



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**WAIKATO**  
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato*

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

## Research Commons at the University of Waikato

### Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

DEMYSTIFYING A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VOLUNTARY WORK AND  
MĀORI

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the

University of Waikato

by

OLIVER HELENA FIONA TE MOMO

---

University of Waikato

2003

## Mihi

I te taha o tōku papa

Ko Tainui te Waka

Ko Tararua te Maunga

Ko Manawatu te Awa

Ko Ngāti Raukawa te Iwi

Ko Ngāti Whakaterere te Hapū

Ko Poaneke Te Momo te Whānau

Ko Poutu Pā te Marae

I te taha o tōku whaea

Ko Huripureiata te Waka

Ko Hikurangi te Maunga

Ko Waiomoko te Maunga

Ko Ngāti Konohi te Iwi

Ko Ngāti Wahakapi te Hapū

Ko Paenga te Whānau

Ko Whangara te Marae

Nō reira ki ngā tangata o te motu, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa. Koia nei ngā mahi a tētahi tuahine, kōtiro, wahine rānei, he tamariki tuku iho nō te whānau Poaneki Te Momo rāua ko Paenga hei koha mō ngā rōpū Māori, ngā tangata katoa e whaiā nei i tēnei kaupapa. He rangahau tēnei hei awahi hei tautoko i ā koutou mahi i roto i te whānau, i roto i te hapū, i roto i te iwi, i runga i te marae.

Ko tāku mahi nei he mahi iti i roto i tēnei whare wānanga, i roto i te ao Māori, ā i ngā ao o te tangata, ēngari kei te pīrangi au ki te tāpiri āku mōhiotanga ki ngā mōhiotanga o te ao.

Nō reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa.

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this thesis is to provide evidence that critically reviews the relationship between Māori and voluntary work in social service organisations. Since colonisation very little research has been initiated that investigated the involvement of Māori in voluntary activity yet recent statistics show that Māori are the highest participants in this type of work. This thesis provides an analysis of the relationship of Māori to voluntary work and its evolution in a Colonial State, Liberal State, Welfare State, and Neo-Liberal State in New Zealand. Three perspectives of Māori voluntary work provide the foundation for the analysis of this relationship. The first perspective describes voluntary work from a personal experience as an insider. The second perspective explores literature that records Māori involvement in voluntary activity. The third perspective documents life experiences from Māori voluntary workers in New Zealand communities. The three perspectives provide an empirical foundation for the type of relationship that has developed between Māori and voluntary work; Māori and the State; Māori and their place in New Zealand society. My interest in Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) as a valid and thriving ontological position and my academic interest in critical theory provide the theoretical lens for my analysis.

Personal experience as a Māori volunteer opened doors to the communities I entered and added strength to the research, the first perspective. Western research in Māori communities often by non-Māori researchers, was conducted to gather knowledge for Western policy makers. Māori knowledge was not recognised as valid and the people were treated as objects. Knowing this, I searched for an approach that valued Māori participants, valued Māori people, and contained cultural aspects that separated the procedure from Western research. A review of literature, the second perspective, introduced a cultural approach to research termed *kaupapa* Māori research, generated out of and for Te Ao Māori detailed further in Chapter Three.

Participants' life experiences coupled with literature provide a wealth of knowledge and a testimony to the type of relationship that exists between Māori and voluntary work. Criticism from Māori communities as to the exploitation of



Māori volunteers has swelled in recent years so that the environment volunteers work in is no longer attractive to Māori people. Therefore, documenting the life experiences of Māori who participate in voluntary work as the primary source of information was imperative and produced evidence to describe the relationship between Māori and voluntary work in the thesis. A triangular study: case study, community study, and cross-section study (Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight), provide the 'grass roots voices' and represent the third perspective.

My observation of Māori organisations' involvement in voluntary work generated in me a deep concern in what appeared to be an involvement in activity that improved neither the lives of the volunteers nor the wider problems to which they attributed their *aroha*. This involvement activity is a product of historical developments whereby the Western ideology of voluntary work became confused with a Māori ideology of collective participation. This confusion has created an environment where Māori voluntary organisations are working unpaid with insufficient resources in oppressive conditions in the attempt to provide social solutions. I argue that the Māori ideology of collective participation has been co-opted in the emerging conflict of neo-liberalism to provide social services in communities which government agencies exploit. In conclusion, the thesis is a journey through the world of voluntary work for Māori in communal organisations.

### **Acknowledgements**

Ngā mihi aroha ki ngā tangata i homai ki a au tō rātou whakaaro, aroha, tautoko, awhi, kai, wāhi noho hoki ahakoa kia taea ai au te tutuki i tēnei mahi rangahau. It is with much aroha I thank all those people who supported me throughout my work on this thesis. A special thank you to the volunteers whose contribution provided the grass roots voices to this thesis. I would like to express my thanks to the staff in Te Tari Whanaketanga, the Department of Development Studies in Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao, the School of Māori and Pacific Development at the University of Waikato for administrative support. I am eternally grateful for the wisdom of my chief supervisor Dr Barbara Harrison who has guided me throughout my work and kept me working. Although there were times when community and personal responsibilities led me astray I was fortunate to have a chief supervisor with the knowledge, time, and commitment to pull me back on track. Thank you to my second and third supervisors, Associate Professor Maria Humphries for constant theoretical support and intellectual stimuli, and Professor Russell Bishop who introduced me to the theory and practice of Kaupapa Māori Research. A very special thanks to Helen De Barry, the former secretary of the School of Māori and Pacific Development, for her unconditional assistance she gave me during my years of study. Thank you Tainui Māori Development Corporation (MDC) for a doctoral scholarship that paid for fees and provided financial assistance.

I would like to thank my whānau, mum, Ivan, Hamiora, John, and Ruku, their families, for support. Without the whānau in Gisborne and Hamilton the struggles to complete this work would have been enormous. To my fellow students and mates at the university thanks for sharing your food, support, and academic thoughts. And most of all, a special mihi aroha to my children Candice and Mychal whose mother was absent again, first in completing my thesis for a masters paper, and another three years to complete this doctoral thesis. Lest I forget a mihi arohanui to my Dad who is no longer with us, but lives on in my writings on voluntary work, in my quest to understand and acknowledge his work and many other volunteers in New Zealand who go unnoticed for their unpaid contribution towards the social enhancement of people in communities across the world.

## Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introducing the Study</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0 An Introduction into the Culture of Voluntary Work for Māori	1
1.1 The Disruption of <i>Whānau</i>	4
1.1.1 New Communities – New Types of Work	5
1.1.2 Dependency	6
1.1.3 From State Welfare to Neo-Liberalism	7
1.2 Overview of Study	9
1.3 Māori Voluntary Work and Māori Voluntary Organisations	12
1.4 Thesis Statement	13
1.5 Research Questions	13
1.6 Conclusion	14
<b>Chapter Two: Laying the Foundation with Key Concepts</b>	<b>16</b>
2.0 Introduction	16
2.1 Introducing the Theories and Concepts	17
2.2 Critical Theory	17
2.3 Challenging Hegemony	21
2.4 Oppression: Living under the Rulers	23
2.4.1 Consciousness Raising and Development	24
2.4.2 Foucault: Relating Power to Development	26
2.5 The Theory of Development and its Relationship to Communities	29
2.5.1 Describing the Characteristics of Community Development	30
2.5.2 Defining Indigenous Development	32
2.5.3 Capacity Building in Communities	34
2.6 The Arrival of Māori and European Contact	36
2.6.1 The Treaty of Waitangi	37
2.6.1.1 The Controversy – Article I	38
2.6.1.2 The Controversy-Article II	38
2.6.1.3 The Controversy – Article III & Codicil	39
2.7 Critical Theory Applied to the Colonisation in Aotearoa/NZ	40
2.8 Māori Hegemony	44
2.9 Māori and Oppression	46
2.10 Māori Development	48
2.10.1 Developing Māori Communities with Sovereignty	50
2.10.2 Developing the Social Conditions in Māori Communities	53
2.10.3 The State, Capacity Building, and Māori Sovereignty	54
2.11 Implications of Mainstream Debates on this Study – A Summary	56
<b>Chapter Three: Methodology</b>	<b>58</b>
3.0 Introduction	58
3.1 Developing the Approach	58
3.1.1 Personal Reflections – Trial, Errors, & Resistance	59

3.1.2	Formalising Research Approaches _____	60
3.1.3	Applying a Qualitative Research Approach _____	62
3.2	Methodology _____	64
3.2.1	A <i>Kaupapa</i> Māori Approach _____	64
3.2.2	Applying a <i>Kaupapa</i> Māori Approach in this Research _____	67
3.2.3	A Social Research Approach with a Māori <i>Kaupapa</i> _____	70
3.2.4	Sources of Data _____	72
3.2.5	Ethical Procedures _____	74
3.2.6	The Case Study _____	76
3.2.7	The Community Study _____	78
3.2.8	The Cross Section Study _____	79
3.3	Data Analysis _____	79
3.3.1	Content Analysis and Highlighting Main Findings _____	80
3.3.2	NVivo-Nudist Computer Software _____	80
3.4	Conclusion _____	81
<b>Chapter Four: Volunteerism in NZ: Developments in the Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State _____</b>		<b>83</b>
4.0	Introduction _____	83
4.1	Revisiting History in New Zealand _____	83
4.1.1	Traditional Māori Societies _____	84
4.1.2	The Māori Market Economy _____	85
4.1.3	The Māori Political Resistance to Losing Control _____	86
4.1.4	Colonisation Produces a Māori Underclass _____	88
4.1.5	The Colonial State & Liberal State Social Policies that Impacted on Māori _____	91
4.2.	Introducing Forms of Voluntary Activity _____	93
4.2.1	Setting the Scene _____	94
4.2.2	Establishing Volunteerism in New Zealand _____	94
4.2.3	Voluntary Work and War _____	95
4.2.4	Voluntary Communal Support _____	96
4.2.5	Voluntary Work and Crown Law _____	96
4.2.6	Voluntary Work and Menial Labour _____	98
4.3	The Evolving Welfare State in NZ _____	100
4.3.1	The Welfare State in NZ _____	102
4.3.2	The Welfare State, Voluntary Organisations, and Māori _____	104
4.3.3	Māori Voluntary Work and World War II _____	106
4.3.4	Developing Māori Voluntary Groups from 1970 onwards _____	109
4.4	Concluding Comments _____	111
<b>Chapter Five: Volunteerism in NZ: The Neo-Liberal State _____</b>		<b>114</b>
5.0	Introduction _____	114
5.1	Voluntary Organisations and Common Values _____	114
5.1.1	The Relationship between Government and Voluntary Organisations _____	117
5.2	Values and Characteristics in Māori Voluntary Organisations _____	119
5.2.1	Māori Voluntary Organisations from 1980 Onwards _____	124
5.2.2	The <i>Whānau</i> as a Māori Voluntary Organisation _____	125
5.3	The New Right Policies _____	127
5.3.1	New Right Policies Create Hegemony _____	129
5.3.2	The Impact of New Right Policies on Māori _____	130

5.3.3	Voluntary Organisations Suffer under New Right Policies	132
5.3.4	New Right Policies – A Way to Shed Responsibility	133
5.4	The Third Way – A Global Perspective	135
5.4.1	The Third Way – A New Zealand Perspective	137
5.4.2	A Māori Third Way	139
5.5	Concluding Comments	141
<b>Chapter Six: The Case Study</b>		<b>144</b>
6.0	Introduction	144
6.1	The Research Method	145
6.1.1	The Case Study	148
6.1.2	Ethical Issues – A Major Hurdle	153
6.1.3	Designing the Interview Approach	154
6.1.4	Interviews	156
6.1.5	Analysis	156
6.2	Organisational Overview	157
6.3	Responses	165
6.3.1	Demographic Details	165
6.3.2	Māori Voluntary Work	166
6.3.3	Voluntary Duties and Job Skills	168
6.3.4	<i>Tikanga</i> Māori	170
6.3.5	Work Place	171
6.3.6	Research Issues	174
6.3.7	Future Māori Volunteer	175
6.3.8	Further Comments	176
6.4	Main Themes	177
6.4.1	Describing A Māori volunteer	177
6.4.2	Māori Voluntary Work	177
6.4.3	Working Conditions and Workload	178
6.4.4	<i>Tikanga</i> Māori – Māori Development	178
6.4.5	Recognition, Value, and Consultation	179
6.4.6	Future Aspirations for Māori Volunteers	179
6.5	Discussion	179
6.6	Personal Reflections	181
6.7	Concluding Comments	183
<b>Chapter Seven: The Community Study</b>		<b>186</b>
7.0	Introduction	186
7.1	The Research Method	186
7.1.2	The Selection Process and Data Collection	187
7.1.3	Fieldwork	188
7.2	Interviews	189
7.2.1	Responses	190
7.3	Analysis	206
7.4	Main Themes	206
7.4.1	Describing a Māori Volunteer and Māori Voluntary Organisation	206
7.4.2	Working Conditions and Workload	207
7.4.3	<i>Tikanga</i> Māori – Māori Development	207
7.4.4	The Treaty of Waitangi – Sovereignty	209
7.4.5	Relationship with Government	210

7.4.6	Future Aspirations of Māori Voluntary Organisations	211
7.5	Concluding Comments	212
<b>Chapter Eight: Cross Section Study</b>		<b>214</b>
8.0	Introduction	214
8.1	The Government Meets the Community and Voluntary Organisations	214
8.2	The Research Method	216
8.2.1	The Selection Process and Data Collection	216
8.3	Analysis	217
8.3.1	Editing the Data	217
8.4	Responses	219
8.5	Main Themes	240
8.5.1	The Treaty of Waitangi – Sovereignty	240
8.5.2	Relationship with Government	241
8.5.3	Policies, Barriers, and Funding Problems	243
8.5.4	Working Conditions and Workload	244
8.5.5	Recognition, Value, and Consultation	245
8.6	Concluding Comments	246
<b>Chapter Nine: Combining the Studies with Conclusions</b>		<b>248</b>
9.0	Introduction	248
9.1	Consistent Themes	248
9.1.1	Working Conditions, Resource Problems, and Funding Problems	248
9.1.2	Recognition, Value, and Consultation	249
9.1.3	Change in Expectations	250
9.1.4	Social Obligation	250
9.1.5	Relationship with Government	251
9.2	Differences in the Studies	252
9.2.1	Cultural Differences	252
9.2.2	The Treaty of Waitangi	253
9.2.3	Māori Voluntary Work	253
9.3	Personal Reflections	254
9.4	Personal Reflections on Theories and Consistent Themes	255
9.5	Concluding Comments	257
<b>Chapter Ten: Developing Methods to Overcome Barriers</b>		<b>259</b>
10.0	Introduction	259
10.1	Barriers	260
10.1.1	Transformation of the Relationships with Government	261
10.1.2	Oppression through the Re-Definiton of ‘Aroha’ as ‘Voluntary Activity’	263
10.1.3	A New Approach to Policy Development	266
10.1.4	Insufficient Resources as a Continual Handicap for the Restoration and Invigoration of Te Ao Māori	267
10.2	Capacity Building – For Tino Rangatiratanga	270
10.2.1	Treaty of Waitangi – Implementing a Partnership Relationship with Government	271
10.2.2	Consciousness Raising and Resource Development	274
10.2.3	Policy Inclusion	278
10.2.4	Organisational and Tino Rangatiratanga Development	279
10.3	Development Theories	284

10.3.1 Tino Rangatiratanga _____	284
10.3.2 Characteristics of a Māori Voluntary Organisation _____	285
10.3.3 Enhancing Working Conditions _____	286
10.3.4 A <i>Kaupapa</i> Māori Approach to Research _____	287
10.4 Recommendations _____	289
10.4.1 Individual, Organisational, and Government Contributions _____	289
10.4.2 National Māori Voluntary Association _____	290
10.4.3 Consciousness Raising _____	290
10.4.4 Support Research _____	291
10.5 Concluding Comments _____	292
<b>Glossary _____</b>	<b>298</b>
<b>References _____</b>	<b>302</b>
<b>Conversation Sheet _____</b>	<b>322</b>
<b>Research Information Sheet _____</b>	<b>324</b>
<b>Interview Schedule/Conversation Sheet _____</b>	<b>327</b>

## Chapter One: Introducing the Study

### 1.0 An Introduction into the Culture of Voluntary Work for Māori

*A good captain goes down with the ship and sinks with their crew but the captains today they've got life boats and the voluntary workers go down with the crew*  
(William Te Momo, President of Te Rōpu Awahi 1998)

