sector world having historically been in managerial/consultative roles. They are all well versed in Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the whakaaro behind it. These themes highlighted some of the key reflections raised by the participants.

These themes were:

1. *Consultation Process* many of the participants discussed the unique nature of the process that was used in the development of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This was also acknowledged in conjunction with the enormity of the process that that was before them. There was a definite need for key administrative roles to assist in coordinating this task and ensuring that there was clear process. A further highlight was the skills that John Rangihau had attained over his lifetime and the beneficial advantages they played throughout this consultation process. One of these being his innate ability of recall and ability to harmonise the varied thoughts, views and attitudes expressed throughout the hui. The people involved in the consultation period were also mentioned in terms of the individual value and experience that they brought to the process. Finally the demanding schedule for those involved was defined and explored.
2. *The Document* or Pūao-te-Ata-tū itself and its achievements received accolades from the participants for its simplicity and acceptance at a Government level. Pūao-te-Ata-tū relationship with 'Te Punga' was mentioned regarding what was seen as an attempt to move on from Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Finally that it was developed by Māori with a Māori centred approach was the reason that it did not gain recognition both nationally and internationally.

3. *Dynamic People* it was evident through the interviews that apart from the people that I was interviewing there were significant personnel involved with this process that it is said would not have made Pūao-te-Ata-tū as successful had they not been involved. The section acknowledges those people and the role that they played.
4. *Pākehā Response to Pūao-te-Ata-tū* examined the support and opposition of Pākehā Department of Social Welfare staff to this era of significant change.
5. *Political Influence* explored the significance and relevance of the governing party in the development and progression of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Participants talk about the significance of the Minister and how the change from Dame Ann Hercus to Dr Michael Cullen saw the priorities for the Department of Social Welfare swing to a position where full support of the implementation of the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū ceased.

These findings are discussed and analysed in the next chapter in relation to current social service structures; articulating the relevance of these findings to social service policy and delivery today.

Chapter Six: Analysis

“He rā ki tua”

“Better times are coming”

Introduction

This chapter follows on from the previous chapter which described the themes discussed by the participants. The whakatauki above articulates people’s thoughts at the time that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was produced; there would have been a sense of excitement, elation and anticipation at the changing tides ahead. The expectation about Pūao-te-Ata-tū was immense and for the Māori people of New Zealand it could not have come any sooner. “They⁸ describe the era with an enthusiasm that emulates the impact the report would have had in 1986” (Hollis, 2005).

This research project aims to examine the period leading up to, including and post-Pūao-te-Ata-tū, allowing participants closely involved in this review the opportunity to reflect on its journey. This chapter will explore some of the common themes⁹ and critically analyse the findings with what the literature tells us about this era, paying particular attention to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its relevance in achieving social change. It will articulate the implications and also lessons discovered through this research project.

The Process

Discussion and exploration of the journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū is uncharted waters from a research perspective. “Initial discussions around Pūao-te-Ata-tū were that there was no

⁸ They refer to the participants another research project. Hollis, A. (2005). *Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori Social Work Methods* (Unpublished masters dissertation). Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.

⁹ *Common Themes* in this instance refer to the themes identified in Chapter Five: Findings. These being *The Consultation Process, The Document, Dynamic People Pākehā Response to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Political Influence*.

template on consultations: nothing, no experience, no western country had ever done this at all never ever” (W. Tait-Rolleston, personal communication, March 27, 2015). Many researchers have focussed on the relevance of Pūao-te-Ata-tū to our history either directly or through examining New Zealand’s social history, but with minimal exploration of the significance of the process (Brown, 2000; Dalley, 1998; Garlick, 2012; Hollis, 2006; Keenan, 1999; Sorrenson, 1996 and Walker, 1995). The initial expectation by the Minister at the time, Dame Ann Hercus, was that the committee be given six months to complete the task. Given the breadth of the approach taken, the fact that the consultation only took eight and a half months is astounding (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986). This depth of the process was and still remains unparalleled.

To give Pūao-te-Ata-tū some perspective of its status regarding ministerial reviews, in 2000 Minister Steve Maharey appointed Judge Michael (Mick) Brown to complete a Ministerial review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services. The Ministerial Review into the Department of Child, Youth and Family services acknowledges 69 written submissions and 63 oral, some of which are the same submitters. This comparison shows 132 submissions versus the Pūao-te-Ata-tū approach which considered 1691 submissions. Even the author of this Ministerial review into the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services understood the relevance of Pūao-te-Ata-tū stating “...that the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report lead by the late John Rangihau be revisited and that some of the thoughts and ideas which were part of that report be looked at again” (Brown,2000). The committee felt that they had to listen to the community and to affectively achieve this “...an oral approach to our work was the traditional approach of Māori people to which they would respond. Our records are equally oral; being unedited transcripts of tapes and proceedings” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986). The committee ensured that the approach taken resulted in the need to really listen to what the communities were

saying and through this it was said that the messages were made in countless different ways but the central themes were all the same, this was to highlight the “oral approach to the work” (Lupton & Nixon, 1999). A myriad of emotions were expressed during these consultations however they were summed up simply stating that “The angry sense of powerlessness is not matched with a sense of hopelessness” (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986; Lupton & Nixon, 1999).

The Document

The basis for this research was the interest in how a report some 26 years old still had prevalence or relevance in the social service arena today. The desire was to explore what was at the essence of this report that was so unique that it spanned generations. Participants as well as authors believe that it is the power of the Māori people that has kept the report alive and relevant, as illustrated in the following comment from Dame Tariana Turia, “It is unfortunate that it has taken 10 years for government to recognise the significance of this document. Significance which the Māori community has always kept to the forefront” (Turia, 2001). Dame Tariana Turia made this statement in Parliament following the release of Judge Brown’s report reviewing the Department of Child, Youth and Family Service. Brown stated in his review that:

“[T]he report of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was in my view a far sighted one. In many ways not only an accurate analysis of contemporary failing prior to 1986 but more importantly a visionary document for the collaboration with the wider community for the enticing prospects of community ownership of responsibility for the welfare of children and young persons” (Brown, 2000, p. 81).

In speaking with the participants there is a strong sense that Pūao-te-Ata-tū did not achieve what it set out to achieve all those years ago and the issues that saw the establishment of the Advisory Committee formed initially are still prevalent. The participants were asked if they

believed Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieved what it set out to achieve the responses were all very similar:

“...Pūao-te-Ata-tū the policy is brilliant and it’s still applicable now trouble is you need innovative and creative way of implementing it” (D. Hauraki, personal communication, April 9).

“I think it was initially but then there was a change when John Grant left and Margaret Bazley came in she went out of her way to make it unsuccessful....my impression is that it went the way almost every other Māori initiative over the last century...when anything Māori looks like it’s going to work governments have repeatedly made sure that they stopped resourcing it or they stopped supporting it in some way” (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9).

“It challenged the institutions ... it didn’t really change anything I say institutional racism still exists” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21)

“So what did we achieve? I think that we delivered a report to the government that accepted it in its entirety and that is probably a fairly major thing cause nobody really took recommendations out or question them and then we talk about the implementation of the recommendations and this is where it fell over and at the time Social Welfare was very keen to show that they were in charge but they kept staff within the bureaucratic control” (N. Baker, personal communication, April 7).

All participants spoke with passion of Pūao-te-Ata-tū, how it was approached and what it attempted to achieve. Many of the participants recognise the beauty in its simplicity, it covered many aspects, and it gave a thorough and pragmatic recording of the recommendations, but much of its strength also lay in the appendices which framed the journey of Māori from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi to the issues of the time. But the

consensus was that although the production and acceptance of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū was unchallenged the implementation of the recommendations was where Pūao-te-Ata-tū's journey ceased. The participant's views were supported by other researchers as highlighted in these comments:

Failure to run with the constructive vision of Pūao-te-Ata-tū is a sad indictment on all those involved. Certainly many of those views received legislative endorsement. But the failure to grasp the opportunities contained therein has meant in my view that the overall benefits which extend far beyond the then Department of Social Welfare has been delayed, diluted and in some cases distorted. (Brown, 2000).

“The report (Pūao-te-Ata-tū) was accepted and the Department of Social Welfare has worked on its implementing its recommendations. Not all of these have survived the 1990s change of Government from Labour party to the National party (in particular the social welfare commission has been terminated)” (Armitage, 1995).

The literature more recently starts to eliminate any reference or relevance to Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This view is from a report submitted to Minister of Social Development when highlighting the history of the Department of Social Welfare in the mid-1980s:

“...the Department were clearly in trouble....and this had thrown the department into relative disarray. And then, three different but powerful forces were about to meet each other at the end of the 1980s – Public Sector Reform, the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (UNCROC) and the emergence of the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act” (Broad, 2013)

This begins to highlight an era where most governmental literature pertinent to reviews and investigations of the practice and service delivery of Minister of Social Development are no longer conferring Pūao-te-Ata-tū the relevance and prestige that it deserves in the area of

consultation with the community, and its core fundamentals and principles.

Outcomes

Throughout this research it was difficult to grasp what were the causes for the lack of support, effort or traction for the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. If the findings and recommendations were accepted without challenge why was it too hard to progress these to a stage of implementation?

Many of our participants and the literature states that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was not successful in meeting its objectives and although this may be true in its entirety some of the 13 recommendations proposed by Pūao-te-Ata-tū were achieved. In an attempt to highlight what recommendations were achieved from Pūao-te-Ata-tū, a chronological examination of relevant documents is provided which highlights a timeline of the progression of relevant recommendations highlighting success or a lack of progress. We will start with the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act. Pūao-te-Ata-tū recommended that

...the Department should recognise the value of kinship groups and especially the personal roles of Māori such as elders. The Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act came out of these recommendations and would enshrine some of the key issues. (Keenan, 2004).

Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989

The Children, Young Persons and their Families Act (CYPF Act) came into effect in November 1989. At the time it was touted as “...the most advanced bit of social legislation of its time in the world, the Act radically transformed children’s welfare services and became a model for other countries” (Dalley, 1998). Some practitioners believe that the CYPF Act was

a direct result of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and there is some truth to this however that is not entirely true. There was a review of the Children and Young Persons Act 1974 (CYP Act) implemented before work had begun on Pūao-te-Ata-tū. This review was not yet completed and the findings of Pūao-te-Ata-tū were released and "... [D]rafts of the new legislation showed that the committee had not incorporated a bicultural understanding of practice its proposals" (Armitage, 1995). Accordingly the bill was rejected and the Committee charged with reviewing the old legislation provided a new bill that introduced two key features that were absent from the previous draft, these were the Family Group Conference and the functioning of Iwi authorities. Although difficult to comprehend that only two objectives of Pūao-te-Ata-tū appeared relevant to the new CYPF Act legislation, the Ministerial Committee had been invited by Dame Ann Hercus to recommend changes to the CYP Act and had formally done so via a written report which is Annex II of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

"The Committee considered a substantial ideological change necessary if the Act were to adequately cater to Māori needs. It did not therefore propose specific amendments but urged that the revision of the Act be shaped around the principles..."

(Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1986, p. 29).

In exploring if Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieved what it set out to achieve, recommendation four was realised through the enactment of the CYPF Act. Furthermore recommendation one was supported as the principles of "Incorporating the values, cultures and beliefs of the Māori people in all policies ..." were featured in the CYPF Act through its principles (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986). Finally the principles of recommendation two regarding "...attacking and eliminating deprivation and alienation by...(c) Ensuring legislation which recognises social, cultural and economic values of all cultural groups especially Māori people (and) (d) Developing strategies and initiatives which harness the

potential of all of its people., and especially Māori people to advance” were relevant also with the CYPF Act. (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986).

The enactment of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 endorsed recommendations one, two and four of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Te Punga: Our Bi-cultural Strategy for the Nineties (1994)

In November 1990 New Zealand saw a change in Government from the Labour Party to the National Party and furthermore a change in Minister from Dr Michael Cullen to Ms Jenny Shipley. The change in Government also brought about a change in Director-General for the Department of Social Welfare and in 1993 Margaret Bazley was appointed to the role.

Most participants discuss how the progression and traction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū really diminished under this governmental regime. K. Workman (personal communication, April 9, 2015) states that “...with a change in Government it was my impression is that it [Pūao-te-Ata-tū] went the way of almost every other Māori initiative over the last century”.

Margaret Bazley states that regardless of her enthusiasm for bi-cultural development she had been advised that the initial surge developed by Pūao-te-Ata-tū has not been sustained, based on this she had published *Te Punga: Our Bi-cultural strategy for the Nineties* (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1994). Furthermore she confirmed within the document that this strategy was based on the foundations of “The Treaty of Waitangi, Pūao-te-Ata-tū , State Sector Act 1988, The Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993. p. 81).

Margaret Bazley does speak highly of Pūao-te-Ata-tū within her report referring to it as “...a landmark report...it resulted in the establishment of new structures which enabled Māori views to be heard...(the changes) led to heightened awareness throughout the Department of the importance of a bicultural approach..(Furthermore she felt that) ... [E]very current staff member and new recruit should gain some familiarity with Pūao-te-Ata-tū and note its recommendations” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993).

The purpose of Te Punga was:

“...to set out the direction in which we will give effect to our role. We need to clarify the purpose so that staff at all levels will know what is expected of them and will gain the satisfaction of doing it well. We need to anchor out bicultural direction in such a way that it will not come loose again.” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993).

Interestingly she admits here that initial progress had ceased but believed that the introduction of this policy approach would reinvigorate the original surge established by Pūao-te-Ata-tū. In exploring Te Punga there are some correlations to some of the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Margaret Bazley broke her strategies into short (1 Year tenure), medium (1-3 years) and long term (3-5 year) blocks. Within these were tasks specific to management, staff and customer matters. Although the strategies did not exclusively achieve the overall purpose of the recommendations she did ensure that they aligned with many of the original features of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Managers were required to have an expectation that they would be culturally appropriate and this would be built into their performance objectives. This supported recommendation one which looked at the social policy objective of providing leadership which help develop a society in which the values of all groups are of central importance to its enhancement. There was also a requirement to identify iwi affiliation for all Māori clients. Te Punga also explored staff recruitment and support. Under recommendation nine of

Pūao-te-Ata-tū the strategy had a requirement to:

Actively recruit Māori staff by utilising media that Māori are likely to notice...all interview panels have at least one local Māori person on the panel who is involved in all stages...develop departmental traineeship programme[s] for recruiting young Māori ...ensure Māori staff [are] provided by persons able to coach staff both professionally and from a cultural perspective (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993).

Bazley had made clear links in her strategies to Pūao-te-Ata-tū recommendations, included in this also was recommendation ten concerning staff training. There was a cry from Departmental staff for adequate and appropriate training:

“I’m seconded to the Staff Training unit and I agree that the staff should be trained in how to handle multi-cultural issues, but the difficulty is that we as trainer receive no training and I think that this is an issue that should be looked at” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986).

Bazley set about addressing this within her strategy ordering training for all levels of staff within the Department from managers through to induction programmes for new staff, training for Māori staff focussing on learning Te Reo and tertiary training for all staff to enable them to gain qualifications in their specific areas. She also proceeded to address an array of situations presented in recommendation eleven regarding appropriate customer service. In order to achieve this Bazley stated that the:

“minimum bicultural requirements for staff include:

- *Correct pronunciation of basic Māori words*

- *Knowledge of who is the mana whenua in an area*
- *Knowledge of Pūao-te-Ata-tū*
- *Knowledge of Treaty of Waitangi*” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993. p. 19).

Finally Te Punga set about moving to support recommendation thirteen by working collaboration across state departments and iwi authorities. She did this by directing that all of her managers “...establish contact and maintain regular liaison with the mana whenua iwi of a district to discuss service issues, improvements required in service delivery and engage in information sharing”. They were also required as part of the long-term plan to report quarterly on these meeting’s. (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1993. p. 20).

‘Te Punga’ developed some clear intentions to develop a bicultural framework within these intentions there are traces to five of the original thirteen recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū . Some of the participants hold Margaret Bazley responsible for the lost traction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū however the objectives of ‘Te Punga’ would suggest otherwise. It is difficult to not see ‘Te Punga’ as a reincarnation of the wheel, that wheel being Pūao-te-Ata-tū . “...the Director-General of Social Welfare released a policy document named ‘Te Punga’ in which the Departments bicultural strategy and commitment to Pūao-te-Ata-tū was restated” (Sorrenson, 1996).

Care and Protection is about Adults Behaviour (Mick Brown Review 2000)

In 2000 the prevalence of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was still evident and again graced the table of those in control of social service in Aotearoa, New Zealand through the Ministerial Review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Service previously known as Department of Social Welfare. Judge Michael (Mick) Brown brought Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its principles to the forefront of social services again by stating that:

“I would respectfully urge that the Pūao-te-Ata-tū report be revisited so that some of those notion and concepts such as social welfare commission, district executive committees and the Mātua Whāngai can be considered” (Brown, 2000).

Although the legislation and policy supported a better and bicultural approach to social services particularly for Māori, information gathered in this review was highlighting that attitudes had not changed and movement towards equality had ceased. Considering recommendation two of Pūao-te-Ata-tū which looks at the operational objective of eliminating racism and this review found that:

“It becomes clear, on reading this part of the submission that the Department’s bicultural model, so promising in the mid-1980s, has stagnated over the 1990s. In the light of this discovery, it seems necessary to go back to the developments of the 1980s, when the longstanding grievances of Māori in terms of their children began to be listened too.” (Brown, 2000)

One of the outcomes of the Mick Brown review was that it is urged that those in control return to that period where as a country we were excited and ready to address the grievance that had plagued the Māori for so long in an attempt to capture the essence and determination to move forward with change. The Mick Brown review also examined the area of legislation as many have said that recommendation four of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was achieved through the enactment of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989. However if we were to examine the opportunity afforded to Māori by both Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the CYPF Act “...from which separate Iwi Social Services were able to be developed to help improve care and protection services for Māori” there are many debates as to the success of this objective and this rests on “...what appears to be the downside of so called devolution where there is a great enthusiasm to devolve responsibility but no control” (Brown, 2000). Through Child,

Youth and Family's own submission to this review they stated that "[I]f devolution of statutory services to iwi and Māori is extended, then a sizable proportion of our current resources will need to be transferred to iwi and Māori providers" they also confirmed that "...service provided by iwi and Māori have not been funded to the same level as established voluntary sector providers" (Brown, 2000, p. 78). This highlights that although the new legislation allowed for the possibility of devolving service to Iwi authorities there was a real gap between saying and doing. As Sorrenson (1996, p. 122), states, "...the discrepancy between what New Zealand Children and Young Persons Service was saying and doing, and some of the possible reasons for the poor response to Māori".

In exploring recommendation eleven whose main intent was really about better communication and a more welcoming feeling from the departmental offices the review states that "Within the social work field one strategy adopted by Child, Youth and Family has been the concept of Roopu with Māori Social work teams". The reasons given for this within Pūao-te-Ata-tū were that "They (Māori Social work teams) are less likely to be confused or diverted by issues of culture" (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986). This example is discussed as something supported and encouraged by Child, Youth and Family during the period of this review mid to late 2000s, This approach highlights the progress made in specific regards to service delivery to Māori by Māori, however in a later section an example of a Departmental Office's attempt to form a Roopu team will be explored in more depth.

Other Relevant Documents

Before entering the more modern arena of the current taskforce established by Ann Tolley there are other pieces of literature and discussions that have occurred since which highlights relevance to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and if it achieved its original targets. This section explores other key aspects of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and their relevance to the progression of this ministerial review

before exploring more of the recent review material.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū's recommendation three and also something that K. Workman stated was a key focus for John Rangihau was the establishment of Local District Committees.