*I te taha o tōku papa*

*Ko Tainui te Waka*

*Ko Tararua te Maunga*

*Ko Manawatu te Awa*

*Ko Poutu Pa te Marae*

*Ko Ngāti Raukawa te Iwi*

*Ko Ngāti Whakatere te Hapū*

*Ko Poaneki Te Momo te Whānau*

*I te taha o tōku mama*

*Ko Huripureiata te Waka*

*Ko Pukehapopo te Maunga*

*Ko Waiomoko te Awa*

*Ko Whangara te Marae*

*Ko Ngāti Konohi te Iwi*

*Ko Ngāti Wahakapi te Hapū*

*Ko Paenga te Whānau*

*Ko Wiremu Poaneki Te Momo rāua ko Raharuhi Paenga ōku mātua. Ko Oliver Helena Fiona Te Momo ahau. Nō reira tēnā koutou katoa.*

*William Te Momo whom I quote above is my father. I am a Māori woman born in Gisborne on the East Coast of New Zealand. My tribal affiliations to Gisborne comprise Ngāti Oneone, Ngāti Konohi, Te Aitanga-a-Hauti, and Ngāti Porou. My whānau (or extended family) were my first community and participation in formalised community voluntary work. Formalised voluntary work began in my late teens and was organised by the Church. Religious voluntary work and activities involving sport always surrounded me. The people I grew up with seldom highlighted that an activity was voluntary or unpaid and there was always a type of reciprocity in the voluntary work between the participants and me. Growing up amongst people who volunteered was a way of life, voluntary work was a social obligation performed as a duty in the community and never perceived as an act of freewill.*



*Reminiscing about my childhood, I realise that whānau voluntary work was a strong value for East Coast Māori families. Our whānau worked a farm in Whangara on the East Coast of the North Island. The whānau consisted of my mother's brothers, sisters, and cousins who made up six families. Two families had more than nine children between them. We all worked together. There was no monetary transaction for work done. Participating in unpaid work was a normal way of life and provided communal satisfaction. When we gathered together for religious teachings and unpaid work, the elders led discussions and organised the voluntary activities for the day. Values such as spiritual commitment, collective work effort, reciprocity, and leadership were strongly advocated and incorporated religious and kinship processes. It was common to work by involving everyone and to live a life that required the contributions from each member. The whānau represented a collection of families who shared a common interest and believed in the same values.*

*Survival on the farm, a Māori Land Incorporated Block, was dependent on voluntary labour supplied by members of the whānau. Our work involved farming the land. My uncles would bring the sheep over the hills on horses and we children made a path to lead the sheep in to the pen. Each child age group had specific roles in this task. The older cousins rolled out sacking material used to guide the sheep. The younger cousins would line up beside the metre wide material and together they would pick it up. They made two opposing lines starting from the entrance of the pen. Coming down the hill the lines formed an alleyway to the pen, with the young cousins lined up on the outside, and everyone making a noise. This activity, guiding the sheep in the pen, was an example of working collectively on the farm. Human labour and co-operation was necessary to make ends meet and ensure that work was completed so accounts were paid on time because there was never an abundance of money.*

*My mother was educated in a native rural school Mihiwhetu located on the farm. Like many Māori students in those times, she was strapped for speaking Māori. Her elder brothers and sister retained the language. Whānau siblings around her age group (including nephew and nieces) lost the Māori language. It was a great loss since her mother and father were native speakers who resisted teaching her*

*the language for fear she would be punished. Consequently, my mother taught her children that Māori language had no value and Pakeha recognition would make a person of Māori origin complete. In election year when candidates had to sign their culture on the election roll or when meeting people she always made specific reference to being of European descent and a New Zealander. Identifying herself as a 'half-caste' (Māori and European descent) seemed to give her some sense of pride.*

*My immediate family lived in town whereas the whānau lived on the farm. However, we were still part of the whānau, and at the weekend we all went to the farm. If the whānau needed help with docking sheep, shearing sheep, cattle management, or farming activities my mother would take the younger siblings who were not at school to the farm during the week.*

*Unpaid work was a social obligation performed for the betterment of the whānau. The notions of freewill or philanthropic activity were not represented in our epistemology of unpaid work. The underlying motivation to participate in unpaid work was the knowledge that to work the land that fed and housed the whānau required unpaid labour. This knowledge spiritually bonded the members to the concepts of reciprocity and mutual responsibility. The spiritual attachment to the farm and legal recognition that each person shared an interest as an owner were significant reasons for keeping the whānau together. The farm had represented more than a place to work because it was an environment to maintain kinship ties and be accepted for who we were, Māori people. For many years, the farm serviced our whānau. However, as the years passed, the whānau began to move off the farm. The values of social obligation and unpaid work were maintained by whānau who continued to exercise working in an unpaid capacity in their new communities after they left the farm. This work, often not linked to whānau obligation, may more readily be termed 'voluntary work'.*

*Urbanisation of the whānau referred to families moving from rural to urban settings. This move appeared to be a matter of choice for individuals and groups of families when remaining in the rural environment appeared unsustainable. Leaving the land behind meant many families planted new roots in urban settings*

*in the search of paid work and an alternative lifestyle. The work whānau secured was manual labour in factories or fields and they lived predominantly in the lower socio-economic communities. Subsequently, contact between individual families dwindled as they spread across New Zealand.*

*Today, the whānau do not work or live on the farm. Working on the farm is a role performed by a Pakeha manager whose family live there. Some whānau are situated in Gisborne while others live across New Zealand. Each year we are invited by a Pakeha Committee of Management to attend an Annual General Meeting. At the meeting, we are informed on the management of the land.*

### **1.1 The Disruption of Whānau**

My experience of *whānau* dispersion as described in my opening story was consistent with the wider patterns of disruption of Māori communities in New Zealand from 1935 to 1980. The social and economic environment, according to Metge (1995), for *whānau*:

Changed significantly since the middle of the century, especially over the last 25 years. Māori urban migration, which began before and during World War II, picked up speed until the relation between rural and urban Māori was totally reversed. Whereas in 1945 75% of the Māori population lived in rural areas, the proportion living in urban areas rose to 56% in 1966, to 75% in 1976 and settled around 80% in 1981. By 1991, Māori born and raised in urban areas made up more than half the Māori population (p. 22).

“By 1996, or even earlier, more than 80 per cent of Māori were living in urban settings, and one-quarter of New Zealand’s Māori population lived in the greater Auckland area” (Durie, 2001, 7). While many analysts described the movements of Māori families away from their rural home as the ‘urban drift’ this dispersion was the result of political, economic, and social policies which made rural life for Māori unsustainable.

Government officials, according to Walker (1990), encouraged this movement. “Māori welfare officers exhorted rural families to leave the subsistence economy of the ‘*pipi* beds’ by finding them employment and accommodation in urban centres” (p. 197). Walker states urbanisation posed two tasks for migrant Māori. The first task was for Māori migrants to learn how to live in a community where money determined the quality of life. Paid employment was necessary to meet financial responsibilities such as rent, power, and food, because Māori were placed in an environment where capitalism, and the individual ownership of wealth, appeared to be preconditions for survival. The second task for migrants was to transplant Māori culture, Māori knowledge and customs, into an urban milieu. Attempts to keep in contact with families living in the rural areas were maintained during the early stages of urbanisation but were costly and often incompatible with the demands of regularised paid employment. Walker contends that after a while the Māori migrants became confident in their new surroundings and established a Māori focussed culture to “put down roots and planted their culture in new ground” (p. 199).

### **1.1.1 New Communities – New Types of Work**

Voluntary associations are identified by Walker (1990) as the key community activity that helped Māori adjust successfully into urban life:

These include Māori sections of orthodox churches, the Māori protest religions of Ringatu and Ratana, culture clubs, sports clubs, family and tribal organisations, benevolent societies, Māori committees, Māori wardens, Māori councils and the Māori Women’s Welfare League. The essence of Māori voluntary association is group membership with the common goal of promoting the *kaupapa* of perpetuating Māori identity, values and culture. In the alien and hostile environment of impersonal cities, kinship bonds were formalised by the formation of family clubs, adoption of a constitution, and election of an executive for the collection of subscriptions and disbursement of funds against the contingencies of illness, unemployment and the underwriting of expenses incurred in returning the bodies of deceased persons to their home *marae* (p. 199).

For Māori, participating in voluntary associations strengthened the new types of Māori communities and provided a way to address social problems by taking on the responsibilities to care for families. However, the vehicle for this early strength, the integration of Pakeha values and ways of working may also be seen to have contributed to the undermining of Māori ways of doing things that manifested Māori identity and values through Māori ways of working. While Walker indicates Māori worked seriously on the process of adjustment to urban life, the transition did not result in the full integration of Māori into the range of social and economic situations enjoyed by the wider population. While there were poor struggling families in all the cultures that make up Aotearoa/NZ Māori persistently predominated in the lower socio-economic ranks.

### **1.1.2 Dependency**

From 1935 to 1984, Māori were “fighting for survival on the playing field of colonising culture, an overwhelming number of Māori people became dependant on the welfare state for jobs and income support. The state had made them dependant” (Kelsey, 1993, 247). Critics of this period argued that “public administrators allocated services and resources rather than the market. This led to the ‘capture’ of state resources by bureaucracies and individuals within them rather than these serving the public/clients and consumers” (Thorns & Sedgwick, 1997, 154). Kelsey (1993) contends the acting government created welfare policies proposed to assist Māori families but failed to promote Māori interest. She states that through consecutive governments Māori people lost land and the structure of their society. This produced a generation of urban Māori families who became required to rely on the government to take care of their welfare.

A new generation of *whānau* emerged raising their children on welfare benefits in urban environments. The government became the employer to Māori families receiving welfare benefits and the controller of developments in their communities.

### **1.1.3 From State Welfare to Neo-Liberalism**

From 1984, the New Zealand Labour led government and all subsequent government committees initiated policies of rapid wide-ranging neo-liberalism. This entailed a rapid agenda of ‘free trade’ support and commitment to a reduction of the role of the state in the provision of the social ‘safety net’ that supported this era. Māori families encountered a different kind of hardship. They were flung into a state of uncertainty as government withdrew welfare support while realistic employment opportunities seemed like a distant hope. Levels of poverty increased and income problems for Māori families were further exacerbated under a National government that further cut social welfare benefits under the guise of an urge to self reliance. The:

Emphasis on the role of incentives for people to provide for themselves has always been an important part of debates surrounding social-security and income support. So-called incentives are typically presented in a way that means, in fact, less eligibility. ‘Less eligibility’ refers to the idea that state assistance provided through social-security benefits should not be kept at a sufficiently low level so as not to discourage beneficiaries from moving from a state-paid benefit and wage rates. It was these arguments that were advanced, in part, as the reason for the benefit cuts that came into effect in 1991 (Cheyne, O’Brien, and Belgrave, 2000, 182).

Now, in the name of market freedom, government was about to kick what social support there was away (Kelsey, 1993, 247).

The change in circumstances for Māori families placed greater responsibilities on Māori voluntary organisations. Government relied on the loyalty of voluntary organisations such as the Māori Wardens and the Māori Women’s Welfare League to take responsibility for the social problems of Māori people. With minimal resources and unpaid labour these organisations struggled to provide community support for Māori.

All subsequent governments continued the commitment to neo-liberalism. Each government committed to further withdrawal of assistance towards social service provision. Wilson (2001) argued when government withdrew:

From direct social service provision, with voluntary sector organisations contracted in to fill the gap. This [had] resulted in a build-up of expectations, demands and pressures on volunteers with regard to the type of work they undertake, the amount of time they commit to volunteering, and the longevity of their commitment. It [was] evident that volunteers involved in service delivery and those serving on management committees have experienced an increase in their workload and level of responsibility. A number of studies [had] reported that management committee volunteers are especially susceptible to increased demands and obligations in terms of their roles and responsibilities under a contracting framework (p. 7).

Among contemporary Māori people, participation in voluntary work is high. As I worked amongst the Māori communities in the Tairāwhiti District (Wairoa, Gisborne, East Coast) in the 1990s I became concerned that the volunteers were not being compensated or recognised for their work in social services. Family members and associates who were volunteers shared this concern. Somehow, the concept of *awhi* and care for each other, deeply embedded in Te Ao Māori, had been translated into a concept of volunteering – and – under the new regime as a social obligation to provide a service that appeared to be addressing problems deriving from government policy – responsibility for economic and social fall-out ‘handed back’ to the community. The reciprocity consistent in the context of Te Ao Māori was seldom active in a local community because the new type of community emerging under neo-liberalism was not obliged (and frequently not resourced) to reciprocate.

The pre-existing and newly emerging Māori volunteer organisations were urged by successive governments to provide ‘culturally appropriate’ services to Māori who were disproportionately affected by the changes in economic and social direction undertaken from 1984. While this ‘urge’ to commit came with a lexicon

of Māori independence and self governance, grant monies and contracts to deliver services came with rules and regulations that frequently undermined the ethos of *'te tino rangatiratanga'* a movement towards sovereignty pursued since early colonisation but finding greater and more pressing voice from the 1980s.

The monitoring mechanisms that accompanied the new responsibilities to ensure government-required 'outputs' were being met, and documentation and certification were being completed, had no significant input from Māori in their formation of the required process or their monitoring. Much work was still to be done by the volunteers, but volunteers were obliged to work in ways that appear to service government requirements rather than community need. Many Māori volunteers I met expressed a feeling of 'abuse' for work they considered *'aroha'*.

Somehow, the concept of *aroha*, *awhi*, and reciprocity became entangled in promoted ideas of culturally appropriate work, social obligation, and philanthropic values. Ironically, elderly Māori volunteers delivered a social service to others while their main source of income was a Work and Income New Zealand unemployment, pension, widows, or sickness benefit. Voluntary work for them was not a leisurely activity. They worked up to 20 hours each week. The concept of 'free will' or a choice not to volunteer was rarely entertained because social responsibility was an integral part of their culture so readily co-opted by the need/greed of the State. It was not often challenged by Māori themselves or the services that used their labour.

Very little research had been conducted to explore what voluntary work has meant to Māori people in terms of their experiences since colonisation, hence my reasons to investigate Māori voluntary work. My concern is that the concept of *aroha* and self-direction, so dear to Māori in my region, have been co-opted to serve government directives that may in the end, work against the idea of *tino rangatiratanga*.

## 1.2 Overview of Study

My passion to explore the transformation of Māori voluntary work from a way of life for a *whānau* to work that is replaced by a network of agents is the



cornerstone of this study. This passion has evolved from a desire to learn how voluntary work for Māori people has developed over the years and the future for this type of work. The topic of study investigates ‘a relationship between Māori and voluntary work’, is an exploration involving discussions about Māori voluntary work and Māori voluntary organisations.

There are ten chapters in this thesis. Chapter One, introduces the study. In this chapter I provide a snap-shot of the contents of the thesis and I claim that voluntary associations and voluntary organisations with reference to Māori social services are the same. It begins with an introduction into personal experiences as a volunteer, and the significance of my identity as a Māori researcher concerned about the development of my people, then proceeds to describe voluntary work and Māori people. In Chapter Two: Laying the Foundation with Key Concepts, I review theories and concepts relevant to Māori development. I explore the critical concepts raised by theorists such as Gramsci to examine the impact of industrialisation on social structures and Freire to explore the explanations for oppression and its resistance. I investigate notions of community development for Māori as a way to empower the people in communities.

The method used in the research is explored in Chapter Three. It gives a brief explanation of triangulation and introduces the Case Study, Community Study, and Cross Section Study. In this chapter I outline a qualitative process applied to collate data using the theories for Social Research and a *Kaupapa* Māori Research set out in that chapter.

Chapter Four, Volunteerism in New Zealand: Developments in the Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State, describes the emergence of voluntary activity in New Zealand. It describes how voluntary work for Māori evolved in early New Zealand history. It explores developments that occurred in New Zealand before and after this country became a welfare state. Throughout the exploration, stories appear that document a voluntary contribution from Māori to build the colonial, liberal, and welfare states. Most importantly, these stories show how settlers, churches, and the government required and expected Māori to provide unpaid work.

As the 1980s approached, New Zealand Governments set neo-liberal direction for the economy. The discussion in Chapter Five focuses on how the associated government policies impact on voluntary organisations and Māori communities. It begins with providing a general overview of voluntary organisations and then narrows discussion to social policies that affected communities in New Zealand under a Labour Party government. In the latter section of the chapter the Third Way is introduced and I suggest a Māori Third Way.

The Case Study, in Chapter Six is the first of my entries into the lives of Māori volunteers in a voluntary organisation. It provides a practical look and describes reports of lived experiences in the life of a Māori volunteer delivering a government programme. The government programme directs the social service the volunteers provide in the quest to enhance the local community. The study brings forward the struggles a small voluntary organisation encounters on a regular basis with insufficient resources. It highlights that the relationship Māori voluntary organisations have with government is unbalanced and power of authority is in the hands of government.

A Community Study, of ten organisations that use the services of Māori volunteers is explained in Chapter Seven. Nine of the organisations were established by Māori and represent different social service sectors in Gisborne City. One organisation was non-Māori and a company. This organisation used the services of Māori volunteers and was managed by a Māori person. In the community study I discussed with participants in positions of authority the struggles and experiences of working with Māori volunteers.

Chapter Eight describes the Cross Section Study. This study reviewed data gathered from 16 voluntary organisations representing communities across New Zealand to identify whether themes emerging in the case study and the community study are also present in the cross section study. It details the experiences of volunteers in voluntary organisations in the North Island and South Island.

The main themes drawn from the three studies are discussed in Chapter Nine. The similarities and differences between the studies are explored. It also presents a personal overview of the three studies.

A discussion on developing methods to overcome barriers is explored in Chapter Ten. The chapter draws the information from literature and research and identifies barriers that reflect individual, collective, and national problems a voluntary organisation experiences. It also looks at ways to overcome barriers that impede development for voluntary organisations and suggests methods to change the situation from personal contributions to a national contribution. It reiterates that action to make change needs to be implemented at all levels in New Zealand society.

This research is limited to gathering information on voluntary organisations which participated in voluntary social services. The research focussed on Māori people who participated in voluntary work. The notion of Māori communities was used consistently to describe the general view of organised Māori groups that were situated in rural or urban communities and predominantly reflected discussions raised in literature. General comments on voluntary organisations represented the western view of voluntary organisations in literature. The Case Study, Community Study, Cross Section Study, and personal experience represent the view of voluntary workers gathered from primary data. In summary, this thesis pulls back the ‘warm fuzzy blanket of philanthropy’ that commonly reflects voluntary activity. I suggest that colonised people in New Zealand, Māori, have another perception of voluntary work that is far from any act of freewill. The people I met conducted their work, often under conditions of personal hardship and little resources or formal appreciation. They do this work motivated by a mixture of culturally embedded *aroha* and as a response to the close and unmet needs of their communities.

### **1.3 Māori Voluntary Work and Māori Voluntary Organisations**

Perhaps one of the most difficult issues I have encountered in the thesis is defining aspects of Māori culture. Historically, Māori culture in literature was defined through Western anthropological and institutional frameworks and

designed for academic intellects or dominant groups. Only recently, Māori scholars have become influential in defining some aspects of the Māori culture through Māori frameworks. Accordingly, I have placed Māori voluntary organisations in a Western framework to define a Māori voluntary organisation. My reason for this, discussed in Chapter Two and Three, are that Māori voluntary organisations were established during colonisation. Since colonisation, many Māori organisations that volunteered social services to the community registered the organisation as Charitable Trusts, or Incorporated Societies. This registration placed Māori under a Western framework and the organisations were required by law to fulfil certain obligations. In this way, Māori volunteers, motivated to help and heal Māori people, tried to do so in the framework of the coloniser. A Māori voluntary organisation, in this thesis, is an organisation that has a legal registration as defined by New Zealand law, whose workers are predominantly Māori and incorporate, as far as they can, Māori customs into the delivery of services.

#### **1.4 Thesis Statement**

My observation of Māori organisations' involvement in voluntary work generated in me a deep concern in what appeared to be an involvement in activity that improved neither the lives of the volunteers nor the wider problems to which they attributed their *aroha*. This involvement activity is a product of historical developments whereby the Western ideology of voluntary work became confused with a Māori ideology of collective participation. This confusion has created an environment where Māori voluntary organisations are working unpaid with insufficient resources in oppressive conditions in the attempt to provide social solutions. I argue that the Māori ideology of collective participation has been co-opted in the emerging context of neo-liberalism to provide social services in communities in which government agencies are required to address the negative social outcomes of their economic policies.

#### **1.5 Research Questions**

This study was designed to answer several questions posed by observing Māori voluntary work and its relationship to the development of Māori communities.

The following questions form the basis upon which I conducted the research in search of explanations and understanding:

- 1) What is a Māori voluntary organisation as described and defined by participants?
- 2) How does a Māori voluntary organisation operate in the natural environment, for example: What are the hours of work members contribute and what resources do they have to support them?
- 3) How do Māori, leaders and *tangata katoa*, perceive the levels of autonomy and self-control in their work?
- 4) What are the perceptions of workers in a Māori voluntary group as to their role in the community?
- 5) What *kaupapa* does a Māori voluntary group follow and how much input of Māori culture is evident?
- 6) What type of consultation process exists between Māori voluntary organisations and outside agencies for example: local government and central government?

The research questions were a guide to construct the research method. The research was initiated from an examination of the many observations informing my concerns. These observations generated a concern that Māori volunteers were the victims of pressure from society to meet urgent and often desperate needs by Māori communities. External forces oppress the volunteers. However, I believe that volunteers have the ability to resist dominant forces, and volunteers had access to support.

## **1.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has set the scene for a thesis that argues that voluntary work for Māori is a struggle in Western structures that are oppressive. Furthermore, it supports the notion that governments have directed the development of Māori voluntary organisations under various political and economic areas. It suggests Māori concepts of kinship and social obligation have been transformed into unpaid social services that occurred as voluntary organisations formalised. This process of formalisation created an environment whereby voluntary work became

a specialist service with criteria and outputs set by government and funding bodies. I have concluded that the outcome became oppressive as pressure placed on Māori organisations to deliver social services with insufficient resources increased. The thesis describes the relationship Māori attach to voluntary work and searches for an understanding of the implication of this unpaid activity on Māori well – being – the very purpose for which this work is donated!

In conclusion, personal interest has steered this research. My quest to understand *whānau* involvement in voluntary work has developed into a major piece of work. I am committed towards exposing social injustices impacting on *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* whose voluntary services are being abused. The position I take in this research is not neutral.

## Chapter Two: Laying the Foundation with Key Concepts

*“He manga wai koia kia kore e whitikia.”*

*“It is a big river indeed that cannot be crossed.*

*Make light of difficulties and they will disappear”*

*(Brougham, Reed, & Kāretu 1999, 39).*

### 2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I trace connections among several ideas generated by the Frankfurt School of Thought. I develop within various strands of critical theory and the concept of hegemony as proposed by Gramsci to explain the co-operation of the oppressed in their domination. I trace the way in which the idea of hegemony was extended from an analysis of class-based oppression to include the consideration of race and culture because I think that these ideas are pertinent to the explanation of persistent oppression and social exclusion experienced by Māori in Aotearoa today. I draw on the similarities between aspects of the work of Gramsci and the analysis that drives the liberatory theories of Freire so that in the later chapters of this thesis I may consider the potential of a Freirian influence as an empowering model for Māori development.

The chapter is divided into three sections. Section one introduces theories and key concepts: Critical Theory (2.2), Challenging Hegemony (2.3), Oppression: Living Under the Rulers (2.4), and The Theory of Development and its Relationship to Communities (2.5). Section two describes the relationship between Māori and the theories and concepts. This section provides a brief summary of the Treaty of Waitangi in The Arrival of Māori and European Contact (2.6) and then relates Māori and Critical Theory in Critical Theory Applied to the Colonisation in Aotearoa/NZ (2.7), Māori Hegemony (2.8), Māori and Oppression (2.9), and Māori Development (2.10). The third section summarises the chapter and explores the potential value of the Western theories to Māori experiences. It draws on the literature to explain the environment Māori volunteers and Māori voluntary organisations operate under to lay the theoretical foundation for the discussions in Chapter Four: Volunteerism in NZ: Developments in the Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State, and Chapter Five: Volunteerism in NZ: The Neo-Liberal State.

## **2.1 Introducing the Theories and Concepts**

This section provides background information for the theories and concepts I intend to use in my analysis of the relationship between Māori people and volunteering. The words ‘force’, ‘coercion’, and ‘education’ are used throughout the chapter to describe how societies were changed. Force represents the notion that superior strength used physical effort to drive against resistance using legal or logical validity (Makins, 1992). Coercion is “force by threat” (Geddes and Grosset Limited, 1996, 89) whereby subordinate groups accept the ideas of the dominant groups. Education refers to the knowledge of individuals or groups acquired by a process of learning and training.

## **2.2 Critical Theory**

The origin of critical theory can be pinpointed to the ‘Frankfurt School’ (Giroux, 1983) where theorists such as Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, Walter Benjamin, Henryk Grossman, and Freidrich Pollack developed the concept in the Institute for Social Research. These theorists “took the dialectical Marxism developed by Lukacs and Korsch as their point of departure” (Agger, 1979, p. 121). Critical theory became another term “for the version of Marxian theory centred around the theory of domination” (p. 342).

Smart (1983) considered ‘a critique of instrumental rationality’ to be the foundation of critical theory:

The general criticism articulated by the critical theorists is that instrumental rationality has become the vehicle of oppression or domination of the human condition. There are several formulations of this development in the work of critical theorist (cf. Horkheimer, 1972, 1974; Wellmer, 1974; Habermas, 1971); however, they ultimately all reduce to a common criticism of the form of domination effected through a specific form of reason, instrumental rationality (pp. 133-134).



Critical theory was the mainstream for sociology, politics, and moral revolution from the 1930s to the 1960s. Critical theory is said to offer:

A critique of modernist narratives in terms of the one-sided, pathological, advance of technocratic or instrumental reason they celebrate, in order to offer an alternative, higher version of rationality. Instead of narratives of progress, we have narratives of reconciliation of the subject with itself, with nature, with the form of its own reason. Such narratives promise emancipation and secular salvation. This form of theory, instanced by 'Western Marxism' generally, and by Habermas' theory of communicative rationality and Horkheimer and Adorno's dialectic of enlightenment, can be characterised as a form of 'critical modernism' (Dean, 1994, 3).

Cunningham (1993) argued that the Frankfurt School called into question the predominant mode of social theorising categorised as 'modernity'. She states that, "modernity was based on reason and rationality with science and technology as its major driving force" (p. 2). Modernity in the early 1900s was believed to be associated with improvement to human social life, and over time, end poverty and the oppression of all human beings (Cunningham, 1993). The Frankfurt theorists criticised this modern form of theorising as an inadequate explanation for the complexity of human experiences. Furthermore, they argued that such a view, when widely formalised in professionalism, research, education, policies and social practices produced a 'false consciousness' about the societies in Western Europe and the experiences of the people. False consciousness entails a form of thinking that confirms human servitude (Marshall, 1998). Both the powerful and exploited were expected to believe that industrialisation produced a better life for the people.

Of the many ideas developed by these writers, the idea of 'false consciousness' and its link to hegemony is of interest to me. 'False consciousness' about the supposed benefits of industrialisation, according to the Frankfurt School had become nearly universally established (Agger, 1979). In response to their concerns about the impact of false consciousness and its persistence, these theorists "retreated into a philosophical mode of Marxian critique that attempted

not to lay political plans for action but rather to destroy the illusion that paradise had been found” (pp. 145-146). Agger (1979) and Cunningham (1993) for example, identified ways in which modernity did not provide an equal opportunity for the different classes of people in society. In doing so, they provided literature to challenge the false consciousness they believed to be so pervasive.

The destruction of an illusion without an alternative to the subsequent chaos or devolution would produce a new future is not a position shared by all those calling for liberation from oppression. Consciousness raising as an attempt to reduce or eliminate false consciousness became a key focus of later critical theorists.

Smart (1983) purported that critical theory when used to raise the consciousness of people can lead to the transformation of a society. Critical theorists encouraged and supported the emancipation of the oppressed by arousing the critical consciousness of their oppression.

Ray (1993) claimed critical theory had become old fashioned in a society that claimed to be realist and postmodernist. Kellner described the Frankfurt School theorists as ‘classical theorists of the first generation of critical theory’. Kellner commented further that in the early 1970s, the theorists from the Frankfurt School were either dead or not producing new ideas or approaches to social theory, so that critical theory subsequently became unfashionable. In the 1980s it was argued to have lost the cutting edge of radical social theory (Kellner, 2001, 2).

One enduring concept that emerged from this scholarship, however is the concept of hegemony and its implication in the winning of consent of the oppressed in oppression. It was Antonio Gramsci who developed this idea to:

Describe how the domination of one class over the others is achieved by a combination of political and ideological means ... . The balance between co-ercion and consent will vary from society to society, the latter being more important in capitalist societies. For Gramsci, the state was the chief instrument of co-ercive force, the winning of consent by ideological domination being achieved by the institutions of civil society (q.v.), the

family, the Church and trade unions for instance. Hence, the more prominent civil society is, the more likely it is that hegemony will be achieved by ideological means (Abercrombie, Hills, and Turner, 1994, 195).

Strinati (1995) articulates this idea by arguing that dominant groups in society “including fundamentally but not exclusively the ruling class, maintain their dominance by securing the ‘spontaneous consent’ of subordinate groups, including the working class, through negotiated construction of a political and ideological consensus which incorporates both dominant and dominated (p. 165).

Cunningham (1993) argues that any “state having to live by force alone would never last long without the support of a civil society” (p. 3). It was the Civil Society that “developed the consensus: the rationality for the society” (p. 3) and the “State’s internal constraints, thus operating the society by consensus rather than by force” (p. 3).

Cunningham (1993) and Laclau and Chantal (1985) say that Gramsci identified the relationship between power and education as the technique used to perpetuate hegemony. They advocate a role for intellectuals as a key to intervene and critique this prevailing hegemony. To this Cunningham adds, he (Gramsci) “also noted that all social classes produced intellectuals, some of whom identified with the state and others who critique its hegemony on behalf of those who were poor and in Italy’s case, peasants” (p. 3).

The development of his understanding of the notion of hegemony was scattered throughout Gramsci’s notebooks. These notebooks have been analysed by theorists who consider the following principles on hegemony to consist of:

- a) consensual domination (Robinson, 1996, 6),
- b) a “combination of coercion and consent” (Hindess, 1996, 5),
- c) a process that “is exerted by the ruling class” (Torres, 1992, 7),
- d) ‘social conformism’ (p. 7),
- e) ‘economic domination’ (Rosengarten, 2001, 5)

- f) 'intellectual and moral leadership' (Smart, 1983, 40),
- g) power as a form of 'cultural domination' (Giroux, 1983, 196).

These principles focussed on the notion that through a process of indoctrination, the values, culture and thoughts of those in power, become the values, culture, and thoughts of those who are dominated. This notion of hegemony entails and the belief that false consciousness as a process of liberation requires an 'awakening' to the conditions of oppression. In Gramscian analyses, this takes the form of class alliances, for Freire, illiteracy made people vulnerable.

In this thesis, I argue that the diminished influence over political organisational processes has occurred as part of the process of colonisation. Any notion of empowerment, and a self direction for Māori communities would need to entail a concept of 'awakening' a relationship with governments to be remotely considered as a partnership. The emerging dominance of neo-liberalism in New Zealand since 1984, and its content for the study, critical theory and the concept of hegemony will be used later in this thesis to consider the emerging relationship of post 1984 government and the 'community sector'. This issue will be taken up in Chapter Four and Five of this thesis.

### **2.3 · Challenging Hegemony**

Giroux and McLaren (1994) highlighted Gramsci's reference to collective transformation of an economic system as a "social movement" (p. 257). This movement created a collective subject including people with diverse affiliations that could overcome material conditions of domination. This collective subject was referred to as an 'historical bloc': "the complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of superstructures (which is) the reflection of the social relations of production" (Hoare & Smith, 1971, 366). The historical bloc presumed the existence of multiple identities in the field of bloc formation, rather than an already given 'objective' identity. In other words, "the outcome of alliances pursued by the labour movement within civil society in what Gramsci called a "war of position" waged in and across the entire complex of civil society against the bourgeois State" (Gallin, 2000, 5). These alliances are known as organisations such as the Labour Unions in industrial work places, church groups or voluntary

sectors set up with a purpose to address unfair treatment to workers and citizens in a civil society.

Hoare and Smith (1971), Giroux and McLaren (1994), and Gallin (2000) identify the strength of bloc formations as having the ability for organised groups to change the social and economic conditions in their working environments. On a larger scale these bloc formations had the potential to transform into social movements that could alter societies and remove control from dominant groups.

Cunningham (1993) and Williams (1977) discuss hegemony and culture in relation to the working class. However, Cunningham addresses the issues of different racial classes in regard to hegemony, whereas Williams discusses hegemony in relation to gender. Cunningham (1993) extends this economic and cultural analysis to include as an influential factor:

This hegemony blinds us to our own lack of control over our lives. If we are poor, is it our fault? To be white and European is preferred; English is the dominant language in practice. We accept the social construction of our society by those who, through images and language, want us to accept this bottom line mentality, not only for our work but for our life spaces. But let us remember, hegemony is a social construction; therefore, it can be changed through political action (p. 3).

Cunningham highlights that hegemony is a social construction that can be changed and identifies the hegemony: ‘to be white is to be privileged’, as a social construction experienced by many colonised people.

Gramsci was aware that colonialism served the needs of the bourgeois. According to Keelan and Moon (1998) Gramsci considered anything European to be positive for economic development in underdeveloped countries:

Yet, having plunged into the depths of capitalist exploitation in the colonies, Gramsci surfaces by offering a partial redemption – arguing firstly that European culture is the only historically and concretely one,

and secondly, that in the longer term, the juxtaposition of European and non-European countries ... was good for the economies of underdeveloped countries (p. 60).