“Local District Executive Committees attached to district offices each had seven community members and two departmental members who monitored their work. None of these groups lasted-they were disbanded in mid-1991- but they symbolised an attempt to ‘deprofessionalise’ the administration of welfare.” (Dalley, 1998, p. 267).

This highlights that although established in 1987-88 and working, it was disbanded. It would appear that through an administrative review in 1990 a Commission was established for which “...the Committees would act as its eyes and ears. A year later, all committees were abolished altogether. The Director-General declared that the Commission had been unable to perform its functions adequately” (Garlick, 2012, p. 125).

Mātua Whāngai is a feature discussed by both the participants and many researchers and it is easy for this concept to get lost amongst our social service history however one researcher has explored Mātua Whāngai and refers to it as – ‘An important concept of Social Work’. Mātua Whāngai began as a joint venture between Department of Social Welfare and Māori Affairs regarding a concern for Māori Youth problems, its focus and development changed over the period and recommendation seven of Pūao-te-Ata-tū solidified Mātua Whāngai relevance to Māori by stating that: “the Mātua Whāngai programme in respect of children return to its original focus of nurturing children within the family group” (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986). It would seem that although supported by Pūao-te-Ata-tū and soon following the enactment of the CYPF Act Mātua Whāngai roles around the country were becoming obsolete this was due to a number of factors. Mātua Whāngai officers were moving into co-ordinators roles under the new Act, following on from this

during the restructuring of the Department of Social Welfare in the 1990s and 1992 Mātua Whāngai disappeared altogether.

Recommendation eight called for a collaborated approach to promote the development of initiatives to improve skills and work experience for the young unemployed. The outcome of this recommendation can also be ascribed as the possible rationale for the overall loss in traction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū generally.

“Less government attention was paid to the committees call for a co-ordinated government response to larger issues, in particular the ‘major social crisis’ of a young, disaffected generation growing up with few opportunities to work, ...And in the following years some of the impetus was lost when those who had advocated a more adaptable system left their positions of influence” (McClure, 1998, p. 13).

Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel (2015)

A ‘complete overhaul’ of Child, Youth and Family was called for and the Expert Panel was announced by the current Social Development Minister Anne Tolley (Tolley, 2015). Anne Tolley states that for the sake of vulnerable children the Department must do better (Tolley, 2015). Two points that were discovered through this recently commissioned report leads to a belief that the significance and life of Pūao-te-Ata-tū has died. Minister Anne Tolley highlights a total disregard for Pūao-te-Ata-tū in her scope of the review by only referring to Māori once within her 18 points and secondly by her initial lack of any Māori representation on her panel. Minister Anne Tolley attempted to rectify this and another anomaly of no social work representation by establishing a Māori reference group.

This review becomes relevant as it provides documented policy related outcomes which highlight that some of the disparities that we spoke of leading up to Pūao-te-Ata-tū are still relevant today.

When comparing this review to Pūao-te-Ata-tū closer there were some disparities between what Pūao-te-Ata-tū was seeking and yet at the same time some eerie similarities of which one was a call to deliver "... the best possible results for vulnerable children and their families decades ahead" (Tolley, 2015). The disparity was that there was no mention here of Māori specifically even though Māori children form 58% of Child, Youth and Families children in care ("Child, Youth and Family," 2015). The similarities are that Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieved a level of change for Māori that remained through the decades.

Similarities in Tolley's (2015) statement that "New Zealand used to be a world leader in the fields of child protection" highlights that the practice that was occurring post Pūao-te-Ata-tū's implementation was highly regarded internationally. One of the obvious disparities and something for which Tolley was challenged for was her non-inclusion of any Māori on her Expert Panel, this highlights a total disregard for the significance and relevance that the approach Pūao-te-Ta-tu had to achieving effective change.

Minister Anne Tolley's Modernisation review has recently been completed. One of the obvious findings is the over-representation of Māori children (Office of the Children's Commissioner, 2015). Minister Anne Tolley's Modernisation review panel state that "[T]hese factors relate to living with higher levels of socio-economic disadvantage, inequality, deprivation and vulnerability than the general population" (Modernising Child Youth and Family, 2016, p. 59). This highlights that Māori needs are not being met by the current system, this is suggestive of the possibility that Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its historical achievements have been extinguished (Modernising Child Youth and Family, 2016). .

The approach employed by the expert panel in having a designated “Youth Advisory Panel” which is a panel is made up of “...young people with experience of CYF service” has similarities to John Rangihau’s approach by going to source and seeking input for change (Modernisation Child Youth and Family, 2015). Clearly this approach is not to the extent that John Rangihau went to in consulting with Māori but it is suggestive of giving a voice to the children and young people involved with Child, Youth and Family.

In Tolley’s preliminary report she made an interesting statement when exploring the previous reviews that have occurred dating right back to Pūao-te-Ata-tū she states that “[I]t is our observation that many of the recommendations of previous reviews in New Zealand were not put into effect, resulting only in incremental improvements to the system but leaving many fundamental concerns substantially unaddressed” (Modernising Child Youth and Family, 2015). This is however a broad and generic statement referring to 8 different government reviews dating back to 1988.

Given that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was from within the social welfare framework and was the outcome of a review into the policy and service delivery at the time it is valid to explore the current review and its 81 recommendations. The interim report highlighted 8 broad recommendations coming from this review, the first highlights that there is going to need to be a gigantic overhaul of the current operating system and this report starts to articulate what the new operating system is and its functions (Modernisation Child Youth and Family, 2015). The recommendations are really a preliminary notice to the Minister of the areas in which the review will focus these include the establishment of an advocacy unit for clients of Child, Youth and Family, some legislative reform, they are suggestive of the proposed budget for their required change (Modernisation Child Youth and Family, 2015). In the interim report there is a noticeable absence of the lack of focus on how all of these changes affect Māori

Child, Youth and Family's most common client group, something which is obvious throughout this review panel.

Although this current review is proposing significant change only seven of the overall 81 recommendations pay particular attention to the needs of Māori within this review. This highlights concerns that even though statistics highlight that Māori are still over represented in the Child, Youth and Family the government is not truly addressing the needs of Māori. These recommendations are:

“16. Note that the majority of children who are known to CYF are Māori and reducing the over representation of Māori children and young people is an objective of the future system.

17. Agree the design of the operating model and the operations of the future department, shall set high and explicit expectations and targets to improve outcomes for vulnerable Māori children, young people and their whānau.

18. Agree the department have an indicative target of improving outcomes for vulnerable Māori children and young people that would result in a 25-30% reduction in the forward liability costs within 5 years, once the new operating model is in place.

19. Agree to establish a partnership foundation between qualified academics, social service providers, iwi, Whānau Ora and the future department to carry out a gap analysis of existing programmes and services to support the department in the commissioning of new initiatives and approaches to improve life course outcomes for Māori children and whānau.

20. Agree that Whānau Ora can play a role in assisting whānau to develop a stronger understanding of their own strengths and how they can access social services to support better outcomes for vulnerable children.

21. Agree strategic partnering with iwi and Māori organisations is established by the Transformation Programme, and later by the future department, to provide opportunity and invite innovation from organisations interested in improving outcomes for vulnerable Māori children, young people and their whānau.

22. Agree MSD commence, and the future department continue, publically reporting progress toward improving outcomes for vulnerable Māori children and young people.” (Modernisation Child Youth and Family, 2016, pp. 21-22).

Will it affect any change for Māori clients? Again it is a review that has been inflicted onto an indigenous minority group without any significant consultation the likelihood of success is remote.

Dynamic People

In examining the current day and what is occurring for Child, Youth and Family it is difficult to not expose one of the findings regarding what made Pūao-te-Ata-tū relevant, how has this Ministerial review lived through the succession of other policy reviews? The answer becomes obvious, that the key facilitators of this period of great change were John Te Aniwaniwa Rangihau and Dame Ann Hercus who we will explore and examine later in this chapter. When one reads through our history books in an attempt to put oneself in the picture of what was occurring at the time it is easy to miss some key people involved unless we look hard. One of these groups of people were what became known as the action group: Women Against Racism Action Group “WARAG”. This group membership at the time that their report was produced comprised of nine Pākehā women, Denise Berridge, Lainey Cowen,

Tanya Cumberland, Allyson Davys, Heather McDowell, Judith Morgan, Lysette Riley, Ann Ruck and Paula Wallis, all in their own right very brave women. Tanya Cumberland had for some months before the production of the WARAG report tried to "...incorporate the Māori dimension by persuading her superiors to establish a Māori Advisory Unit" (Walker, R. 1987, p. 90). She was successful with this task and the Auckland Māori community were given the responsibility to appoint to this advisory unit. These appointments were made in accordance with a Māori approach and in September 1984 the first successful candidates were appointed to the Advisory unit and the community had high hopes that this unit was going to "...transform the Department of Social Welfare from monoculturalism to biculturalism..." (Walker, 1987, p. 90).

At the time that the WARAG produced its report on Institutional Racism in the Department of Social Welfare, the Māori Advisory Unit were also researching how they perceived the Department of Social Welfare and its capacity to meet the needs of the Māori people in relation to service delivery. The MAU findings were that "...it substantially supported the WARAG report and recommended that a taskforce comprising of Māori and non –Māori be established to deal with the issue of racism in the Department of Social Welfare" (Walker, R. 1987, p. 90). The WARAG report also asserted that institutional racism was a Pākehā problem and it needed a Pākehā solution. The groups "...concluding recommendation was that the Department must become bicultural and to do this it must return power and resources to Māori people so that they may be equal participants in policy and decision making" (Walker, 1987, p. 90). Clearly the highlight on racism and the suggestion that Department of Social Welfare were operating a monocultural approach to its issues were faced with white backlash. WARAG who had stated that they believed this to be a Pākehā problem, offered to deliver training seminars from their report and the need to address the issues, however they were refused the opportunity and Cumberland became the "...sacrificial victim..[her

behaviour]...would not be tolerated [nor would] any further agitation on her part to speed up the eradication of racism in the Department” (Walker, R. 1987, p. 91).