Gramsci's class based ideas about oppression and liberation do not take into account the analysis of colonisation provided by recent post-colonial writers. His view merely suggests an assimilation of colonised people into the working class (conceived of as European) and in this way, achieves economic liberation.

#### **2.4 Oppression: Living under the Rulers**

Critical theorists who took up the ideas associated with the notion of false consciousness and hegemony discussed in the earlier pages of this chapter, set out to analyse and expose the crucial influence of the superstructure, culture and self-image of people in the maintenance of oppression. The work of Hegel 'unmasking' false consciousness became useful in enhancing the emancipation of people. 'Consciousness-raising' became a positive action arising from the analysis of critical theorists and brings me to consider the work of Paulo Freire.

Freire, who worked amongst the poor people teaching adult literacy, observed the dominant groups (rulers) and those who dominated the oppressed. From his writings, Freire identified that adult literacy perpetuated an oppressed state for people of lower class, the poor people. Mayo (1999) relates Freire to Gramsci and considered Freire to be an unconscious Gramscian because of his theorising of how society can transform by collective alliances and education – the formation of historic 'bloc' as discussed earlier.

Brazilian born, Freire applied his thoughts and theories to educate the oppressed people in Brazil. Freire argued that instead of "being a critical response to the plight of the oppressed traditional literacy approaches ignore the culture, language skills, and issues that both inform and dignify the everyday life of the poor" (Giroux, 1983, 226). The outcome of such approaches transmitted the rulers' (dominant) ideas that the societal order in which the poor found themselves was inevitable. Freire (1972; 1973) and Giroux (1983) contend that traditional literacy approaches embedded the perception of powerlessness and, in turn, made people

voiceless, denying them the tools that they needed to think and act reflectively in order to change their circumstances.

Through education and praxis, Freire constructed fundamental principles for a liberatory pedagogy. The fundamentals were, according to Janmohamed (1994):

- documentation to enable the development of a rich archive,
- construction and comprehension of one's history to achieve a greater control of one's past and present,
- control combined with an understanding of the future to enhance one's sense of agency and the possibility of changing one's present condition (p. 251).

Freire broadened his theories of liberatory education to include ways to transform societies. The ontological feature of being human from Freire's perspective, according to Glass (2001), was that people produce history and culture:

Even as history and culture produce them, and thus both the theory and application of education as a practice of freedom "take the people's historicity as their starting point" ... The ontological truth of historicity thus not only defines human nature for Freire, but grounds his theory of liberation and provides an opening for concrete efforts to transform oppressive realities (p. 17).

Glass argued that the oppressed, from a Freireian point of view, have the human capacity to intervene in a given situation and the power to liberate themselves from an oppressive society. Freire's work to raise the consciousness of the oppressed threatened the dominant position of the rulers, and consequently he was exiled from Brazil (Freire, 1972; 1973).

#### **2.4.1 Consciousness Raising and Development**

According to Ife (1995) critical consciousness is a necessary aspect of empowerment:

Thus, Freire requires that programmes must be grounded in the real life experiences, sufferings and aspirations of people as articulated by the people themselves, while at the same time these subjective experiences must be linked to an analysis of broader social, economic and political structures which are the cause of people's oppression and disadvantage. It is only by showing how the personal and the political relate, in such a way that possibilities for action are revealed, that genuine empowerment can occur (p. 95).

The enhancement of critical consciousness by oppressed groups could change the lives of the oppressed in different ways. An oppressed group, for example, may be critically conscious of their oppression and rise up to fight against the oppressor. As my study progressed, these concepts from Freire became particularly important in the way I formulated my conclusions (see Chapter Ten).

Kaplan (1996), on the other hand, considered critical consciousness may also be achieved without revolution as an outcome. The theories of development, by Kaplan, are motivated towards organisational consciousness and a means in which the oppressed moved from their oppression. Kaplan referenced Freire's theory of 'critical consciousness' as a 'stage of independence':

In Paulo Freire's terms, development occurs when one moves from dependence to a critical consciousness; the ability to analyse circumstance, to question existing reality, and to say no. This, however, only corresponds to the stage of independence. I am saying that this is only partial development, and that interdependence is a stage beyond (p. 22).

Kaplan's notion on the interdependence phase focusses on individual organisations in the community. His comments move from raising the critical consciousness of a society to raising the consciousness of individual organisations in the society. However, Kaplan's descriptions of development discuss 'organisational consciousness' and are included as an alternative to raising the consciousness of people in New Zealand society. It is my belief that raising the



consciousness of New Zealand society as a whole can be achieved by raising the consciousness of individual organisations and collectively create an ‘awakening’.

#### **2.4.2 Foucault: Relating Power to Development**

Notions of power influence critical consciousness. Developing consciousness raising techniques involves understanding and recognising the power relations that exist in communities and societies. Foucault’s theories on power and knowledge explore how such power is established in societies.

Michel Foucault (1926-1984) was born in Poitiers, France. In Paris he studied philosophy, psychopathology, and psychology. Fillingham (1993) acknowledges Foucault for starting the truism “knowledge is power, he took it apart, analysed it, and put it back together. He was particularly interested in knowledge of human beings, and power that acts on human beings” (p. 5).

Fillingham argues that Foucault identifies how people use knowledge to dominate, coerce, and educate other people:

When we’re talking about knowledge of human beings, the social sciences, or, as Foucault calls them, “the human sciences”, then the people deciding matters that define humanity affect people in general. If they get enough people to believe what they have decided, then that may be more important than some unknowable truth (p. 8).

This makes knowledge powerful. Knowledge may be received freely, subtly, or be forced upon a person.

While there is some controversy over the legitimate interlinkages of the work of critical theorists and the postmodernism attributed to Foucault, the ideas I am interested in developing relate to the way dominant ideas are transposed into ‘common’ beliefs and practices. In his early exploration of this concern, Foucault focussed on those who were perceived by the state as being ‘mad’ and identifies the social injustices and prejudices the state had towards the poor and mentally ill. The oppressed groups in society were punished by the state for being ill or poor

and imprisoned. “The mad became thought of as a subcategory of the unemployed. You might think that the poor were victims of an economic problem, but no, they were creators of a moral one” (p. 41).

Foucault wanted to “create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 1982a, p. 208). In historical accounts, Foucault described the state as a form of political power that ignores individuals, and shapes a certain type of citizen to reflect the normality of being human and those who did not fit this shape were punished:

Since the sixteenth century, a new political form of power has been continuously developing. This new political structure, as everyone knows, is the state. But most of the time, the state is envisioned as a kind of political power which ignores individuals, looking only at the interest of the totality, or, I should say, of a class or a group among citizens. That’s quite true. But I’d like to underline the fact that the state’s power (and that’s one of the reasons for its strength) is both an individualizing and a totalising form of power. Never, I think, in the history of human societies – even in the old Chinese society – has there been such a trick combination in the same political structures of individualization techniques, and to totalization procedures (p. 213).

Florence (1998) argued that Foucault attempted to analyse the development of psychological knowledge over history in two ways. The first was by analysing the living subject according to a form of scientific knowledge and secondly as an object. By conducting these types of analyses he was able to inform people of the difference in how one sees themselves. This argument is then used to explain the actions of governments over its citizens and why unequal classes exist in a society to which:

These power relations characterize the manner in which men [sic] are “governed” by one another; and their analysis shows how, through certain forms of “government”, of madmen, sick people, criminals, and so on, the

mad, the sick, the delinquent subject is objectified. So an analysis of this kind implies not that the abuse of this or that power has created madmen, sick people, or criminals, where there is nothing, but that the various and particular forms of “government” of individuals were determinant in the different modes of objectivation of the subject. One sees how the theme of a “history of sexuality” can fit within Michel Foucault’s general project. It is a matter in which the subject is objectified for himself and for others through certain specified procedures of “government” (p. 463).

Foucault’s work provides an interesting link to the optimism of Freire’s liberatory perspective. Both recognise the ‘social constructedness’ of social relations and identities and both believe in the possibility of change. Both understand that the source of any social reality – and therefore strategies for change are often obscure:

I deal with obscure figures and processes for two reasons: The political and social processes by which the Western European societies were put in order are not very apparent, have been forgotten, or have become habitual. .... People are universal – are the result of some precise historical changes. All my analyses are against the idea of universal necessities in human existence. They show the arbitrariness of institutions and show which space of freedom we can still enjoy and how many changes can still be made (Foucault, 1982b, 2).

Foucault believed that individuals had the ability to free themselves from oppression through thought. His role as an intellectual was to show people they were freer than they assumed. People, according to Foucault (1982b) accept what is referred to as truth. This truth is built on evidence and themes in history and can be criticized and destroyed. To change truth or the minds of people Foucault says is the “role of an intellectual” (pp. 1-2).

According to Foucault, all social relations are systems of power. Such power is not so much exercised by individuals but “dispersed through impersonal aspects of society and in particular in modes of surveillance, regulation or disciplines that adapt to people to surrounding social structures” (Blackburn, 1994, 296).

In the way the critical theorist following Hegel, and in the way implicit in the work of Freire, Foucault shares a belief in the potential of liberation from oppression. The belief in the possibility of social change and a particular role for intellectual work in the achievement of such change is linked in an urge to ‘praxis’: intellectual analysis followed by action – the action – reflection – action – cycle.

## **2.5 The Theory of Development and its Relationship to Communities**

The idea of ‘development’, according to Todaro (1997) has different meanings to different people. Thompson’s (1996) definition of development concentrates on the processes that facilitate growth or advancement. The World Bank (1992) defines development to be “improving the well-being of people” (p. 34).

The notions of growth and advancement may be used to refer to any number of development approaches in societies. Preston’s (1996) discussions on the industrial revolution during the mid-nineteenth century state that the agrarian, hierarchical and deferential societies were replaced within a new pattern of industrial, liberal and individualistic societies. From a development theory point of view Preston acknowledges Marx for his analysis of society in relation to development:

The key to the ethic of Marx can be found in the idea that humankind has become alienated from its true nature but might now overcome this condition. Human beings are taken to create themselves and their societies in and through their creative labour, and consequently a just and rational society is one that acknowledges this and is organized accordingly. A productive system that degrades human labour into mere work is a system of alienated labour (p. 65).

To overcome the conditions that have alienated humankind from its true nature, as Marx understands it would be, in part, to reconstruct society. For Marx, this would consist of changing the industrial capitalist system and abolishing the class

society. The results would produce a force that was not divided and bring humankind closer to its nature.

### **2.5.1 Describing the Characteristics of Community Development**

Community development, according to Ife (1995), is a combination of history, capitalism, industrialisation, and religion. Ife argues that “the history of industrial society, and indeed of capitalism, has been a history of the destruction of traditional community structures, whether based on the village, the extended family or the Church” (p. 14).

Shirley (1979) contends community development originated from early attempts to rebuild stagnant rural institutions. Communities that were encountering hardships such as poverty, ill health, literacy, and poor housing sought methods to change the situation. Community development is a term that was:

First applied in aid programmes to third world countries. This was in response to failures in top-down development programmes promoting things such as birth control or new farming practices. Programmes were designed to help poor communities recognise the causes of their poverty and to develop strategies for improving the situation. Instead of seeing problems in technical terms such as contraceptive technology or new seeds and fertilisers, the community development approach focussed on social relations of under-development, such as the role of moneylenders and landlords, rather than the need for miracle seeds. When adopted by industrial countries in the sixties, community development also operated primarily in low socio economic communities. Since then programmes termed community development have operated at all levels (North Shore Council, 1995, 1).

Community development refers to efforts to enhance the economic, political, and social position of the people collectively. Khinduka (1987) considers community development to enhance the locality process by bringing people together, encouraging participatory democracy, promoting local reasoning and decision-making processes. According to Jones (1995), community development could

occur in any area and at any level; when communities mobilised their resources to build the social infrastructure people realise the potential.

Giddens (1998) argues that the idea of community is fundamental to emerging politics associated with the Third Way and has a direct relationship with government. However:

‘Community’ doesn’t imply trying to recapture lost forms of local solidarity; it refers to practical means of furthering the social and material refurbishments of neighbourhoods, towns and larger areas. There are no permanent boundaries between government and civil society. Depending on context, government needs sometimes to be drawn further into the civil arena, sometimes to retreat. Where government draws from direct involvement, its resources might still be necessary to support activities that local groups take over or introduce – above all in poorer areas (pp. 79-80).

Shirley (1979), Khinduka (1987), Taylor (1992), Jones (1995), Ife (1995) and Giddens (1998) hold in common the view that community development is a process of ‘collective change’. Community development is described as motivation by the community towards developments that change the situation for the betterment of the people. This change may include restructuring the social, political, and economic position of the community in society. Such a programme of restructuring might be more creatively re-visioned as a process of revitalisation. Community revitalisation discussed by Donovan (1993) is a method for organising people in a community. It consists of ‘action strategies’ “for countering economic decline and revitalising communities – both urban neighbourhoods and rural communities” (p. 8). To this he adds that the effects or the strategies can be limited when national economies are in recession. In a social economy there are three sectors. The state or government operates in the first sector and businesses develop in the second sector. Community development is the development of the third sector of economy. It derives from economic and social difficulties facing local people and:

Many people are still involved in productive, wealth producing economic activities, but their emphasis is on co-operation, collective ownership, accountability to the community, maximising the use of local resources and skills, concern for the environment and the provision of socially desirable goods and services (p. 18).

### **2.5.2 Defining Indigenous Development**

In colonised states developing a community encompasses cultural dimensions that reflect 'indigenous development'. In the form of intent on de-colonisation as an aspect of liberation and self-determination these dimensions challenge colonial thinking and western development initiatives:

What kind of community is likely to stand the test of time? Especially for an indigenous people, development most certainly means the community must build around values and culture .... A crucial issue is that the incentives of the western based system are wrong for indigenous communities because they do not adequately reward the initiative in the context of community (Poulin & Tahi, 1991, 66).

The economic, cultural, and political disruption often associated with the devastation and alienation of colonised peoples the world over, has generated significant interest in what is termed 'indigenous development'. Associates of development processes may be driven from concerns about political instability caused by visible poverty (and the economic cost and security risk of such impoverishment) or by strong social justice or human rights drives to integrate or assimilate indigenous peoples into 'mainstream' society. Others may focus on working to generate a form of self determination. Indigenous development draws on a variety of development theories. At the assimilationist end of the spectrum the development literature has begun to add in a cultural dimension. At the more radical end 'development' is driven from a cultural foundation.

Ife (1995) argued community development in indigenous communities must comprise indigenous traditions. Development of an indigenous community requires consideration of the indigenous culture. To attempt otherwise is to:

Participate in the further oppression of indigenous people, and to reinforce structures of domination. The primary aim of community development, therefore, is to legitimate and strengthen indigenous culture, through an effective empowerment strategy which enables indigenous people to have genuine control over their own community and their own destiny. Indigenous people themselves must set the agenda for development and have complete control over processes and structures (pp. 158-159).

The Viceministry of Indigenous Affairs and First Peoples (VAIPO) state that indigenous people delivering social services need to organise and develop standards that reflect their culture in a fashion that is manageable. Building the capacity of indigenous people is a method of developing standards that reflect the culture. VAIPO (2000) argues that a focus on culturally driven development may be separated into different facets of culture: culture and economy; culture and social services; culture and policy; and interculturality (p. 1). In addition, they contend that indigenous communities cannot develop culturally unless they participate in, or control the development and management of resources and knowledge. In other words, the state cannot develop the social services of an indigenous community without involving the people at the decision-making level because:

It is necessary to promote public investment and social management capacities, ancestrally developed by the indigenous and first peoples under the sign of equality and solidarity, in standards of institutional and technological co-management with the organisations of the state to develop complete coverage, with cultural pertinence, quality of loans and integrated services to meet the needs of the indigenous communities. In the short term, this relationship operates in the priority standard of Equality and Struggle Against Poverty (p. 2).



Poulin and Tahi (1991), Ife (1995), and VAIPO (2000) argue indigenous development is indigenous people using their own knowledge and culture to develop their community. Indigenous development is not the development of Western ideas or theories from an outside culture. Instead, indigenous development involves 1) understanding the 'alienation' of an indigenous people to their resources and culture as a result of colonisation; 2) creating methods to implement 'self driven' cultural initiatives; 3) empowering the local communities that have been colonised.

### **2.5.3 Capacity Building in Communities**

Jones (1995), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1997), Rivera and Erlich (1998), and Nabalarua (2001) relate capacity building to community development. Capacity building involves a process of identifying community resources and implementing initiatives to build on to the existing resources so that the community capacity is strengthened. According to Jones (1995):

The capacity of a community for collective action is affected by the character of the people and their interactions with one another. It is important to understand the social infrastructure, the elements that contribute to it, the diversity of leadership, and to understand the collective will of local communities to provide for their social and economic well-being (p. 33).