It is said that after the production of Pūao-te-Ata-tū Tanya’s Cumberland’s promising career plateaued out. N. Baker (personal communication, April 7, 2015) stated that “*Tanya Cumberland... blew the whistle on institutional racism*”. Although for some Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the acknowledgement of institutional racism launched their careers within the social sector for the likes of Tanya Cumberland she “...became the target of opprobrium from her reactionary Pākehā colleagues” having built her career to Assistant Regional Director of Development in Auckland for the Department of Social Welfare, she resigned “...totally demoralised in the lack of support from her director in the Auckland office for her commitment to eradicate racism and sexism in the D.S.W.” (Walker, 1987).

John Rangihau.

Born in Kuha, south of Waikaremoana, Rangihau became known in his iwi as Te Nika (Underhill, 1998). After serving in the Māori Battalion in 1949 John Rangihau’s career in the social service sector began with the Department of Māori Affairs as a welfare officer following a stint in a government run health centre. He was a recognised leader within Tuhoē and with the support of his family in 1957 he moved to Wellington to pursue academic qualification, thus he completed the Diploma in Social Science at Victoria University in 1959 (Underhill, 1998). Following this he moved around establishing and working for offices of the Department of Māori Affairs but also for his people, becoming their main spokesperson, for relevant events at the time. He was also a feature within Government hui and even international hui and conventions speaking of developments within the Māori world. In 1973 he moved into education and worked in the University of Waikato’s Centre for Māori Studies and Research. Much of John Rangihau’s work around Te Reo Māori was completed during his time at Waikato University. In 1982 he was involved in a “...committee that

investigated the establishment of a new and more effective scheme to stop the decline in numbers of Māori speaking people in New Zealand” (Rangihau, 2014). Later this same year he became a senior consultant with the Department of Māori Affairs from where he then retired. Dame Ann Hercus approached John Rangihau in retirement to seek him to lead the committee for this Ministerial review. “John Rangihau knew he had been recruited from retirement to produce a report that would damp down the fires of resentment kindled in the D.S.W. by the WARAG report” (Walker, 1987). A point that was captured on video is a quote from John Rangihau where he states “Despite the fact that there were five of us that were Māori we were called a white washing team a team of wankers and a team of uncle toms” (Maxwell, 2011). John Rangihau “...disavowed that he would do a whitewash job because as a retired servant he was beyond the reach of the system” (Walker, 1987).

Dame Ann Hercus.

Dame Ann Hercus entered the realm of politics on the back of a Māori renaissance in the late 1970s early 1980s. “In the 1980s the government began to describe the treaty as New Zealand’s founding document...some government reports advocated biculturalism” (Haywood, 2012). Even though she had thought fondly of John Rangihau and he too thought very highly of her suggesting that “...Dame Ann Hercus...be the helmsperson, the navigator and the guide for your Māori people in a new age through and beyond the year 2000” (Turia, 2001). Dame “...Ann Hercus accepted that Social Welfare was one of the worse monocultural departments” (Morgan & Scott, 1990). Pūao-te-Ata-tū was described by Ann Hercus as the most significant document ever presented to the Department of Social Welfare.

The calibre of people involved at different stages both pre and post Pūao-te-Ata-tū all highlight traits and qualities that were courageous, brave and arduous. They were people who were dynamic and used their roles and their voices in an attempt to address racism within the Department of Social Welfare. They were dynamic people.

Pākehā Responses to Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Following in the footsteps of Pūao-te-Ata-tū in the early 1990s the Lower Hutt Office of the Department of Social Welfare unbeknown to the higher managers within the organisation, had established a Māori Unit. When it came to light Dr Cullen who was the Minister at the time following on from Dame Ann Hercus stated that these units were "...leading down the separatist path to a liberal version of apartheid" (Raea, 1990). There was a threat that they were operating separatist racial policies and they were forced to close by both Dr Cullen and the Director-General for the Department at the time John Grant. Clearly deep concern had developed for this unit and people were being asked to give their perspective on the situation, a comment that caused sufficient turmoil at the time came from Mr Harry Walker:

"... Māori were continually told to look after themselves, but when they took initiatives they were criticised. We are damned if we do and are damned if we don't ... I think the moves are a positive thing. The offices are trying to redress imbalances. Māori often worked together on common issues in Social welfare offices. If you see two Māori in the street, you see a gang, if you see two in an office, you see a unit"
(Morgan & Scott, 1990).

It was this final sentence that caused the most uproar and he was asked by his superiors to tell the media that he had been misquoted; he refused to do this stating that it was what he had said. The unit was not the only casualty from this situation. On the 2nd August 1990 the Lower Hutt office had received a written instruction that it needed to take immediate steps to disband the unit. The Lower Hutt office responded by "...implementing a working party to review the current structure and recommend a new structure" (Van Rooyen, 1990). It is important to note that these developments occurred only 4 years following the production of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and furthermore the initial findings of this working party were:

“Staff in the unit are [sic] working as normal ordinary social workers. They do all social work duties. They report through senior social workers to the Assistant Director, Social Work. They handle some Pākehā cases. Sometimes a Pākehā and Māori social worker will work together on a case. Staffs are [sic] accountable as are other social workers, to the care and protection and youth justice coordinators. In general Māori clients will be referred to a Māori social worker and if that is not the clients wish, then the client can be transferred to a non-Māori social worker.”
(Rooyan, 1990)

In conclusion the working party that was established to develop the less obtrusive manner in disbanding the Māori unit concluded that there was no need to disperse the unit as it was meeting all of its requirements and furthermore that it wasn't practicing separatist attitudes and policies as was previously implied. The Acting Director-General at the time, Mr Murdock Taylor, did not agree with the findings and gave the Director until 31 August 1990 to disperse the Māori Social workers into other care and protection teams. The working party were directed to revisit the situation and to concentrate on the outcome of a disbandment of this unit. This is confirmed in a letter written to Adrienne Hewitt¹⁰ in response to a thank you letter received from Dr Michael Cullen in September 1990 regarding participation on the working party, the executive senior social worker states:

“It appears that the Department failed to advise you that I formally withdrew from the working party during the second meeting. The reason for this was my concern regarding the request to rework our recommendations. The request to rework the proposal contained very specific indications of what we should come up with. In my view, it was more appropriate for the Department to instruct the social services

¹⁰ Letter from Dr Michael Cullen addressed to Adrienne Hewitt

division accordingly, rather than the working party pretending it was their idea”

(Hewitt, 1990).

This highlights clearly the lack of support and recognition for the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and concern that the essence of the findings were becoming lost. Furthermore there was a real sense of fear from ‘some’ Pākehā within the organisation that this approach to working in a more culturally appropriate fashion may actually gain traction.

Political Influence

Following on from the Māori Unit issue in Lower Hutt, the Department had a newly appointed Minister of Social Welfare, Dr Michael Cullen, Margaret Bazley was the Director-General following on from John Grant and this changing of the guard had a significant conclusion to the direction that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was taking. A movement away from following in the line of the Pūao-te-Ata-tū recommendations was imminent “...some of the impetus was lost when those who had advocated a more adaptable system left their positions of influence. John Rangihau died, John Grant retired, and [Dame] Ann Hercus left politics” (McClure, 1998). Some put this down to the fact that the government saw a means to diverge from a more bicultural model by stating that we were a multicultural country and needed to take all cultures into consideration. “The Pūao-te-Ata-tū recommendation for the establishment of a bicultural unit in the DSW was subverted by entrenched Pākehā people. The standard technique of de-emphasising the Māori claims to an equal share by introducing the ideology of multiculturalism was used” (Walker, 1987).

The concept of monoculturalism being proposed by the government has also been targeted as bearing some responsibility for the lack of traction and progression of the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

“I’ve always believed that we should never get carried away we’re a minority group of people so we need to know that anything that happens only happens because the majority of culture says it should happen and of course we can feel really great about it and we think it’s us but really deep down it ain’t us” (H. Walker, personal communication, May 21).

N. Baker (personal communication, April 7, 2015) states that Margaret Bazley “...lived in a monocultural world herself and her management style was monocultural (as was) her attitude...”. It would seem that the introduction of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was pivotal in defining if Aotearoa New Zealand as a bicultural or monocultural society, Pūao-te-Ata-tū presents an option and blueprint for how we can move forward as a bicultural state however monoculturalism prevailed. As Walker (1987) states “[T]ransformation for monoculturalism to biculturalism is not easily achieved, because it requires Pākehā who monopolise power to share it with Māori people whom they have come to dominate through colonial despoliation.”

“There is no doubt that Māori people are disadvantaged by our monocultural system” (Bieto de Serrallach, 1988).

Current Implications

The recent reporting and review of the Child, Youth and Family service has made this research very relevant. In exploring the current research implications one cannot ignore what is occurring within our country regarding the Child Youth and Family review. The current Minister of Social Development Anne Tolley has been very clear regarding this current review. She has stated that

“...we’ve (CYF) had 14 different restructures over the last 28 years...not much has changed for the children that came through that system...when you look at the results that we get for those children in our care we should be ashamed of those

results...when you go back and look at the previous reviews and restructurings not all of these have been put into place...we've done a little bit of this and a little bit of that...but what is clear is that no one has ever gone back and monitored, checked and evaluated if what they were doing was actually working” (Producer, 2015).

This research and exploration of Pūao-te-Ata-tū could assist the panel in understanding how a Tūturu Māori approach to researching social outcomes for Māori has the ability to effect significant change if fully supported at a governmental level. If this support is unequivocal the outcomes will be great and plentiful. However what is currently proposed is clearly not on par with the framework developed by John Rangihau, so with this in mind is the failure of the current Child, Youth and Family review already written?