The UNDP (1997) takes the view that capacity building is a method of achieving social objectives.

Capacity building for indigenous communities is a strategy for constructing standards that are consistent with their culture. This strategy must be developed from the 'bottom upwards'. It consists of concepts such as community empowerment initiatives, controlling resource development, identifying community assets, and collective participation. "Capacity focussed development calls for initial activity that creates a map of community assets which includes the gifts of individuals, citizens' associations, and local institutions" (Rivera & Erlich, 1998, 67).

Capacity building described by Nabalarua (2001) is a combination of community driven initiatives, strengthening human capacities, and good governance. Communities that apply capacity building techniques must construct adequate systems of governance and:

Need to be adequately contextualised if they are to be meaningful and relevant to people's lives. That contextualisation needs to emphasise participation, accountability, transparency, efficiency, equity and responsiveness. It also needs to emphasise the importance of the ideals of upholding the rule of law and promoting human rights. All of these have implications for methodology, particularly in the context of an indigenous community and rural subsistence economy that is undergoing rapid change (p. 64).

Nabalarua argues that, in the context of capacity building within, by and for indigenous communities, entails an obligation to contribute to the quality of life for community members. Enhancing the quality of life for community members of the same ethnic origin according to her is 'ingrained in the social psyche' so long as the services delivered to the community are maintained within a holistic framework. Nabalarua's discussions on voluntarism suggest communities' approaches to this type of work need to change. She argues that good management in non-government organisations should replace 'ad hoc work culture'. It would consist of implementing programmes that deliver quality services, time management and personnel skills, accountability and financial prudence with effective and responsible leadership.

The first step to such community development, however, is the identification of resources that are available to build the capacity of a community to enhance their well-being. Identifying resources with which to enhance well-being is to perform a 'Capacity Assessment'. Loomis (1998) considers capacity assessment to be "the process of identifying the strengths and weaknesses that exist in the capacity of

organisations, sectors, countries and communities to perform the functions necessary to achieve the desired outcomes” (p. 1).

Ife (1995, 210) suggests that educating the community on basic development initiatives is important. To him, community development is an ongoing process of education and learning. The community worker advances their learning by consciousness raising, informing, confronting, and training. Consciousness raising processes are a way to strengthen people in the community. Raising consciousness consists of linking the personal to the political or:

The individual and the structural. It aims to help people locate their own problems, dreams, aspirations, sufferings and disappointments within a broader social and political perspective. The conventional splitting of the personal and the political is a major cause of disempowerment, leads to ‘blaming the victim’, and reinforces dominant structures of oppression and disadvantage. In order for people to take effective action to overcome structural disadvantage they need to make that connection, and this is the first aim of consciousness raising (p. 210).

In the next section of this chapter, I argue that in Aotearoa/NZ economic and cultural hegemony combined with the processes of colonisation leave the majority of Māori people alienated from their culture and livelihood. Community development through capacity building is now being promoted both by the [neo – colonising] state and Māori seeking an authentic form of self determination. I will integrate my introductory use of the work of critical theorists in combination with a critical review of the specific (historical and material) conditions of the colonisation of Māori – from which to assess the potential of community development and capacity building through the voluntary commitment for the enhancement of Māori well-being.

## **2.6 The Arrival of Māori and European Contact**

This section describes events and experiences that have occurred in New Zealand since the 1800s. In 1835, under the Declaration of Independence, Māori in New Zealand were recognised as a sovereign nation. This declaration set in place the

possibility of Treaty making between sovereign nations. In 1840, many chiefs representing Māori *iwi* (tribes) signed a Treaty with the Crown of England to set the conditions for ongoing governance. The section begins with discussing the Treaty of Waitangi as the foundation document to establish that at a time in history Māori and the Crown shared power and agreed that the society in New Zealand would be bicultural.

### **2.6.1 The Treaty of Waitangi**

Nearly two hundred years ago international trading and immigration brought different cultures to New Zealand. The European population at that time was on the rise and New Zealand was seen to provide, especially England, a free market that was unregulated by law (Walker, 1990, 89). The rising European population entailed both pressure to sell land as well as a group of disruptive and violent men who worked in areas such as forestry. This, together with pressure from the Frenchman, Baron De Thierry, that he was intending to be the first king in Aotearoa/NZ, provoked Māori tribes to strategise for the future of the land. A number of Māori chiefs agreed to enter a treaty agreement with the British.

Britain appointed Captain William Hobson on instructions from the Marquis of Normandy who held office as Colonial Governor, in conjunction with Busby and Freeman, who was Hobson's secretary, to draft a treaty to be named the Treaty of Waitangi. The task was then given to Reverend Henry Williams and his son Edward to translate the English draft into Māori. In 1840 it was delivered to Māori. According to more recent interpreters of history the Treaty of Waitangi was not assembled with the assistance of Māori but was rather a British fabrication. The original Treaty of Waitangi was written in English and translated to Māori, Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The English version contains three articles and the Māori version has three articles and a codicil (Project Waitangi, 1989).

In the next section I outline the differences of interpretation among the two main versions of the treaty, as these differences now contribute to a significant level of disagreement in both Māori and non-Māori communities about what might be considered Māori and non-Māori entitlement and responsibility under the treaty. These differences also influence individual or organisation interaction with the

State, recent pressure to meet their obligation to govern in part through the service of delivery to Māori through Māori voluntary work.

#### **2.6.1.1 The Controversy – Article I**

In the English version, Article I states that Māori give up or surrender sovereignty to the Queen. It allowed the Queen to reign over Māori people and implied that Māori chiefs relinquished authority and prestige to her.

In the Māori text the word '*kawanatanga*' is used to describe the proposed part that the Crown would be allocated in the governance of Aotearoa/NZ. Orange (1987, 40) says, *kawanatanga* did not convey a precise definition of sovereignty and in a Māori view did not pose a threat to their control over New Zealand or transfer authority from Māori to Britain, and therefore a governance role appears to be implied in this wording. Māori chiefs perceived this Article to allow the British Government to set up Governorship. The Māori equivalent to the English word sovereignty would be *mana* or *rangatiratanga* but these words were not used in this article. They do, however, appear in Article II.

#### **2.6.1.2 The Controversy-Article II**

The English version in Article II discusses Māori resources. The Crown confirmed full exclusive and undisturbed possession of the lands, forest, fisheries and other properties they may individually or collectively possess to Māori (Project Waitangi, 1989, 31). In the Māori text the Queen guaranteed Māori '*tino rangatiratanga*' of their lands, homes, and *tāonga*. *Te Tino Rangatiratanga* means ultimate authority and complete power or right to enforce obedience concerning status and prestige pertaining to Māori all that Māori value. The English text uses the word 'property' but the Māori text used the term '*tāonga*'. *Tāonga* refers to Māori possessions or anything that was highly prized. Thus, the English text does not reflect the conflated understanding of the tangible with the intangible, a characteristic of Māori holism. This Article also confined and restricted the sale of Māori land to the Crown. The word 'exclusiveness' was used in the English text; the Māori text used '*hokonga*'. *Hokonga* meant exchange, barter, buy, and sell, and was interpreted by the chiefs that the first

option was given to the Crown and failure to make a sale meant they could then seek alternative buyers.

### **2.6.1.3 The Controversy – Article III & Codicil**

The third Article confirmed Māori the same rights and privileges as British citizens and a form of dual citizenship. Māori were entitled to their own economic and political identity while also being entitled to those rights being shaped for non-Māori settlers.

A codicil is only in the Māori version. It was recorded by Bishop Pompallier (a Catholic) and William Colenso (an Anglican missionary). Significantly, this Article was read out to the Māori chiefs before they signed the Treaty of Waitangi although it was excluded from the English text. It guaranteed the protection of Māori customs and Māori chiefs refused to sign without this assurance. While for many Māori the signing of the Treaty was a hopeful and powerful moment in signifying joint (or partnership) in the management or governance of New Zealand, others argue that the Treaty ended Māori political independence:

Māori people have long seen the Treaty as a charter for power-sharing in the decision-making processes of this country, for Māori determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand, and as a guide to the future development of New Zealand. Initially, post-Treaty government policy in New Zealand was totally opposed to these aspirations; it has only recently attempted to come to terms with Māori and non-Māori aspirations for equity and social justice through self-determination (Bishop & Glynn, 1999a, 14).

The disagreements about a valid interpretation now colour all aspects of community development and capacity building. Where the prevailing interpretation gives the Crown sovereignty, commands for compliance to Crown demands (for policies, processes, and accountabilities) do not go unchallenged. Where *te tino rangatiratanga* informs a community organisation, a quite different relationship with the Crown is asserted. How these differences translate into capacity building of individuals and groups will be discussed later in this chapter.

In the next section I review the work of those authors and researchers who view the history of colonisation in New Zealand as one in which Māori have been denied. Both their *tino rangatiratanga* as well as access to equal social and economic outcomes, as guaranteed in the articles of the Treaty with non-Māori, have been systematically denied – throwing into question their access to equal rights guaranteed in article three of the Treaty.

## 2.7 Critical Theory Applied to the Colonisation in Aotearoa/NZ

From being direct descendants of sky and earth parents, Christianity positioned some of us as higher order savages who deserved salvation in order that we could become children of God (L. Smith, 1999, 33).

The above reference from L. Smith highlights three important things. The first is that Māori people believed they were descendants from godly parents. The second is the Christian belief that Māori were savages and needed saving by God. The third is the eventual dominance of the Christian belief in the superiority of their god as generator of life and the need to eliminate, through the process of conversion Māori spirituality. This was achieved by the elimination of the *tohunga* and the domination of Christian beliefs and processes in Church education and State effectively contradicting both the concepts of *tāonga* in Article two of the Treaty and the notions *tino rangatiratanga* encapsulated in the codicil of the Māori version.

My interpretation of the colonisation of Māori in New Zealand builds on the critique by critical theorists of ‘position power’ – in this case, European over Māori. Critical Theory draws attention to Western ideas that perpetuate dominance over subaltern. A subaltern is a person of inferior rank or position. Dominance and power over subalterns are strong themes emanating from the literature by Bishop (1997; 1998b) and Smith (1999). In this interpretation of history the state (New Zealand Government) represented the dominant group and Māori the subaltern. Orange (1987), Smith (1997), Bishop (1997), L. Smith (1999) and Bishop and Glynn (1999a; 1999b) describe in literature how the Crown used force, coercion, and education to dominate the Māori people.

L. Smith (1999) stated “under colonialism indigenous peoples have struggled against a Western world view of history and yet been complicit with that view” (p. 33). Smith argued in her discussions that Western research was a dehumanising process inflicted on the Māori people and produced incorrect stories about them to fulfil Western desires. Smith connected colonisation to the formation of Māori people occupying the lower socio-economic groups of New Zealand society, below European. Smith’s critical analysis of research methods showed history from an indigenous perspective highlighting that the way Māori people think and act today are a direct result of being overpowered and dominated for more than two centuries.

L. Smith (1999) used critical theory to deconstruct colonial structures and argued that the European interpretation of Māori knowledge was an unjust representation of their aspirations and commitment. Loomis (2000a) purports that the actions of a State cause the traditional knowledge of an indigenous culture to change, and therefore:

Indigenous peoples are encouraged to accede to standard notions and techniques of “development”. The effect is the further commodification of their people, resources and culture in the service of expanding global capital. In many countries the specific aim is to transform indigenous peoples into modern, productive, law-abiding citizens in the state-controlled education system. Indigenous peoples’ plight is blamed on their own ignorance and backwardness. Thus they would do well to turn from their traditional culture and economic practices, and embrace ‘modern’ knowledge and skills. In support of this ‘up-skilling’ process, states often impose ideological definitions of good [loyal] citizenship, particularly in regard to religious practice and culture. Indigenous peoples are considered as aliens or second-class citizens unless they convert to the officially recognised religion, and adopt majority cultural values and traits. They are typified as traditionalist, backward, uncivilised and disloyal, in contrast to the progressive society and ‘modern’ state surrounding them (pp. 17-18).



Pihama (1993) states “*kaupapa* Māori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist within society” (p. 57). To this Pihama links domination of European groups to the oppression of Māori by further stating that “the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of ‘common sense’ and ‘facts’ to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Māori people” (p. 57).

A *Kaupapa* Māori approach according to Smith (1992) addresses the philosophy and practice of ‘being Māori’:

In this respect, ‘being Māori’ has a valid and legitimate social, political, historical, philosophical, intellectual and cultural authenticity. Within the New Zealand context this has not always been the case given the colonising and assimilatory history of a dominant Pakeha (non-Māori) population, which has operated within a societal context of unequal power relations (p. 1).

In other words, and paraphrasing Smith, critical theory is used to uncover social, political, historical, philosophical, intellectual and cultural injustices encountered by Māori people.

Steven (1989) states that colonisation was a tool to extract labour and, more importantly, describes how the colonist wanted to rid New Zealand of Māori people. To a greater extent he argued that New Zealand could produce wealth for the bourgeois in Europe:

Unlike cheap-labour of extractive colonies, where what is wanted from the indigenous people is primarily their labour, the settler colonists of Aotearoa wanted only one thing from the Māori people: their disappearance altogether, so that their land could be taken and converted into a source of bourgeois wealth which could provide even wage labourers with a standard of living unknown to that class elsewhere in the world. Since workers would be imported and any potential trouble they

might cause averted by means of high wages, which would give them a stake in the system, the settler society created pressures towards the ‘final solution’ of the Māori people, who were themselves not needed for anything whatsoever (Steven, 1989, 29).

Spoonley (1996) argued that the history of the labour market in New Zealand stems from colonisation which developed a working class of Māori and unskilled migrants. He stated that, “the question as to what are the most important influences in producing Māori disadvantage in the labour market is an important one” (p. 57). His answers are found in the history of labour market trends since colonisation; the nature and:

Structures of the labour market which produce such divisions have been largely confined to the skills that a particular group might or might not have in the context of a specific set of labour market trends or requirements. ... An important need in the post-war environment was the recruitment of semi and unskilled migrants to fulfil the labour needs of an expanding industrial sector, included within the New Zealand economy (p. 57).

What our families experienced as pressure to leave our farms, and what historians and policy makers call the ‘urban drift’, Spoonley identifies as strategies by which ethnic groups were targeted as wage labourers. Māori and Pacific Islanders were incorporated into urban-centres and models of labour structures. Jobs allocated to them were predominantly manual labour, thus:

Māori and Tangata Pasefika became incorporated into the urban-industrialised centres of capitalist production as wage-labourers. Their resulting location in terms of employment and residence within the working class, but they were not simply labour; they arrived in these urban centres as an integral part of a pre-existing set of colonial relations. These relations were based upon certain ideological constructions (typically of these migrants as coming from ‘primitive’ or ‘backward’ communities)

and they encountered and contributed to the development of a particular set of relations in their new location (p. 57).

As argued in page 23 of this thesis, the theorists from the Frankfurt School confined their theorising to describe a Western society and failed to broaden their scope to theorise an Eastern, Southern, or Northern society. More importantly, these theorists did not explore critical theory in relation to indigenous societies. Indigenous writers such as Smith (1992), Pihama (1993), Bishop (1997; 1998a; 1998b), Smith (1997), Smith (1999), and Bishop and Glynn (1999a) incorporate critical theory and a decolonisation approach to their critique and address the social, political, and economic conditions of Māori in contemporary Aotearoa/NZ. Steven's (1989) and Spoonley's (1996) analyses of the labour economy in early New Zealand history show that government policies rather than Māori choices generated what is referred to as 'urban drift' which succeeded in the assimilation of rural Māori into a low paid, low skilled industrial labour force.

## **2.8 Māori Hegemony**

L. Smith (1999) and Bishop and Glynn (1999a) agreed that colonisation was a destructive force geared toward dismantling Māori society and creating subordinate people. While the economic and political policies were strongly instrumental in the generation of an urban lower working class of Māori people, such a social construction could not have been so readily achievable without winning the consent of Māori to fulfil this place in society. Bishop and Glynn introduce the concept of 'hegemony domination' as a method used to ensure that a Western culture became the values and ideas in Māori society. Consequently Māori values and ideas were marginalized and in some areas eradicated like many Māori people/families, just as occurred in ours as described in my introduction (page 3). Bishop (1998b) contends:

To understand these patterns I developed a draft using the Gramscian concept of hegemony (Bishop, 1991b) to explain how the persuasiveness of ideas could enable colonization of the mind to occur. This approach sought to explain why the majority of the 14 siblings of my grandfather chose to raise their children in the culture of their father, that is as Pakeha,

and not in the culture of their mother, that is as Māori. Further, this concept of hegemony was used to explain why the information about our ancestry was suppressed and knowledge of our Māori heritage was not passed on (p. 420).