Conclusion

Through the exploration of the different themes evident in discussions with the participants there was clear articulation to what Pūao-te-Ata-tū had achieved for many people. Pūao-te-Ata-tū was significant on a number of fronts, the consultation process it undertook was unique to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and has never been attempted again, yet there are key learnings from having an untarnished consultation process with Māori iwi, hapu and whānau. The document itself is simplistic yet the depth of knowledge within its brief 91 pages may never be surpassed by any other document. The knowledge and depiction of the effects of colonisation on Māori is succinct and it contains the most accurate account of Māori history. There were many purposes that came from Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the dynamic, courageous and passionate people involved around this significant time of change were also a key feature in discussions with our participants. Pūao-te-Ata-tū was appropriately about how to deliver a service to Māori that eliminated the institutional racism that had been perpetuated by a monocultural society and policy base and that culture was the Pākehā. Examining how Pākehā responded to this Ministerial review assists in understanding what people’s true and

genuine intentions were. Pūao-te-Ata-tū and any matters relevant to politics will always be swayed by the 'powers that be' thus the current Government and also the government's agenda. At this level when change is required it will only come from the top down. Pūao-te-Ata-tū remains as a feature in our political circles contrary to the hope by some political forces that it would disappear never to be mentioned again. However the life that is Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the excitement gained by its founding principles for Māori are key in it maintaining its buoyancy within the troubled waters of our welfare system. This timeline explored highlights that ten of Pūao-te-Ata-tū's thirteen recommendations have at numerous times been restored into our social histories and policies in an attempt to reignite the philosophy and drive behind the original passion that came from Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Pūao-te-Ata-tū did not achieve what it set out to achieve in its entirety, but so powerful is it as a document that the essence of New Zealand will not allow it to fade into the abyss of history, instead its relevance and prevalence in the fabric of our society still holds steadfast.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

“E kore te patiki e hoki ki tōna puehu”

“The flounder does not return to his dust”¹¹

This whakatauki summarises the overall message that reverberated throughout this research; ‘don’t make the same mistake twice’. This was regarding the structural injustices of the 1980s prevalent within the Department of Social Welfare and more currently Child, Youth and Family regarding institutional racism. This whakatauki is a challenge to those responsible for reviewing any form of change within the Government social policy divisions. Pūao-te-Ata-tū is an approach managed from a tūturu Māori perspective that achieved the objectives and requirements of government in a culturally appropriate manner. When Government Ministers and review panels are given the task of reviewing structures within our governing bodies they must give consideration to the approach taken by Pūao-te-Ata-tū. “There are some who suggest that the framework in Pūao-te-Ata-tū can be successfully used across the social policy sector. I believe this may well be worth considering” (Turia, 2001).

This research explored the journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū by investigating the information regarding the inception of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the fundamental support that it gathered through the different levels from Government down to frontline staff. This concluding chapter revisits the research, its process and findings providing some reflections and recommendations including a substantive and authentic approach are undertaken when exploring and examining the needs of Māori.

¹¹ Author Unknown: As cited in <http://www.Māori.cl/Proverbs.htm>.

Summary of Research

This research was inspired through the on-going recognition that Pūao-te-Ata-tū received particularly amongst Māori Child, Youth and Family employees, but at the time apart from the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989 there appeared to be little other acknowledgement of the recommendations of Pūao-te-Ata-tū within the day to day delivery. The initial aim of this research was to explore what those involved in the committee felt when Pūao-te-Ata-tū was commissioned. Was it a tokenistic approach to an embarrassing situation reported on by nine Pākehā women within Department of Social Welfare at the time, or was it in fact a deliberate and authentic approach to truly address the historical injustices on Māori? Accordingly the question was asked; did *Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieve what it set out to achieve*? Initially for the researcher there was a sense going into this research that it definitely had achieved its targets and that success formed part of its ongoing significance and relevance today. However our findings suggest that Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieved some of its recommendations yet the maintenance and development of those changes had a limited tenure, highlighting that even the enactment of the Children Young Persons and their Families Act did not fulfil the true intent behind its role for Iwi, Whānau and Hapu (Moyle, 2013). What is significant today is that Child, Youth and Family report that 58% of all children in care are Māori (Office of the Children’s Commissioner, 2015).

Chapter Two:

When examining Pūao-te-Ata-tū it would be an injustice to ignore the social and political movement within Aotearoa, New Zealand at the time. Pūao-te-Ata-tū came about out of a need for Māori to have a different service to what they were currently receiving through the Department of Social Welfare at the time. The journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū began with a passion from dynamic people. It started with nine Pākehā women highlighting the racial injustices faced by Māori involved with the DSW as both clients but also as employees. It

was developed in an era of people fighting for equality and human rights.

Chapter two explores this background and sets the landscape for the development of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. The pathway from the WARAG report and MAU Report which were all starting to demand a change in how the welfare system was being run particularly for Māori. This chapter achieves its objective in setting the scene for what was occurring nationally and internationally during the formation of Pūao-te-Ata-tū.

Chapter Three:

The literature review spanned decades as the relevance to our research is widespread. There were a broad set of topics which were all relative to Pūao-te-Ata-tū in setting the scene it was important to examine the social climate and political climate of the time as it was the themes surrounding, institutional racism that came from this exploration. One of the clear factors to come out of this research is for there to be effective change, the commitment and support needs to come from those in power, the government. Support from this level will inevitably filter down through all levels. Although the essence of Pūao-te-Ata-tū was kept alive by staff from a ground level, the success of its initiatives went when the Labour Government were voted out in 1990. The commitment and desire for change and the support for Pūao-te-Ata-tū was firmly ensconced in the Labour government during their term from 1984 to 1990. It is by no coincidence that these years are the years in which Pūao-te-Ata-tū made the most traction. Ultimately with the change of government saw a relinquishing of the support for Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its recommendations (Sorrenson, 1996). As with most developed countries to effect any change of this magnitude there needs to be the full support of the government, but that doesn't remove from the power that the fieldworkers have in keeping those in power on task.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū is the outcome to a journey of significant and substantial change, change that was challenging, opposed, demanding and arduous; however throughout this chapter that journey is adequately recorded.

The WARAG and MAU report were the final triggers to Pūao-te-Ata-tū and shortly following their publication the Minister Dame Ann Hercus commissioned Pūao-te-Ata-tū. When then move to the period post the publication of Pūao-te-Ata-tū in examining the State of Care 2015 report, it provides current and updated information and statistics highlighting a growing concern for Child Youth and Family. What is concerning is that more than half of all children in care are Māori when our Māori population percentage is 15% of the National population¹². Māori are still over-represented in the welfare statistics. This modest indicator highlights how if Pūao-te-Ata-tū set out too “...overcome problems and deficiencies” for Māori it was not achieved (New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1986). Current statistics tell us that those same failings are still occurring for Māori. Pūao-te-Ata-tū never achieved what it set out to achieve in its entirety. Even Anne Tolley during a televised interview admitted that historically we have never committed to all of the recommendations made by the many different reviews over the years and in her words we (the government) have historically done “...a little bit of this and a little bit of that” and according to her this modernisation strategy will be different (Producer, 2015). The current government are not only admitting that they and their predecessors have never entirely implemented and addressed all recommendations of past reviews but they have also stated that within the Department of Social Welfare or more recently Child, Youth and Family there have been 14 different restructures since Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Evidently although none of these restructures or reviews have effected any change the only restructure referred to and spoken about by frontline staff currently is Pūao-te-Ata-tū. We need to review policy and service delivery to

¹² Information taken from the 2013 Census statistics retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/infographic-culture-identity.aspx>

Māori using the principles and philosophy developed by Rangihau. The framework of Pūao-te-Ata-tū needs to be utilised to review why Māori still feature in the negative statistics socially, economically and in health.

Chapter Four

The methodological approach taken had always been to have a semi-structured interview approach to the participants as this allowed for exploration and reflection of their thoughts, feelings and beliefs both current and historical. There were definitely aspects of Pūao-te-Ata-tū that the researcher wished to capture and the approach taken also supported that. There was a strong Kaupapa Māori philosophy behind the research approach; all participants were well versed and knowledgeable in Te Ao Māori. A strong narrative approach was required and of significant benefit to the researcher as individuals stories were told within the context of the interview. The symbolic interactionism involved in scribing all of the narratives leads to a wealth and a beauty which would only be available to those living within the time. Although possible harm and risks were noted the research progressed with no obvious harm. There are however significant benefits in this research which will be explored further in future research implications.

Chapter Five

The findings produced by this report have been delivered through a narrative approach. All of the participants stories were scribed and common themes were extracted from the transcripts.

The Process

The approach that was created by John Rangihau was not only culturally appropriate but it was extensive and a true representation of Māori-centred approach. There is much to learn from John Rangihau's framework for nationwide consultation. An approach of this magnitude has never been replicated to the authenticity of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Over a nine month period a total of 69 hui were held which were attended by 2954 people and furthermore there

were 1424 verbal submissions made during these hui². There will be many reasons and rationale for why this process is not always followed when reviewing ministerial departments, many of which will be a cost saving exercise. When reflecting on the enormity of this task, the Ministerial membership was made up of 18 personnel of whom many would have been in attendance at all of these hui. They referred to it as the most exhausting yet rewarding times of their working careers (K. Workman, personal communication, April 9, 2015). John Rangihau ensured that the tūturu Māori approach was embedded during consultation hui around the rohe and it was reported that he would never pass a tangihanga, he was always prepared to stop and pay his respects. John Rangihau had a very clear vision of whom and what representation he wanted to see on his panel and hand selected his participants. Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its consultation process was an effective consultation process for Māori given its approach, the question remains why is this process not followed or applied for in all consultation that impacts Māori? Current action from the Minister of Social Development Anne Tolley in her appointment of the CYF Expert Panel on a modernising strategy for the Department highlights two key fundamental perspectives that our research has found regarding effective change for Māori, the first being that the scope of this review shows a tokenistic approach for Māori by stating that “...the new operating model delivers better outcomes for all Child, Youth and Family clients, and particularly Māori” (Tolley, 2015). This is the only mention within 18 key aims that recognises Māori which is the Department’s highest clientele group. Furthermore the essence and relevance to Māori was further diluted by the omission of a Māori representative for the panel. The Minister Anne Tolley received great chastising from many factors including the Māori Women’s Welfare League’s national president Prue Kapua who stated that “Without Māori expertise and knowledge we have no confidence that any of the panel’s findings or recommendations will properly address the needs of our children” (Kirk, 2015). When Ann Hercus ordered the

² A further 267 written submissions were also received.

Pūao-te-Ata-tū it had a strong Māori focus from its inception right throughout the review process and recommendations, Anne Tolley has admitted that these recommendations as well as subsequent recommendations were never fully followed through by all governments, and we are back at the beginning again discussing the new dawn of another approach of child protection work in Aotearoa New Zealand. Given the disproportionate number of Māori children in care the current CYF review panel needs to work off the framework developed by John Rangihau¹⁴. There have never been challenges or disagreements in the recommendations developed by Pūao-te-Ata-tū. It's failing or lack of traction came from a lack of governmental support for those changes. Anne Tolley and her current government are very clear about how this is the last review in a list of reviews that they want to see. This research and our history then suggests that an approach more in keeping with John Rangihau's framework for working and consulting with Māori will achieve more success. What is concerning and could see our country return to the era of the 1970-1980s in DSW is if the current discussion by the Minister and the government regarding exploration of removing the 'family-first' option which is legislated currently. That could mean for Māori children a return to an era of Māori youth who are alienated from their haukāinga, and with their whānau feeling a sense of disempowerment.

The Document

Pūao-te-Ata-tū has lost much of its prevalence in Child Youth and Family. Hollis, (2005) states "...that on one hand, participants agreed that Pūao-te-Ata-tū was outstanding for Māori but state that, in another sense it was ineffectual". The recently appointed CYF expert panel never mentions the relevance to Pūao-te-Ata-tū in its search for a new 'modernised approach'

¹⁴ In June 2015 60% of all children in out of home placements were Māori, retrieved from <http://www.cyf.govt.nz/about-us/key-statistics/children-and-young-people-in-out-of-home-placements.html>

to social work. There is still a very small determined group that work tirelessly in a futile attempt to keep Pūao-te-Ata-tū alive and current and they are the Māori and some Pākehā Child, Youth and Family frontline staff (Child, Youth and Family. (2015a). It is the employees who will not allow Pūao-te-Ata-tū die. Some claim that John Grant's predecessor is responsible for the beginning of Pūao-te-Ata-tū's demise however the Māori staff created and still pay homage to Pūao-te-Ata-tū through waiata appropriately named after this renowned document. Having recently attended a powhiri in a local Child, Youth and Family office the researcher felt privileged to hear the staff recite the Pūao-te-Ata-tū waiata. It was this employee commitment and dedication that ensured the principles, philosophy and whakaaro of Pūao-te-Ata-tū remained present in people's minds.

<i>“Anei ra aku ringa</i>	<i>Here is our offering</i>
<i>He ringaringa mau</i>	<i>To empower you</i>
<i>Pūao-te-Ata-tū</i>	<i>Heralding the new dawn</i>
<i>Pupuritia kia mau</i>	<i>Hold on to these principles</i>
<i>Hei kaimahi mau</i>	<i>Give them meaning</i>
<i>Pūao-te-Ata-tū</i>	
<i>Ko te manawanui</i>	<i>Through your dedication</i>
<i>Me te tumanako</i>	<i>and commitment</i>
<i>Kia ea ngā wawata a tōu iwi e</i>	<i>the aspirations of our people</i>
<i>Pūao-te-Ata-tū</i>	<i>can be fulfilled” (Mutu, nd)</i>

As with many things if people believe in something they will support and enhance it and this remains true for the longevity of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Where it was let down was by those at the managerial, ministerial and governance levels, once it was no longer a Government priority Pūao-te-Ata-tū and its principles never received the necessary support it needed to maintain significant change for Māori. The success of changes within institutions such as Child Youth and Family needs the full and unadulterated commitment and support within all levels from the government through to frontline workers, only then will the proposed changes be fully realised.

Dynamic People

If we want to effect change in our current climate how does that operate and where do we get support. The development and drive of change for Māori has definitely remained current within our society, but on many levels we have changed, from a political view point we now have a political party whose philosophy is solely based on achieving what they believe is best for Māori. With the inception of social media and international journalism the issues of the world now become the issues of Aotearoa New Zealand and as such many of our passionate advocates for change become occupied with the injustices that are occurring not only nationally but also globally. The WARAG group of the 1980s have been replaced with the quiet achievers within Child, Youth and Family. Those passionate advocates for change are the tireless frontline workers who through all 14 reviews since Pūao-te-Ata-tū have continued to remain true to the understanding of the principles of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. The dynamic people of today are not the group of staff who go out on a limb to whistleblow on the injustices but they are the steadfast and loyal employees that continue to keep Pūao-te-Ata-tū alive.

Pākehā Response to Pūao-te-Ata-tū

Historically when the principles of Pūao-te-Ata-tū started to gain traction people including Pākehā became fearful of the direction of that change and accordingly hurdles were developed to slow this progression. It was evident with Pūao-te-Ata-tū that Pākehā had a response of fear and there were a number of factors where this was evident. Walker, H. (personal communication, May 21), spoke of Pākehā DSW staff fitting into two categories those that sympathised with Māori and their situations and those that felt they were becoming victims of what they felt was a Māori resurgence. These factions remained even through to the late 1990s early 2000s. There was another example of this fear in 2003 that was reported in the national media. In a small provincial Child, Youth and Family office staff were given the option to select where they wanted to sit within a newly refurbished office. The local Rōpu group decided that they would request to be seated together as they felt that this would espouse a great sense of support and understanding from each other. Although there was no obvious disapproval of the request initially it was discovered that some staff felt a great deal of animosity for this request and reported to the media. The headline read as “Child, Youth and Family staff segregated themselves on one side of the office (Kitchin, 2003). This highlights that some 15 years after Pūao-te-Ata-tū that Pākehā still feared Māori and the on-going threat of Māori. Also that Māori still had a battle to be recognised and have tino rangatiratanga. Until all people are supportive of Māori in all levels of our welfare system from staff through to clients will we start to work in a truly bicultural manner for the betterment of all and for the success of Māori outcomes.

Research Questions

In Chapter One the scene for exploration was set with the research questions. Throughout our themes we have identified key learning’s moving forward, here we frame and draw back to the original proposal.

Research Questions One: Explore the participants' perceptions of the intentions of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and examine the experiences and reflections of the participants 26 years after the Report.

The research highlighted that all participants felt that Pūao-te-Ata-tū the approach and its outcomes would have affected the necessary change for Māori if the recommendations had been followed through and supported by all. While some change was made initially in the DSW and there was definitely a support for change from a government level this desire and support to change swung with the appointment of a new government in the 1990s.

Research Question Two: Examine the participants' expectations on the delivery of services to Māori by DSW and its successors as a result of the Report.

As stipulated above there was some initial change to services for Māori, for example the enactment of the Children, Young persons and Their Families Act and consequently this change was maintained but the participants felt that insufficient change had occurred to rule Pūao-te-Ata-tū a success in its entirety. It certainly highlighted a pathway to achieving a better service to Māori however successive Governments chose not to take that path.

Research Question Three: Outline the implications for social workers, for Māori families and for Māori communities.

The participants spoke of many implications, some which saw a common theme developed of Pākehā response of Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Pākehā social workers within the DSW were referred too often as being either the Māori sympathisers or fearful of this wave of biculturalism. This divide is supported through previous reports and publishers and supporters of those reports being labelled as Māori sympathisers. In opposition to this stance we have those that leaked information to the media regarding a Rōpu groups desire to sit with each other in an office setting, labelling Māori staff as practising 'racial segregation'. These were the opposing

views held within the social work field not only at the time of Pūao-te-Ata-tūs' inception but also some years following.

There were some aspects of change that were evident and one of these was Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act which some of its principles came from Pūao-te-Ata-tū. Principles like the inclusion of whānau, hapu and iwi groups or the preference for children to be placed with whānau care. This was successful for Māori families as it saw change in legislation that allowed Māori to care for their own, a celebrated shift to what had historically been occurring for families. Children although not always remained within whānau, hapu and iwi groups rather than institutional care. It is important to note here that the current Government have not ruled out a possible legislative change here which could set Māori back 30 years.

Research Question Four: Explore what has changed and what has been achieved as a result of the enquiry

- **Intentionally**
- **Unintentionally**

Unequivocally Pūao-te-Ata-tū is still relevant and many CYF staff are able to articulate its principles. Pūao-te-Ata-tū has been kept alive by its own merits, for all whom have had a role with Pūao-te-Ata-tū its essence, mana and mauri keep it alive with the support of the Child, Youth and Family frontline who will not allow the principles too die. Pūao-te-Ata-tū although not successful in its entirety, it may not have yet exposed its full potential; there is capacity within its powerful doctrine that its best is still to come.

Intentionally, it gave a pathway and direction to how to effect change at service delivery for Māori. Intentionally is set out foundational principles to guide effective practice.

Unintentionally, it gave Aotearoa, New Zealand a framework in how to complete a true consultation particularly when dealing with issues relating to Māori or any true consultation process for that manner. The approach taken by John Rangihau was unique yet effective in giving Aotearoa, New Zealand its own voice.

Future Research

Pūao-te-Ata-tū occurred in an era of significant change and the research participants were all key contributors to the formulation of this document. A future key research proposal would be to interview all remaining members of the Committee to provide a more robust set of outcomes and views from all of the surviving original committee members.