While the majority of Māori were being channelled into low skill low paid jobs, an elite group of Māori found their way to university education, but this education was to provide a domesticating element identified by Walker (1996). He identifies Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck, and Maui Pomare as the first Māori graduates in an European university who were intellectual by profession. “Freire warns that educated men from subordinate strata are determined from above by a culture of domination, which constitutes them as dual beings” (p. 80). It was necessary that they became dual beings and contribute to the *reorganisation* of a new society. He contends that Ngata, Buck, and Pomare were reclaimed by their people and essentially “reformists who worked for the physical and cultural survival of their people” (p. 80). Their educational achievements pleased Pakeha because:

The ruling class accepted these intellectuals as deputies, to exercise what Gramsci has termed subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government. As long as they performed the function, their positions were secure. They were not pursuing Māori sovereignty to the Crown as a *fait accompli* under the Treaty of Waitangi (p. 80).

Walker (1996), Bishop (1998b), Bishop and Glynn (1999a), and L. Smith (1999) describe how hegemonic processes of colonisation positioned Western knowledge as superior. Through a process of force, coercion, and education conducted by the state, Māori were positioned in the lower socio-economic groups of society. By conceding to the ruling class and pleasing Pakeha they were led to believe that their status in society could be raised. Essentially this ‘promise’ has not changed. The outcomes of their investment in this belief as told in contemporary statistical records belie this promise. It is in the unmasking or demystifying of this promise that this thesis takes an interest.

Despite the powerful contribution of the concepts generated from the schools of critical thought hegemonic influences are rarely ‘total’. While the concept of hegemony has been a powerful device to focus on Māori compliance with their oppression, pervasive focus on Māori through this lens distracts attention from the analytical energy and resistance from Māori that has an enduring history from the point of formalised relations with the settlers. Loomis (2001) argued that the extension of state hegemony over indigenous people does not imply that indigenous people do not think or are totally subservient. He says with “indigenous people the processes of relocation, annihilation, or assimilation have not been complete and indigenous people have found ways to resist. This resistance has withstood the encouragement by states to consent to the standard notions and techniques of western development” (p. 17). It is in the incompleteness of hegemonic influence that the needs of resistance, empowerment and liberation may be nurtured. I have chosen to use the work of Paulo Freire to examine how this work has been undertaken in Aotearoa/NZ, and what potential this work has for the liberation of contemporary Māori.

## **2.9 Māori and Oppression**

In 1974 Freire visited New Zealand and held a conference based on the theme ‘a pedagogy of liberation’:

Some Māori began saying ... ‘no use having a Christian concept of being free’ when the reality was that Māori were not free to practise their own form of Christianity of power. .... If Māori were to seriously consider a move towards liberation and decolonisation – the common themes in Freire’s struggle for the oppressed groups throughout the world – then they would need to develop a critical perception of their true position. Prior to Freire, Māori analyses of their situation rested mostly with conservative, Western and particularly Christian forms of interpretation (Jenkins and Martin, 2001, 49).

Freire’s visit to New Zealand accelerated Māori Christian leaders’ questioning of the pedagogy of Western religious doctrine. Māori realised that the Māori knowledge of religion was omitted from religious teachings and began to

challenge the current practices that passed on religious knowledge. Those who were unhappy with the circumstances as they saw them resisted from perpetuating this limited form of knowledge by leaving the Churches that governed them and changing their practices to teach a faith that incorporated a Māori perspective.

Freire's visit to New Zealand and his concepts of 'consciousness raising' and 'pedagogy of the oppressed' touched various aspects of Māori society. Subsequently, collective action has taken on a new form in the modern Māori communities. Within some modern Māori communities arose new approaches to development. G. Smith (1999) and Finsen (1999) in education, Boler (1999) in feminism, and Peter's (1999) postmodernism have taken up Freire's work in their research.

Ife (1995) argues that:

Community development must incorporate strategies of consciousness raising and of ensuring the voices of the oppressed are heard, acknowledged and valued. A particularly important component of the wisdom of the oppressed is the wisdom of indigenous people. Indigenous people, such as the Aboriginal people of Australia, the Māori of Aotearoa and the First Nations people of North America have shown how it is possible to live in harmony with the natural environment .... they are an important source of wisdom not just because of their status as some of the most oppressed people within Western societies, but also because their values, social structures and cultural traditions clearly point the way to alternatives from which mainstream Western society has much to learn (p. 96).

Building on the work of critical theorists and especially the work of Paulo Freire, this thesis takes the view that Māori can change the oppressive environments they work in and challenge the stereotype that they are an underclass. This view is broadened to argue that Māori must have improved social and economic status, and be recognised as valued bearers of ideas and ideals that may bring us to a more just society. A way to alter the situation is through dialogue, education,

theory, and practice that will inform a more critical and liberatory development ethos. In the next section I identify just a few strands of Māori consciousness that might enhance contemporary ideas of ‘development’.

## 2.10 Māori Development

A number of scholars have been at work retrieving and inscribing Māori history and aspects of Māori ontology into the record books. It is now more common to hear or read that Māori communities in traditional times represented a structure that was kinship based. Each person was linked to the kin by *whakapapa* and collectively it formed the basis of Māori kinship. Rules and regulations were adopted on a consensus basis and enforced by the *hapū* members. The Māori social system consisted of three main social organisations: *whānau*; *hapū*; and *iwi*. *Whānau* was the basic social unit whose fundamental job was to produce food, hold residence on land, and administer the daily chores in the home. The *hapū* were kinship groups in a tribe and the *iwi*, the tribe, was a nation of people (Williams, 1992, 36-80). The *hapū* operated the larger cultivating, fishing, and canoe making activities. The *iwi* took care of the political affairs between *hapū* and with other *iwi* (Henare, 1997, 5-35). Any social problems in the community were a collective responsibility. Individualism was never welcomed because the society was structured on kinship, what theorists would term in a contemporary society, the values of socialism and democracy. Providing incentives that catered for the welfare of all members was a necessity since strength of unity was required to win battles against foes, feed the people, and sustain the needs of a community. Patterson’s (2000) discussions on individualism compared the *mana* of the individual with the *mana* of the community to which the individual belonged. “In particular those who have been brought up as individualists might see *mana* as basically an individual matter, and might therefore conceive the *mana* of a community as sort of sum of the *mana* of all of its members” (p. 102). Patterson argues that:

When we start from an individualistic viewpoint we tend to see a community as a mere collection of individuals, but in Māori terms that is a mistake. Māori sometimes seem even to go to the opposite extreme: rather than taking the view that the individuals in a community make it what it is,

they sometimes seem to take the view that it is the community to which one belongs that makes an individual what he or she is (p. 102).

While recent illustrations of Te Ao Māori may be somewhat romanticised, they carry in them the seeds of suppressed differences that may provide the fruit for a re-visioning of 'development'. However, this re-visioning is not only for Māori, but to meet the critique of those who are concerned about the competitive, individualistic, consumer driven social Darwinism. Critical theorists attributed this re-visioning to the globalisation of neo-liberalism as discussed in Chapters Four and Five of this thesis. Some of these ideas provide a basis for re-viewing the concepts of voluntary work. In the contemporary social policy directives emanating from the State in their 'Third Way' approach to social development, capacity building for cultural capital have become prominent. My intention in this thesis is to examine whether these directives will serve as an ethos of further Māori alienation through the processes of an assimilationist nature or be a vehicle of liberation for Māori people.

Voluntary work or *aroha ki te tangata, manaaki te whānau*, or one's duty to contribute to the well being of the tribe were values Māori placed on social activities performed in the kinship organisations. Levine and Henare (1994) discussed traditional developments for Māori to operate under a kinship system. Such development consisted of bringing together the social, political, and economic activity to provide a service for the members in a community. Service implied a social obligation that came with no monetary value but rather encouraged reciprocity by way of bartering or communal satisfaction. In this type of society the services delivered by a kinship system are not considered voluntary or philanthropic, rather, they are intrinsic requirements of social life.

Spellerberg's (2001) discussions on Māori and social capital describe the relationship between common ancestry and social obligation. She makes a connection between social capital and cultural capital as developments that operate in Māori communities and highlights the:



Difficulties faced by Māori moving into or using European structures include the formality and rules of the bureaucracy and the systems that have to be understood and mobilised for use by Māori. ... For example, it may be difficult to take part in an informal activity where there is no organisation to join, no membership fee and no clear gateway – where membership is based on an exchange of obligations and acceptance by the group. The ‘conditions for joining’ may be verbal, implicit and obligation driven rather than rule driven, specified and written down as usual in European society. The concept of ‘obligation-driven’ membership includes obligations based on a common ancestry – the *whānau whanui* motive, and the cultural dimension that obliges one to act in certain ways that give rise to the development of social capital (p. 13).

### **2.10.1 Developing Māori Communities with Sovereignty**

The notion of sovereignty when combined with a liberatory form of development becomes a strong force of indigenous motivation because:

Sovereignty and development are the defining concepts for understanding the status and structural position of indigenous peoples. In almost every instance they have been encompassed within the boundaries of a hegemonic state and progressively incorporated into the capitalist world economy. They are quite literally ‘nations within,’ although the factors may not exist which lead an indigenous population to identify a set of common interests and organise to act collectively as a ‘nation’ (Loomis, 2000a, 22).

Tamihere (1995) considered sovereignty to encompass self-esteem and confidence. It involves standing up to authority and taking responsibility for one’s own future. According to Tamihere, this meant “stop training for ‘the man’ and stop asking ‘the man’ what to do. That’s sovereignty. We’ve got to maximise our assets right now – in case the Asians, the Pacific Islanders and the Pakeha take over completely” (p. 113).

Parata (1995) relates sovereignty to *iwi*. Sovereignty from an *iwi* perspective is *iwi* making decisions for their tribe. Parata separates decision-making that involves individuals or government and implies that while in the overall national framework they have a place in accordance with Article I of the Treaty of Waitangi, it is the tribe that should make decisions over Māori and endorses cultural sovereignty and political sovereignty as a method to retain Māori culture. Thus:

Cultural sovereignty is ownership and control of those characteristics which reflect your culture and keep it alive – like language, value systems and institutions such as the *marae* and the *whānau*. ... A confederation of *iwi* could stand their own representatives in a senatorial election campaign on behalf of their *iwi*. The senate would have tribal representation, not Māori representation (p. 39).

Parata (1996) argues for a concept of shared sovereignty between *iwi* and *hapū*, and the government. The government would fulfil the role as Treaty partner for the Crown whereas *iwi* and *hapū* were identified as representing *tangata whenua*. The other beneficial parties to the Treaty according to Parata were the New Zealand citizens, for example, other Māori and non-Māori.

Cheyne et al. (2000) attribute the term ‘Māori activism’ to describe Māori people who pursue Treaty grievances. They say that over the past thirty years activists have demanded Māori sovereignty and “control over their own destiny, and responsibility for delivery and provision of services in all areas, including social services. Underlying these demands, are two important components of relevance to discussion of the development of the social services” (p. 193).

Māori sovereignty in a Māori voluntary organisation consists of the two important components raised by Cheyne et al. (2000). The first is control over their destiny meaning the organisation would take the lead in determining the type of service they would deliver instead of continuing to modify practices as a response to government directives. The second would be to implement culturally appropriate

services as determined by the organisation rather than seeking government approval as to whether it meets mainstream social service standards.

Mikaere (2000) attributes the *kōhanga reo* and *kura kaupapa* as initiatives that represent the best examples of Māori self determination. She says the recent Treaty of Waitangi settlements showed Māori at their worst:

It is apparent that we are slotting ourselves into a Western model of “development” we are forgetting to look to our own cultural roots for answers. Our only concern seems to be whether we can generate a profit. What is more, in our efforts to “succeed” in Western terms, we are in danger of completely forgetting about the *tino rangatiratanga* guaranteed to us in the Treaty of Waitangi. At the very least, the Treaty was about the sharing of political power in Aotearoa, not simply striving for commercial success within a Crown-driven agenda. .... Māori have survived the onslaught of colonisation, the tenacity of our ancestors leaving us now poised to take up the challenge and regaining the self-determination that we once had (p. 22).

While Mikaere cautions Māori to review the way they are engaging in the emerging Treaty settlement procedures, Durie (2001) argues that when the Treaty of Waitangi is acknowledged and implemented in New Zealand laws it adds value to social, political, and economic policies. Similar to other indigenous people Māori people, according to him, place importance on greater autonomy and self-determination. *Tino rangatiratanga* is described as a concept that can be interpreted in different ways:

Ranging from total independence and a separate nation state to simply a greater say in decision making at national and local levels, there is a measure of agreement that at the very least self-determination is about the right of Māori people to exercise authority in the development and control of resources that they are supposed to own, and to interact with the Crown according to their own needs and inclination. Second, and to an increasing extent, self-determination has come to mean the right of Māori,

collectively and at a national level, to determine their own policies, to actively participate in the development and interpretation of the law, to assume responsibility for their own affairs and to plan for the needs of future generations. Self-determination is about taking control of those resources and activities that impact on Māori lives – the management of land, the delivery of services, the generation of wealth, and the development of human capital – and doing so in a way that strengthens personal and collective identity (p. 256).

While attempting to devise a Māori driven theory of development, this is unlikely to succeed unless a significant sense of participation is generated in non-Māori. Kelsey’s (1990) discussion on sovereignty and the Crown identifies how European structures were used to oppress Māori. To this she introduces the argument that success in sovereignty requires support from Pakeha:

The ‘purists’ argued Māori could never effectively exercise their *rangatiratanga* by depending on the benevolence of the Crown, whether through government or the courts. Structures whose legitimacy depends on the oppression of others do not simply hand over power. As time went by it became clear that in Māori terms the purists were indeed the realists, and that the quest for *tinu rangatiratanga* will ultimately give rise to a new form of resistance. The response of the state will be no different from any other time since 1840 unless it can be forced to address the central issue of economic and political power. In large part the success of such resistance will depend on whether Pakeha can be convinced that the successful reassertion of *te tinu rangatiratanga o te iwi Māori* over Aotearoa is in their interests, too (p. 270).

### **2.10.2 Developing the Social Conditions in Māori Communities**

Poulin and Tahi’s (1991) discussions of developing the social conditions in Māori communities described in section 2.5.2 of this thesis involve operating in a market that has a range of problems: information, external, and internal. They contend “unless basic standards are achieved which can sustain and nourish a community,

the inequitable but likely result will be long-term failure, or at best underachievement” (p. 13). However, the issues raised by Poulin and Tahī, on basic economic survival – either as an integrated economy or separate economy raises challenges for Māori. The concepts of critical theorists and the challenges generated by debates about greater integration or the drive towards independent sovereignty provide a lens through which to examine rhetoric of capacity building.

Spellberg (2001) contends changing Māori social conditions involved developing the Māori cultural capital and Māori social capital in communities. Spellberg states “as with cultural capital, which consists of the values, history, traditions and behaviours that link a group of people together, Māori social capital is drawn upon and used to defend, preserve and expand existing *hapū/iwi* communities” (p. 13). Emphasis is placed on preserving the language and culture and:

May contrast with current Western European understanding of social capital, which builds on concepts of modernisation developed by Max Weber, Karl Marx, Jürgen Habermas and others. Western or modern (post-reformation) social capital is often used to move out of traditional networks in order to expand, build and “conquer” or “colonise” the wider world (p. 13).

### **2.10.3 The State, Capacity Building, and Māori Sovereignty**

In the year 2000 the Labour government launched a capacity building programme for Māori to support their need to close the gaps of disparity between Māori and non-Māori. It was the role of Te Puni Kōkiri (Ministry of Māori Development) to deliver a capacity building program for Māori that would build a partnership between the state and *whānau, hapū, iwi*, Māori organisations and communities. Funding of \$243 million was set aside by government to deliver a Closing the Gaps programme. From this amount \$113 million was targeted to fund capacity building for projects initiated by Māori and Pacific peoples. To deliver the capacity building programme to Māori \$3.2 million was allocated for capacity assessment and \$6 million towards development, implementation and evaluation plans. Capacity building, according to Te Puni Kōkiri (2000) was about:

1. Strengthening the ability of *whānau*, *hapū*, *iwi*, Māori organisations, and Māori communities to control their own development and achieve their own outcomes,
2. Empowering and enabling Māori to develop their own solutions to problems,
3. Accessing practical support needed to get grassroots initiatives underway,
4. Partnership that involves a range of agencies and sharing resources to assist *whānau*, *hapū*, *iwi*, Māori organisations, and Māori communities to develop their own flexible and innovation solutions to achieve aspirations,
5. A Government's Closing the Gaps strategy and an attempt to drive initiatives from the bottom up where Māori communities respond to their own needs and preferences (p. 1).

Māori communities and organisations were given the opportunity to apply for assistance that would help them build their capacities. Te Puni Kōkiri on receipt of successful applications allocated money; it was the duty of Te Puni Kōkiri to approve funding.