This research aimed to explore if Pūao-te-Ata-tū achieved what it set out to achieve and this was examined through interviews with original members and other parties close to Pūao-te-Ata-tū the recommendations were articulated and explored through the decades to examine what if any progression had been made to achieve those outcomes. Overall it was evident that although an attempt had been made soon after the release of Pūao-te-Ata-tū there had not been sufficient developments and progressions to rule Pūao-te-Ata-tū a complete success nor would one accuse it of being dead. A future research focus could be to explore ministerial reviews on an international scale that effect positive change for minority ethnic groups, in racial discriminatory situations. As an unintentional outcome the process for Pūao-te-Ata-tū deserves to be explored in its own right.

Recommendations

The short answer to The Journey of Pūao-te-Ata-tū: What did we learn? We learnt that in examining the outcomes of Pūao-te-Ata-tū it would be difficult to ignore the great significance of the process and document in their own entirety. We learnt that the significance of getting such a review sat predominantly with dynamic people who were not afraid to stand for what they believed in. We learnt that if true change is to occur successive Governments need to be fully committed and open to change.

1. This research and the exploration of Pūao-te-Ata-tū could assist the current CYF expert panel in understanding how a Tūturu Māori approach to researching social outcomes for Māori has the ability to effect significant change if fully supported at a governmental level. The consultation process led by John Rangihau was of benefit to the result of Pūao-te-Ata-tū and if government agencies are authentic in their desire to effect positive change for Māori they will endeavour to learn from and replicate John Rangihau's approach.

2. Pūao-te-Ata-tū was as much about the journey as it was about the outcome. The process envisaged and enacted by John Rangihau needs to be an established framework for authentic and sincere consultation with Māori.
 - a) An approach such as John Rangihau's will work towards addressing the negative statistic for which Māori feature far too frequently.

- b) Furthermore in order to address the cultural inconsistencies within our country this framework needs to be applied to all governmental reviews. Māori are the specialist in Māori issues.
3. A further recommendation to address the Māori statistics particularly of children in care is that we truly need a bicultural approach if we are to look for successful Māori outcomes.
4. The findings highlight that DSW/CYF staff had a major role in keeping Pūao-te-Ata-tū relevant and alive. If the government is to be the architect of change they must open themselves fully to the recommendations that come from reviews. The commitment to change needs to be unpretentious, honest and authentic. The success of changes within institutions such as Child, Youth and Family needs the full and unadulterated commitment and support within all levels from the government through to frontline workers, only then will the proposed changes be fully realised.

It is hoped that a Government of the future will examine and explore the pathway development by John Rangihau and truly implement the recommendations for the benefit of Māori then Pūao-te-Ata-tū's significance will be truly recognised.

Glossary

Aotearoa	New Zealand
Hapū	sub-tribe
Haukainga	home people
Hīkoi	march
Hui	meeting
Iwi	tribe
Kaitiakitanga	guardian
Kanohi-ki-te-kanohi	face-to-face
Kāumatua	elder
Kaupapa	topic, subject
Kia Māhaki	calm and quiet
Koha	gift
Mana	prestige, status
Manaakitanga	hospitality
Marae	open area out the front of the whareniui or meeting house
Motu	island
Pākehā	New Zealand of European descent
Papakāinga	home grounds
Tamaki-Makau-Rau	Auckland
Tangihanga	funeral

Tauīwi	foreigner
Te Punga	anchor
Te Reo Māori	the Māori language
Tino rangatiratanga	absolute self determination
Tūturu	staunch
Rangatiratanga	chieftainship
Whakaaro	thoughts, ideas
Whānau	family
Whakapapa	genealogy

Reference

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Worker: ANZASW. (2013). *Code of Ethics*. Christchurch, NZ: ANZASW.

Armitage, A. (1995). *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Bevan-Brown, J. (1999). *Kura Kaupapa Māori Report, Phase one: report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Whakawhānaungatanga. Collaborative Research stories*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Bishop, R. (1997). Māori people's concerns about research into their lives. *History of Education Review*. 26(1), 25-41.

Bold, C. (2012). *Using Narrative in Research*. London, UK: Sage.

Brown, M. (December 2000). *Care and Protection is about adult behaviour: The Ministerial Review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Policy.

Burns, P. (Producer). *Māori Land Protests* [DVD]. New Zealand: Video Education Australasia.

Carpenter, V.M. & McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2008). Cross-cultural researching: Māori and Pākehā in Te Whakapakari. *Qualitative Research*, 8(2), 179-196.

Chegg. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.chegg.com/homework-help/definitions/institutional-racism-49>

Child, Youth and Family. (2015). *Children and Young People in the Custody of the Chief Executive*. Retrieved from <http://www.cyf.govt.nz/about-us/key-statistics/children-and-young-people-in-the-custody-of-the-chief.html>

Child, Youth and Family. (2015a). *Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.cyf.govt.nz/documents/about-us/publications/reports/our-strategy-final.pdf>

Coney, S. (1988). *The unfortunate experiment*. Auckland, N.Z.: Penguin.

Connolly, M. (1994). An Act of Empowerment: The Children, Young Persons and their Families Act (1989). *British Journal of Social Work*, 24, 87 – 100.

Connolly, M. (2004). *Child and Family Welfare: Statutory Responses to Children at Risk*. Christchurch, NZ: Te Awatea Press Ltd.

Cunningham, C. (2000). A framework for addressing Māori knowledge in research, science and technology. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7(1), 62-69.

Dalley, B. (1998). *Family Matters: Child welfare in twentieth-century New Zealand*. Auckland, NZ; Auckland University Press.

Doolan, M. and Connolly, M. (2010). *Care and protection: Capturing the essence of our practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.practicecentre.cyf.govt.nz>.

Dyson, R. (2006). *Celebrating innovation in family decision making: the family group conference*. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/celebrating-innovation-family-decision-making-family-group-conference>

Foster, M. (2007). Te Hoe Nuku Roa: A Journey Towards Māori Centred Research. *A Journal of Plants, People and Applied Research*, 1, 47-55.

Galletta, A. (2012). *Mastering the Semi-structured interview and Beyond: From Research Design and Analysis and Publication*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Garlick, T. (2012). *Social Developments: An organisational history of the Ministry of Social Development and its predecessors, 1860-2011*. Wellington, NZ: Steele Roberts Aotearoa.

Gilbert, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Researching Social Life*. Los Angeles, CA.: Sage.

Haywood, J. (2012, November 12). *Biculturalism*. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biculturalism>

Hollis, A. (2005). *Pūao-te-Ata-tū and Māori Social Work Methods* (Unpublished masters dissertation). Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Human Rights Commission. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.hrc.co.nz/news/state-care/>.

Jahnke, H. T. & Gillies, A. (2012). Indigenous Innovations in Qualitative Research Method: Investigating the Private World of Family Life. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(4), 498-512.

Karena, R.W. (2014). *Powhiri Poutama Framework 2014: Applying Culturally safe practice in Māori/Counselling, Social Work, Mental Health & Social Sciences*. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/Rawiri/powhiri-putama-framework-2014>.

Keane, B. (2017, March 21). Ngā rōpū tautohetohe – Māori protest movements. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/nga-ropu-tautohetohe-maori-protest-movements/page-1>

Keddell, E. (2007). Cultural Identity and the Children, Young persons and Their Families Act 1989: Ideology, Policy and Practice. *Social Policy Journal of new Zealand*, 32, 49-71.

Keenan, D. (1999). Anchors away: Assessing Te Punga o Matahorua: Our Bicultural Strategy for the Nineties. *Te Komako: Social Work Review*. 11(4), 28-31.

Keenan, D. (2004). The Treaty is Always Speaking? Government Reporting on Māori Aspiration and Treaty Meanings. In B. Dalley & M. Tennant (Eds.), *Past Judgement: Social Policy in New Zealand History* (pp. 207-223). Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.

Kirk, S. (2015, May 18) Social workers fuming over CYF overhaul snub. Retrieved from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/68635010/Social-workers-fuming-over-CYF-overhaul-snob>

Lawrence-Neuman, W. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. (7th ed.). Boston: USA: Pearson.

Levine, M. (2000). "The family group conference in the New Zealand Children, Young Persons, and Their Families act of 1989 (CYP&F): review and evaluation." *Behavioural Sciences & the Law* 18(4), 517-556.

Levine, S. & McRobie, A. (2002). *From Muldoon to Lange: New Zealand elections in the 1980s*. Rangiora, NZ: MC Enterprises.

Lister, P., Rivers, M.J., & Wilkinson, A. (1991). The Management of Change – The Social and Personal Perspective. In J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot, & P. Walsh (Eds.), *Reshaping the State: New Zealand Bureaucratic Revolution* (pp. 297-319). Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

Lupton, C. & Nixon, P. (1999). *Empowering practice? A critical appraisal of the family group conference approach*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

McClure, M. (1998). *A Civilised Community: A History of Social Security In New Zealand 1989-1998*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.

McClure, M. (2015). 'Auckland places – Eastern suburbs: Ōrakei to the Tāmaki River'. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/video/16199/bastion-point-protest>.

Maxwell, G. (2011, May 5). *Youth offenders – Treatment of young offenders, 1840-1980's* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/video/26599/puao-te-ata-tu-report>

Maxwell, G., Robertson, J., Thom, A., & Walker, B. (1995). *Researching Care and Protection: A proposal for a study of the outcome of interventions under the Children's, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989*. Wellington, NZ: Office of the Commissioner for Children and Social Policy Agency.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mikaere, A. (2011). From kaupapa Māori research to re-searching kaupapa Māori: Making our contribution to Māori survival. *Kei Tua o te Pae hui proceedings: the challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, 5-6 May 2011/ compiled by Te Wāhanga Jessica Hutchings, Helen Potter, Katrina Taupo.* (pp. 29-37). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Mills, J. & Birks, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Qualitative methodology: a practical guide*. London, UK: Sage.

Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare (1986). *Pūao-te-Ata-tū – Day Break: the Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Wellington, NZ: Department of Social Welfare.

Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2016, Jan 13). *The 1970s – Overview*. Retrieved from <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/the-1970s/overview>

Ministry of Social Development (2014). *Historical Timeline*. Retrieved from <https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/about-msd/history/index.html>

Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel. (2015), *Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel: Interim Report*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Development.

Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel. (2016). *Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel: Final Report*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Development.

Morgan, L. & Scott, S. (1990, July 29). Separate Māori units get Pākehā backing. *The Dominion*, p.2.

Moyle, P. (2014). A model for Māori research for Māori practitioners. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work Review*, 26(1), 29-38.

Mutu, J. (n.d.). *Pūao-te-Ata-tū*

Nash, M. (2001). Social Work Practice and Current Issues: Social Work in Aotearoa New Zealand. In M. Connolly (Ed.), *New Zealand Social Work: Context and Practice* (pp. 32-43). Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

Nash, M. (2009). Histories of social work profession. In M. Connolly & L. Harms (Eds.), *Social Work Context and Practice*. (2nd ed., pp. 363-377). Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

New Zealand Department of Social Welfare. (1985a). *Institutional Racism in the Department of Social Welfare, Tamaki-makau-rau*. Auckland, NZ: Department of Social Welfare.

New Zealand Department of Social Welfare. (1985b). *Māori Advisory Unit report 1985*. Auckland, NZ: Department of Social Welfare.

New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, (1994). *Te punga: our bicultural strategy for the nineties*. Wellington, NZ: Department of Social Welfare.

Office of the Chief Social Worker. (2014 May). *Workload and casework review: Qualitative Review of Social Worker Caseload, Casework and Workload Management*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Development.

Office of the Children's Commissioner, (2015 August). *State of Care 2015: What we learnt from monitoring Child, Youth and Family*. Wellington, NZ: Office of the Children's Commissioner.

O'Leary, Z. (2009). *The essential guide to doing your research project*. London, UK: Sage.

Penetito, W. (2011). Kaupapa Māori education: Research as the exposed edge. *Kei Tua o te Pae hui proceedings: the challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, 5-6 May 2011/ compiled by Te Wāhanga Jessica Hutchings, Helen Potter, Katrina Taupo*. (pp. 38-43). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Pere, L., & Barnes, A. (2009). New learnings from old understandings: Conducting qualitative research with Māori. *Qualitative Social Work*, 8(4), 449-467.

Pickmere, A. (2006, July 28). Obituary: Peter Boag. *The New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10393477

Pihama, L. (2011). The role of te reo and tikanga Māori in kaupapa Māori research. *Kei Tua o te Pae hui proceedings: the challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, 5-6 May 2011/ compiled by Te Wāhanga Jessica Hutchings, Helen Potter, Katrina Taupo*. (pp. 49-55). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Powick, K. (2003). *Māori research ethics: a literature review of the ethical issues and implication of kaupapa Māori research and research involving Māori for researchers, supervisors and ethics committees*. Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato.

Producer. (2015, September 26). *The Nation* [Television Broadcast]. Auckland, New Zealand: TV3.

Raea, S. (1990, July 29). Māori welfare unit running for six months. *The Dominion*, p. 1.

Rangahau. (2011). *Māori Ethical Frameworks*. Retrieved from <http://rangahau.co.nz/ethics/166/>

Rangihau, R. (2014, January 14). Rangihau, John Te Rangianiwaniwa. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/5r6/rangihau-john-te-rangianiwaniwa>.

Ryburn, M. (1993). A new model for family decision making in child care and protection. *Early Child Development and Care*, 86, 1-10.

Shank, G. D. (2006). *Qualitative research: a personal skills approach*. New Jersey, NY. Pearson.

Smith, L.T. (2011). Story-ing the development of kaupapa Māori-a review of sorts. *Kei Tua o te Pae hui proceedings: the challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st Century*, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, 5-6 May 2011/ compiled by Te Wāhanga Jessica Hutchings, Helen Potter, Katrina Taupo. (pp. 10-15). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: Otago University Press.

Sorrenson, D. (1996). *Kaupapa Māori and Responsiveness: New Zealand Children and Young Persons Service management responsiveness to Māori in the restructured state sector* (Unpublished masters dissertation). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Squire, C. (2008). Experience-centred and culturally orientated approaches to narrative. In M. Andrews, C. Squire & M. Tamboukou (Eds), *Doing Narrative Research*. (pp.41-63). London, UK: Sage.

State Services Commission, (2013). *100 Years of Public Service: A Centenary Celebration of new Zealand's State Services Commission. Leading a State sector New Zealand is proud of ...since 1913*. (State Services Commission)

Te Ahu, (n.d.) The Evolution of Contemporary Māori Protest. Retrieved from <http://maorinews.com/writings/papers/other/protest.html>.

Tolich, M. & Davidson, C. (2011). *An Introduction of Research Methods: Getting Started*. Auckland, NZ: Pearson.

Tolley, A. (2015). *Terms of Reference for the Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel*. Wellington, NZ: Child, Youth and Family.

Tolley, A. (2015a). *Independent expert panel to lead a major CYF overhaul*. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/independent-expert-panel-lead-major-cyf-overhaul> .

Tolley, A. (2015b). *Minister welcomes State of Care report*. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/minister-welcomes-state-care-report>.

Tracy, S. J. (2012). *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. Hoboken, NY: Blackwell.

Turia, T. (2001). *Mick Brown Report of Child, Youth and Family Services*. Retrieved from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/mick-brown-report-child-youth-and-family-services>.

Underhill, B. (1998). *A Bibliography of Writing by Māori in English*. (Unpublished doctorate dissertation). University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.

University of Canterbury. (n.d.). *Academic support for Māori students*. Retrieved from http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/Māoristudents/support/Ta_Apirana.shtml/

Walker, H. (1995). Where is Pūao-te-Ata-tū and the Department of Social Welfare? *Te Komako: Social Work Review*, 7(1), 12-16.

Walker, H., Allan, G., Featherstone, T., Hewitt, A., Keith, G., & Smith, D. (2000). *Family Decision Making a Conferencing Philosophy*. Masterton, NZ: Kinpower Associates.

Walker, R. (1987, December). Irresistible demands. *Listener*, 119(2495), 90-91.

Walker, R. (1993). *Applied Qualitative Research*. Vermont, CA: Gower Publisher.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without End*. Auckland, NZ; Penguin Books.

Appendix A: Cover Letter and Advertisement for participants

Florrie Brooking
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Tangata Whenua Social Workers Association
c-o Miriama Scott
P.O. Box 11-837
Ellerslie
Auckland 1542

Dear Miriama

I am currently completing an MSW thesis through Massey University. The topic is: *The inside view of Puao-te-ata-tu*. I am seeking people willing to be interviewed who were either involved with the original committee or were involved in the implementation of the recommendations.

I am hopeful that you may be able to forward the attached advertisement through the Association network so that people interested in participating in this research can contact me for further information. Furthermore I have included an information sheet for your perusal.

If you require further information please contact me on [REDACTED].

Your time on this matter is gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely,

Florrie Brooking
Student Researcher

Florrie Brooking

██████████
██████████

The Chief Executive, Lucy Sandford-Reed
ANZASW
DX Box WX33484
Unit C, 375 Mail South Road, Hornby
Christchurch

Dear Lucy

I am currently completing an MSW thesis through Massey University. The topic is: *The inside view of Puaoteata-tu*. I wish to interview people who were involved with the original committee or the implementation of the recommendations.

I would appreciate your advertising my request on the ANZASW website. I have attached the advertisement. I have included an information sheet for your perusal.

If you require further information please contact me on ██████████.

Your time on this matter is gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely,

Florrie Brooking
Student Researcher

Advertisement for Research participants

Pūao-te-ata-tū

You are invited to participate in a one hour interview
with a Massey University student
completing an MSW thesis
about Pūao-te-ata-tū and its implementation in the 1990s.

If you are interested
and

For further information:

Contact

Florrie Brooking



Appendix B: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

Participants History/Background:

- How did you become involved in the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare?
- What was your role:
 - during the establishment of the Ministerial Advisory Committee?
 - during the consultation process of the Ministerial Advisory Committee?
 - in the implementation of the Ministerial Advisory Committee?
- What was happening in the 1980s that led to the establishment of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare?
- How was social service delivery before the establishment of the Ministerial Advisory Committee?
- What event prompted the Minister to commission the Report?

Participants Expectations:

- What did you expect the Ministerial Advisory Committee to achieve?
- What did you hope the impact of the report would be:
 - a. on social work?
 - b. for families?
 - c. for Maori?
 - d. For Pakeha?

Participants Views post-Puao-te-ata-tu:

- How did Pūao-Te-Ata-tū change:
 - a. The ethnic composition of staff?
 - b. Staff retention and selection?
 - c. Staff training?
 - d. The overall Department environment?
- How did New Zealand respond to Puao-te-ata-tu?
- What did you hope would be the impact of Pūao-Te-Ata-tū on:
 - social service delivery?
 - Māori?
 - Families?
 - Pakeha?

Appendix C: Ethics Approval Letter



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PUREHUROA

25 May 2014

Flon-ie Brooking
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Flon-ie

Re: HEC: Southern B Application - 13/95
The inside view of Puao-te-ata-tu. Key participants reflect on Puao-te-ata-tu at the time of its inception

Thank you for your letter received 23 May 2014.

On behalf of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B I am pleased to advise you that the ethics of your application are now approved. Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Prof John O'Neill, Acting Chair

Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B

cc Dr Awhina Hollis-English
School of Health & Social Services
PN371

Lareen Cooper
School of Health & Social Services
PN371

Dr Kieran O'Donoghue, HoS
School of Health & Social Services
PN371