Loomis's (2000b) discussion on capacity building warns indigenous people to be careful. He says there are problems in countries that increased priority on capacity building and technical assistance. He argues that in every country except Canada, capacity building seems to have been captured or subverted to apply to improving the capabilities of business and service providers, rather than first nations governments. An industry emerges with experts with standard (and often inappropriate) models which are costly and usually counterproductive. There has been little knowledge or commitment to enabling tribal organisations and communities to engage in their own process of capacity assessment and capacity building (p. 10).

He adds that the Closing the Gap programme administered by the government focussed on improving government services for better state intervention and targeting Māori provider groups to provide the government intentions. He argues:

Closing the gap ignores indigenous self-governance in favour of more accountable and sophisticated mainstream services, subcontracting and benchmarking of indigenous provider groups. To escape the dilemma, a fundamental shift in Crown thinking is needed that not surprisingly is embodied in the Treaty itself. A shift from viewing Māori as a client population (just one ethnic group) to Māori as indigenous nations and partners under the Treaty. That is, from government trying to lift a disadvantaged sector of the population to a “nation building” approach. Māori self-determined development can only be accomplished by Māori through Māori (p. 10).

Further research in the effectiveness of capacity building from a variety of Māori perspectives driven by the grass roots would provide the necessary knowledge to build on and amend any capacity building programme initiated by government or the community. It would identify the capacities for Māori organisations that deliver voluntary social services and provide strategies to strengthen the Māori voluntary sector of society:

In building the capacity of Māori communities to engage in local and regional economic and social development programmes, attention needs to be given to customary forms of association and organisation. Economic development may grow more effectively from building on the existing capacity of a community to associate and act collectively based on *whānau*, *hapū* and *iwi* connections (Robinson and Williams, 2001, 70).

However, the divide remains between those who believe such capacity building should be directed towards greater integration of Māori within New Zealand or whether such capacity building should begin with the building of capacity needed for sovereignty.

## **2.11 Implications of Mainstream Debates on this Study – A Summary**

In this chapter I have drawn on concepts of hegemony and oppression taken from critical theories to provide a theoretical framework to examine Māori occupation of lower socio-economic positions in communities. The work of critical theorists

allowed me to identify processes by which Māori people have accepted lower positions in both paid and unpaid work in order to develop a critical approach to emerging theories of development. The weakness in this theory was that it reflected a European experience. I drew a link between these theoretical traditions and the way in which a number of critical Māori scholars are building on this work to engage with the risks and challenges for Māori development in the contemporary context in which ‘capacity building’ and ‘social capital’ are predominating metaphors.

Building on the work of critical theorists and Māori scholars such as Walker (1990; 1996), and Bishop (1997; 1998a; 1998b) colonisation produced low paid and unpaid Māori workers. Applying the concept of hegemony to a Māori experience I have suggested that Māori were conditioned into believing that being lowly paid, unpaid, and poor was normal for them. Living in oppressive communities was common for Māori. Government and New Zealand society encouraged this perception of normality as justification for Māori poverty. Writers such as Foucault and other post-structuralists and social constructionists challenge the apparent structural solidity of such a belief. It is for this reason I turned to the work of Freire and his visit to Aotearoa/NZ. Through the initiation of the type of consciousness-raising he advocates, new explanations of underdevelopment and new strategies for liberation from oppression are being generated – both within affiliation to non-Māori organisations (such as the Anglican church) and through experiments with parallel development (as in the *kōhanga reo* movement).

The Development Theories provide ideas to transform oppression into liberation. Its arguments support the advancement of communities that are underdeveloped. In a Māori context development would be collective and pursue notions of ‘*tino rangatiratanga*’. The following Chapters Four and Five continue to explore the literature on Māori voluntary work as part of the pattern occurring in Aotearoa/NZ at the present time. Chapters Six, Seven, Eight, and Nine compare theories and concepts with life experiences.



### **Chapter Three: Methodology**

*“Pai tu, pai hinga, nā wai, nā oti.”*

*“Good at standing, good at falling, the work is eventually finished”*

*(Brougham, Reed, & Kāretu, 1999, 164).*

#### **3.0 Introduction**

This chapter draws together the various procedures applied in the research. It describes the method and theories used to collect data in four sections. Section one: Developing the Approach (3.1) describes the initial steps of the research. It is followed by section two: Methodology (3.2) which discusses the chosen approaches and sources of data then section three on how the data was analysed (3.3). In section four the chapter is concluded (3.4).

#### **3.1 Developing the Approach**

The approach to this research was initially stimulated by my own experience of living and working in Māori communities. My interest in the ways in which Māori participated in community well-being sparked an enthusiasm to explore a range of sources to gather an understanding of the relationship Māori have to voluntary work. Information about Māori voluntary organisations, traditional approaches to working together, and the more recent formalisation of Māori voluntary work, were sparse and difficult to locate. My perception is that research on voluntary work was often a response to a government initiative and conducted in a fashion that was driven more by policies than created from community initiatives. Research on Māori voluntary work that was independent of government or agencies that funded voluntary organisations presented an opportunity to describe the relationship between Māori and voluntary work without being pressured into providing representations stipulated by them. This thesis provided an opportunity to develop a research framework that government or funding agencies could not control. I was free to pursue the examination of the relationship between Māori and voluntary work without pressure to achieve any pre-designed research objectives.

Along with increasing assertiveness of Māori to take control over their own destiny there have been challenges asserting that research has rarely been done by and for the benefit of Māori. Emerging literature on researching in Māori communities advocates that a type of *kaupapa* Māori methodology be followed as this would address ethical and power imbalance issues that have been embedded in much previous Māori research. It is imperative that my approach to researching Māori participants would be ethical. This meant that in the fieldwork the process was to be made transparent and involved the sharing of information with an intent to enhance the well-being of those who participated. Also, when recording the knowledge and epistemology of Māori people, *kaupapa* Māori research methodologies advocate a person of Māori descent working in collaboration with participants.

### **3.1.1 Personal Reflections – Trial, Errors, & Resistance**

My first entrance into fieldwork was an exercise in learning. It was necessary to increase my personal knowledge of the community I was to work with and prepare myself for working with the people who would participate in the research. These preparations ensured that my knowledge was grounded in practical experience. It involved meeting with the people, sharing my intention to research, and modifying approaches depending on the feedback received from the people. The values necessary for these stages of fieldwork were humility, basic research skills, and writing skills. These skills proved to be essential as the research progressed.

Approaching people about conducting research on the topic of Māori voluntary work met with resistance from academics and lecturers I talked with. Choosing to research a topic on Māori voluntary work was not as popular a topic as was research into the operations of trust boards, fishing industry, *marae*, forestry, education, land, casino, water, and Waitangi tribunal claims that dominate the media. It appeared that a stigma was attached to the topic of voluntary work. It appeared to be considered as an area where Māori wasted a lot of their time. Academic peers and lecturers questioned the relevance of researching a topic on voluntary work.

Finding support for the research exposed the challenges I would encounter. There were many hurdles to cross that involved both theoretical concerns and ones of a personal nature. The first step was to gain support from the school I was enrolled in. The school considered development studies to be critical. Their work entailed comparative analysis of the definition and processes of development and sought explanations of why some populations 'lag' behind. Researching in the field of Māori voluntary work was a chance to build a bridge of knowledge between the school and Māori voluntary organisations that work in communities. In keeping with the development focus of the school there was a need to design processes that would enhance the voluntary organisations and extend the human resources to improve conditions for voluntary activity. In the school, development studies is claimed to be:

An empowering process for Māori, Pacific Islander and others who engage in it. It is the opportunity to develop the conceptual tools, critical techniques, comparative analysis, research methods and practical skills to actually be able to practice in a chosen field of development (School of Māori and Pacific Development, 1998, 2).

The initial lack of support for this topic that I experienced from academic peers and lecturers is similar to traditional Western research as a signal for what is deemed to be important; a judgement about what is and what is not valuable as research (L. Smith, 1999, 28-29). However, eventually with the support of strong community orientated supervisors the research approval was granted. When further resistance or criticism was raised during fieldwork, I found that my initial struggle for credibility and support for this project had made me more capable of dealing with these challenges.

### **3.1.2 Formalising Research Approaches**

Miles and Hubberman (1994) contend that researchers learning the techniques of social research in the initial stages do not have structures to guide them and would be wise to apply a 'loose design'. Accordingly, adopting structures and guidelines sharpened a research design so that the overall process transformed into a 'tighter design', a term used by Miles and Hubberman to describe structured research.

The research process I designed reflected Miles and Hubberman's descriptions in that, over time it was transformed from a loose to a tighter design. It began unstructured and gradually developed into a more structured piece of research.

My research approach, in a broad sense, used techniques drawn from ethnomethodology and grounded theory. I chose these theories because they promised to allow me to work with the processes I was interested to develop. In the words of Morse (1994), "the greatest trap in research is to mistake conjecture for fact by treating theory as fact and forgetting that a theory was created as nothing more than a 'best guess'" (p. 32). For me, combining these theories was my 'best guess' for the research.

An ethnomethodologist looks for processes people use to make sense of their lives by observing their interactions and institutions through which they live. "They assume that people do make sense of these phenomena and that their sense making is the basis of their future actions and interpretations" (Feldman, 1995, 4). A fundamental assumption of ethnomethodology is that people have 'ethnomethods' or 'culturally based methods' (p. 8) for making sense of their lives. Ethnomethodologists investigate the processes people use to make sense of their lives and why they behave the way they do. This approach provided an opportunity to work alongside the people in the voluntary sector I had chosen to work with – to understand with and through them, what volunteering meant to them.

Ethnomethodology seldom focuses on issues of power and dominance (p. 66). However, I was keen also to understand the expression of power and dominance, and that my interest in critical theory was generated. Lengthy engagement is a common practice of ethnomethodology. I did not spend years studying Māori people and their relationship to voluntary work, therefore, the approach was not solely an ethnomethod. In a brief encounter with voluntary organisations, the research explored voluntary activity and environment where Māori volunteers worked and the relationship between the organisations they worked for, the local community, and the clients for whom they provided a social service. However, bearing in mind the critique emanating from post – colonial scholars and critical

theories I also sought ways to work with Māori participants to contribute to an ethic of liberation.

Morse (1994) argued that:

The assumptions of symbolic interaction that underlie grounded theory set the stage for the examining process, for identifying stages and phases in the participants' experience. Symbolic interaction purports that meaning is socially constructed, negotiated, and changes over time. Therefore the interview process seeks to elicit a participant's story, and this story is told sequentially as the events being reported unfolded. Comprehension is reached when the researcher has interviewed enough participants to gain in-depth understanding (p. 39).

Since, the essence of my research was to record the stories of participants, in a fashion centred on 'culturally based methods' (ethnomethodology), by interviewing participants to 'gain in-depth understanding' (grounded theory), a combination of the theories described my method. The 'culturally based method' I refer to as a *Kaupapa* Māori approach to research, and Social Research as the process to 'gain in-depth understanding' and drew together the liberatory intentions of the critical theorists whom I have used to frame these theories.

### **3.1.3 Applying a Qualitative Research Approach**

The theories on *Kaupapa* Māori Research and Social Research were adopted to reflect a cultural and qualitative approach. The methods were qualitative because the participants in the research constructed the realities. The qualitative research approaches chosen provided a method to bring forward the explanation of Māori volunteerism by documenting the voices of the participants. Creating a theoretical approach to represent qualitative research involved educating oneself on qualitative and quantitative research assumptions to gain an understanding as to how theories related to research. Figure 1.1 provided a model of paradigms and assumptions that were used as guidelines to understand theories in research. It provided basic explanations of theoretical terms such as 'ontology' and epistemology that are essential for the development of research. According to

Davidson and Tolich (1999) “theory without research is mere speculation; research without theory is merely data collection” (p. 17). Therefore it was imperative that the research combined theory and research so that an understanding of Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities could be constructed from the realities voiced by participants.

**Figure 1.1 Qualitative and *Kaupapa* Māori Paradigm Assumptions**

<b>Assumption</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Qualitative</b>	<b><i>Kaupapa</i> Māori</b>
Ontological Assumption	What is the nature of reality?	Reality is subjective and multiple as seen by the participants in a study.	Reality is subjective and dual as seen by Māori in a Western society.
Epistemological Assumption	What is the relationship of the researcher to that researched?	Researcher interacts with that being researched.	Researcher interacts with Māori participants.
Axiological Assumption	What is the role of values.	Value-laden.	Māori values are paramount.
Rhetorical Assumption	What is the language of research?	Informal. Evolving decisions. Personal voice. Accepted qualitative words.	Informal. Could involve Māori language. Personal voice. Accepted qualitative words.
Methodological Assumption	What is the process of research?	Inductive process. Mutual simultaneous shaping of factors. Emerging design – Categories identified during research process. Ethically appropriate conduct. Patterns, theories developed for understanding. Accurate through verification using more than one source to validate findings.	Inductive process. Shared process between Māori and researcher. Evolving design. Main themes identified during research process. Ethically appropriate conduct. Pattern theories developed for understanding. Accurate through verification using more than one source to validate findings.

Source: Adapted from Creswell (1994), Feldman (1995), Rubin and Babbie (1997)

## 3.2 Methodology

Methodology describes the rational and philosophical questions that particular methods assume. Bouma (1993) states that the methodology section of a research report is where:

You describe and give the reasons for the choices you made with respect to the selection and operationalization of variables, research design, and sample selection procedure. Once you have stated your research question it is possible to raise and discuss these methodological issues. They do not make much sense prior to this point and are missed if raised later (Bouma, 1993, 194).

The method refers to the processes used in the research, the practical application. Webster (1998) defined method as “a systematic, established, or orderly procedure or way of doing anything; system order or regularity in general. The disciplines and techniques used in any field of knowledge” (p. 317).

### 3.2.1 A *Kaupapa* Māori Approach

Traditional research practices failed to conduct Māori focussed research and researchers producing knowledge for western society dehumanised Māori and caused Māori to be ‘anti-ALL-theory and anti-ALL-research’ (Mead, 1996, 196). According to Mead, this posed a challenge for Māori researchers entering Māori communities as researchers to discover knowledge because:

One of the challenges for Māori researchers working in this context has been to retrieve some space, firstly to convince Māori people of the value for Māori, and secondly to convince the various fragmented but powerful Pakeha research communities of the need for greater Māori involvement in research, and thirdly to develop approaches and ways of carrying out the research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous and current approaches to research. What is now referred to as *Kaupapa* Māori Research is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims (p. 196).

The perseverance from writers such as G. Smith (1992), Mead (1996), Durie (1998), Bishop (1999) and L. Smith (1999) have reinforced processes of ‘*Kaupapa Māori*’ or ‘*Kaupapa Māori Research*’ as a process of ethical conduct for a researcher intending to research in the Māori world. A *Kaupapa Māori* research approach challenges Western research doctrine by creating a space for research to be conducted in a way that is Māori.

The comment from Mead (1996) contends “*Kaupapa Māori Research*, as currently framed, would argue that being *Māori* was an essential criteria for carrying out *Kaupapa Māori* research” (p. 203). In addition, she identified seven principles to inform a code of conduct constructed by Te Awekotuku to guide researchers with Māori in their work:

- 1) *aroha ki te tangata* (a respect for people).
- 2) *kanohi kitea* (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face).
- 3) *titiro, whakarongo, korero* (look, listen, ... speak).
- 4) *manaaki ki te tangata* (share and host people, be generous).
- 5) *kia tupato* (be cautious).
- 6) *kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata* (do not trample over the mana of people).
- 7) *kaua e mahaki* (don’t flaunt your knowledge) (p. 221).

The principles for conduct are intended to enhance trust in the benefit of the research process for the Māori participants.

A further connection between my theoretical interest in critical theory and theories about decolonisation is the associative notion of ‘praxis’ – the connection between analysis and action for change. *Kaupapa Māori* is also a ‘theory of change’ (Smith, 1990, 13). Smith stated that this theory emerged out of Māori resistance initiatives and developed from within the Māori community. Accordingly, it:

Speaks to the validity and legitimacy of being and acting Māori; to be Māori is taken for granted. Māori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right. *Kaupapa Māori* is the critical factor



underpinning *Te Kōhanga Reo*, *Kura Kaupapa* Māori, hui Māori, *marae*, *whare wananga* and some bilingual units. It is not the rejection of Pakeha knowledge and culture. *Kaupapa* Māori advocates excellence within Māori culture as well as Pakeha culture. It is not either/or choice – Māori parents want full access to both cultural frameworks for their children (p. 13).

The aspiration for change is also described by Bishop (1998). “Following the rapid Māori urbanization of the post-Second World War” (p. 201) an ethnic revitalisation movement was initiated. This revitalization resisted perpetuating the traditional research practices to gather Māori knowledge. Bishop contends this:

Revitalization blossomed in the 1970s and 1980s with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Māori communities. ... This consciousness has featured the revitalization of Māori cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and a resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse. ... One of the main focus of a *Kaupapa* Māori approach to research is the operationalization of self-determination (*tinu rangatiratanga*) by Māori people (p. 201).

Bishop and Glynn (1999a, 173-175) discuss *whakawhānaungatanga* as a process of establishing relationships in a Māori context. This process involves establishing and maintaining *whānau*-type relationships, physical, ethical, moral, and spiritual values, sharing power and control between researcher and participants. Bevan-Brown (1998) discusses *whakawhānaungatanga* as a research process whereby:

The active participation of *kaumātua* and *kuiā* to bless, guide and give authority to research: conducting meetings, workshops and presentations according to Māori protocol and in Māori environments: negotiating and consensus decision making: maintaining Māori control of research activities using *whakawhānaungatanga* as a research process. The latter is done to establish *whakapapa* links with people on board the research canoe thus advancing the research and strengthening and empowering the *whānau* and in turn empowering the community (p. 243).

Jahnke and Taiapa (1999) state that the “construction of methodologies appropriate and relevant to Māori is based on several underlying assumptions. The first is a Māori viewpoint and a distinctively Māori way of organising knowledge” (p. 41), the most important approach in research. The second assumption is *matauranga* Māori, followed by the third: Māori-centred research. The Māori worldview as expressed by Jahnke and Taiapa was encapsulated in *whakapapa* that forms orderliness, sequence, evolution, and progress. Marsden and Henare (1992) remark that *whakapapa* as a tool for transmitting knowledge pervaded Māori culture. Bevan-Brown (1998) states this “tool has been used in a number of ways by various researchers e.g. to establish *whānau* connections between the researcher and researched and as a metaphor for the development and presentation of the research process” (p. 243).

### 3.2.2 Applying a *Kaupapa* Māori Approach in this Research

In various previous research projects, I now see that I unconsciously followed codes of conduct identified by Te Awēkotuku without realising it reflected a *Kaupapa* Māori approach. For example, the concept of *whakawhānaungatanga* was applied by me throughout the research and a behaviour I attribute to being Māori and brought up in a community with a strong Māori presence. By reading literature and attending a class on *Kaupapa* Māori Research I recognised ways of behaviour I have always taken-for-granted, but learned to connect it to ways in which theory and practice from a Māori viewpoint could be conducted. However, I came to make my own modifications.

*Kaupapa* Māori Research provided methods to prevent the participants and researcher from exposure to negative experiences or harm. It informs the researcher that there are cultural practices one must apply when conducting research with Māori participants. It provides guidelines on the process of encounter between participant and researcher. Researchers who have not undertaken a course to learn aspects of a *Kaupapa* Māori approach or have community knowledge about working with Māori participants can expect to be confronted with negative experiences. A negative experience for the researcher comes in many forms such as criticism from participants, lack of participation, or being told to leave the premises of participants. For the participants, a negative

experience can be harmful and take on many forms such as create mistrust about the research process.

The concept of *whānau* is significant in *Kaupapa* Māori Research. My understanding of *whānau* came from life experiences. In the first chapter, *whānau* was described as a group of family members or a family social unit whereas the fourth chapter refers to *whānau* as a group of volunteers. In the present chapter, *whānau* is described in research as a relationship formed between participant and researcher. It was difficult for me to accept the idea that a researcher shared a *whānau*-type relationship with participants who descended from different *whakapapa*. I felt it appropriate to call participants 'rōpū' which meant to be in the company of person(s) (Williams, 1992, 347). Subsequently, this idea was tested in the field where the participants and I developed a friendly relationship and mutual respect for each other. The participants and I did not share a family relationship shared between *whānau*, but we shared a friendly relationship.

Exploring a *Kaupapa* Māori Research approach in the field teased out the practices that were relevant to the project that I had undertaken. For example, some theories of *Kaupapa* Māori Research were not applicable in the case study because the participants and research did not fall in the Māori worldview as expressed by Jahnke and Taiapa (regarding the *whakapapa* relationship to *kaupapa* Māori). This worldview required the *kaumātua* (elderly male) and *kuia* (elderly female) to mentor the participants and researcher. *Kaumātua* and *kuia* did not mentor the participants in this research although some participants were indeed *kaumātua* and *kuia*. In addition, some participants descended from different *whakapapa*, *whānau*, *hapū* or *iwi* and therefore represented a range of cultural beliefs.

The modified approach I adopted was to grasp some theories of *Kaupapa* Māori research and apply them in the research. Below are concepts drawn from literature and exercised in the field:

- 1) to build *whakawhānaungatanga* relationships of a friendly nature;

- 2) to apply the concept of '*rōpū*' instead of *whānau*; to acknowledge the diversity of *whakapapa* and support working with people who are not Māori but experienced in the field of research;
- 3) to advocate Māori values as an essential criterion for *Kaupapa* Māori Research;
- 4) to implement the principles advocated by Te Awēkotuku.

These guidelines were followed in the case study, community study, and fieldwork.

A *Kaupapa* Māori research approach in my research incorporated a variety of conventional social research practices. I reviewed literature on social research because academic institutions and literature favoured Western approaches and I was aware of the criticism research focussed entirely on Māori knowledge would receive. However, this literature could not substantiate or articulate the experiences I was to encounter in the field.

When I began the fieldwork I encountered a situation where participants did not trust researchers. The participants showed me documents where a researcher requested information without coming to meet them or explain the research. This experience made them sceptical about researchers. In the Case Study (detailed in Chapter Six), participants showed me correspondence from another researcher and stated, "they didn't know the person" (Notes, 30/5/00) meaning that the person I spoke to did not know the researcher. In fact everyone in the organisation had not met the researcher. The participants were given instructions by the researcher on how they (the participants) should collect information from clients (people that used their social service) and to send the data to the researcher. The participants were required to distribute and collect the questionnaires sent by the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of thirty questions and required clients of the participants to rate how they abused their partners from a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing never and 5 frequently. I found the questions to be disrespectful, dehumanising, and critical of clientele behaviour such as question 23 'my partner slaps me around the face and head'. My reason for forming this opinion about the researcher is based on the rigorous process I undertook gaining ethical consent

from the university where I was enrolled and knowledge I learnt researching Māori people. The researcher exposed the participants, and clients of the participants, to a negative experience.

The process the researcher applied to the participants discussed in the case study I considered to be a misuse of position and unethical. It was disappointing for me to learn that the participants agreed to collect the data because the researcher represented a Department of Social Science in a New Zealand university. The participants thought if they failed to participate they could lose funding and support from government and preferred to deter from upsetting the university or students representing a university. After all, in the eyes of the participants, the university was an institution of power they were reluctant to challenge. Although the university did not fund the community organisation, its status was deemed powerful enough for members in the organisation to feel that they had to uncritically comply with its request. The participants disclosed the information about this researcher to me with the assurance that the researcher's details would remain confidential because participants were never informed about the outcomes of the research, and were unsure as to the consequences for them if I identified the university or the study (Notes, 28/8/00). Therefore, the names of the researcher and university have remained confidential information.

Hearing the voices of the participants and sharing experiences with them was positive. It made me aware that a researcher should tread with caution in the case study and refrain from imitating a negative research experience the participants encountered. With this insight in mind, aspects of a *kaupapa* Māori approach were undertaken so that the participants and I felt safe and not threatened by each other. By combining the theories of social research and *kaupapa* Māori research I was able to conduct research grounded in theory and practice.

### **3.2.3 A Social Research Approach with a Māori *Kaupapa***

Important issues raised in literature on research methodology that were relevant to my study were conceptual frameworks, practical application, and measuring devices, that related to Māori social research. Some:

Rethinking is needed in what are appropriate measuring devices in Māori social research. For example, occupation and income are used by Pakeha social scientists as measures of socio-economic status. The ‘big gun’, the principal orator on a *marae*, may be a member of a Ministry of Works road gang, or knife hand at the local freezing works. Mana or status is not measured by occupation and income. There are many Māori workers who choose to stay in lower status and possibly lower paid wage-earning jobs, on shift or whatever, because this gives them more time to get involved in *marae* activities. There are other jobs where the group involvement provides a more congenial work environment. Perceptions of ‘work’ need to be explored. Work done to cater for hundreds of visitors at a *marae* gathering may be a great deal more demanding than the job that earns the pay packet. But in Māori terms it is likely to be this work on the *marae* that carries more status. Likewise, voluntary work done outside of working hours such as Māori Warden, or unpaid welfare work, is valued more highly (Stokes, 1985, 15-16).

Cunningham (1998) stated that research involving a *kaupapa* Māori approach could incorporate a range of research methods. A *kaupapa* Māori approach had many descriptions, and according to Cunningham was still undergoing development to define and describe the process. There was no singular definition to applying the theories of *kaupapa* Māori in research, rather an evolving definition because:

*Kaupapa* Māori research is formative. It has its own methodologies and may employ a range of contemporary and traditional methods. Researchers undertaking *kaupapa* Māori research are developing standards in order to maintain quality. A definition of *kaupapa* Māori research will develop over time as more researchers and users of research information come to understand the philosophy and benefits of the approach (p. 51).

By gathering theories from Māori and non-Māori approaches to research, I was able to design a research project that incorporated appropriate ethical procedures and methods of analysing data. The available literature on social research

methods was diverse and covered a range of approaches to record the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. A difficulty I experienced was deciding what procedures to include in the research that complemented the characteristics contained in a *kaupapa* Māori approach. It was necessary to adopt a course of action that included interviewing people and documenting their experiences. A case study and the community study were social research methods used to gather information, along with the cross section study that supplied information from a national view of voluntary activity.

The techniques I used were preliminary work, participant observation, exploration, interviewing participants, and a critical review of existing documentation. The data were analysed by an interpretative approach of content analysis, highlighting main findings, and filed using computer software. The techniques are explained in the following paragraphs.

#### **3.2.4 Sources of Data**

The sources of data came from three main studies I undertook; the Case Study, Community Study, and Cross Section Study. Each was designed to represent the varied voices of the members of the community. Using three different sources to gather data was referred to in qualitative research as ‘triangulation’ and a way to establish validity. According to Babbie (1995) the use of several methods:

To test the same finding is sometimes called *triangulation*, and you should always keep it in mind as a valuable research strategy. Because each research method has particular strengths and weaknesses, there is always a danger that research findings will reflect, at least in part, the method of inquiry. In the best of both worlds, your own research design should bring more than one method to bear on the topic (pp. 105-106).

The studies in this thesis, then, represent three different strategies to research the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. To ensure that each study presented a relationship between Māori and voluntary work participants were questioned about Māori voluntary activity, social services, and Māori cultural

practices. This process meant that the participants' knowledge of voluntary work would provide a deeper understanding of how Māori voluntary work developed in Māori communities as perceived through their eyes. By replicating the questions in each study I could show whether there was a general understanding of the relationship between Māori and voluntary work.

After working in the field in the exploratory phase of this research and searching through literature it was evident that in Māori culture development was holistic and bonded a person to their family and the environment. Taking this concept on board I designed a research model so that the sources of data, the case study, community study, and cross section study represented different parts of the whole. When these parts were combined together it created a body of knowledge. This body of knowledge I described as the voice to represent Māori volunteers working in community organisations. The case study became the *pito* (navel) that provided the bases to construct the other research. In Māori culture the *pito* is the 'belly button' and considered the centre of a person. For this research, the *pito* reflected the centre to the sources of information. The information gathered from the case study was an in-depth study of volunteers where, on a personal level, the volunteers shared their experiences. The community study developed into the *iho* (umbilical cord) from which information learnt in the case study could be best utilised and tested. The *iho* in Māori culture signifies the relationship from the mother to the child and when it is buried in the ground represents the bond from that child to the earth. This research perceived the *iho* as the link between one organisation and many organisations (cross section study). The cross section study was the *tinana* (body). In Māori culture *tinana* denotes the body of a person. In the research the *tinana* symbolised the different organisations that made up the voluntary sector of society, including Māori and non-Māori. It consisted of 16 communities that provided a perspective on the voluntary sector of society. The relationship between the *pito*, *iho*, and *tinana* was that each represented different sectors of voluntary activity that involved a Māori contribution. The model was called 'Te Whakatata Hou – The New Approach'. The model contained four stages.



### **Model 1.1. *Te Whakatata Hou* – The New Approach**

#### **Stage One: Study a Case**

- From the Case study draw out main themes and values.
- Learn the positive and negative experiences incorporated in research.
- Develop a research framework that suits your researching style and discipline.

#### **Stage Two: Broaden the Study**

- Using the information learnt in the case studied test whether the main themes and values are present.
- Modify the study to compensate for new information.
- Fine-tune your research approach.

#### **Stage Three: Cross Section Study**

- Building on to information gathered in the previous stages, test whether the main themes and values are present.
- Modify the study to compensate for new information.
- Reflect on your research approach and look at improvements.

#### **Stage Four: Analysis & Findings**

- Analyse the information gathered from the stages 1-3.
- Document findings and concluding comments
- Make recommendations

The model is simplistic in style and theory. Its purpose was to approach research by utilising the theories of triangulation and to test whether the main themes and values are consistent throughout the stages. The model is a working model and can be modified to suit future research. There are no specific references to other models or literature because *Te Whakata Hou* encompasses knowledge I have learnt over the years through experience and education and developing this model can be referenced to a lifetime of work.

### **3.2.5 Ethical Procedures**

The process to obtain ethical consent from the university was rigorous. The application form provided by the university was detailed and very lengthy. The Ethics Committee requested detailed information such as how information would be gathered from participants and the type of information recorded. My response was different in the case study and community study. The case study required consent to record the history of the organisation from the start to the present day. This documentation included individual stories such as what brought the

volunteers to the organisation, how they coped unpaid, and where they saw themselves in the future. The only information recorded about the number of clients the organisation provided a service for was the percentage of ethnic affiliation for the year 1999. I did not interview clients, record client names or request to be involved in any matter concerning the clients the organisation deals with. The ethics procedure for the community study was less detailed because I interviewed one person per organisation in one visit to the home or workplace.

The ethical consent form for the case study and community study requested information on participants' health, culture, and state of mind. The participants were adults and did not suffer from any disabilities that required consent from another person on their behalf. Participants were selected because they were Māori and knowledgeable about volunteering. I informed participants that their knowledge contributed to this research and they responded supportively and were eager to share their knowledge. Any potential risks that could have caused discomfort to the participants such as questioning them when they had heavy workloads or encountering awkward situations with the participants, were handled with care. Provisions were implemented to ensure the interviews were conducted when participants had available time and I worked at building a relationship of trust with them. In the case study some participants were quiet and did not engage in casual conversation with me so their privacy was respected and interviews were conducted upon their approval. Confidentiality was preserved by recording codes for participant names such as W1 for worker one in the case study and O1 for organisation one in the community study. The president of the organisation in the case study gave consent for me to use the organisation's real name, however, after careful consideration I chose to retain their anonymity. I was the only person who viewed the information collected from participants.

The ethical consent form questioned relationships between researcher and participants. The participants from the case study shared a family association with me and the involvement of my family with the organisation did not pressure participants to participate. On the contrary, the participants were experienced community people and their mannerisms dictated that I would be informed on any

matter they felt I needed to know. Family connections placed more pressure on me to apply proper codes of conduct because the repercussions from inappropriate behaviour faced personal and family disgrace. As a volunteer I contributed to the organisation at all levels, from cleaning to computing that supported the organisation, the workers, and the clients. The material benefits participants received from the research were paid through the voluntary work performed by me. The next paragraphs discuss the case study, community study, and cross section study.

### **3.2.6 The Case Study**

A case study, as described by Yin (1994), is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context where the boundaries between phenomenon and context were not clear using multiple sources. The rationale for using a case study method, according to Rubin and Babbie (1997), was the availability of a special case that seemed to merit intensive investigation. The case study would provide key points to test in the community study and cross section study. “The application of a case study method that perhaps is of greatest interest to social workers is when the case being studied is an individual, group, or family engaged in social work treatment” (p. 403).

The case study in this thesis was exploratory because the research was not designed to test a hypothesis. Instead the research gathered information and recorded the conversations of the participants in order to gain a better understanding of how Māori understood, participated, and shaped volunteer work. Bouma (1993) supported a case study as a means to gather information and describe an environment, therefore:

A Case Study is an exploratory study, one of the purposes of the research may be to ascertain the relevant variables for a particular area of study. ... An exploratory study takes a very broad look at the phenomenon under study. Attention is not focussed as in a study to test a hypothesis. The purpose is to gather information, so that a description of what is going on can be made (pp. 89-90).

The exploratory study was not confined to participant observation but broadened to incorporate an exploration of the documents held by the organisation. The information described instances throughout the history of the case under study, the working environment, and factors that related to the service the organisation provided.

The case study allowed me to engage in an in-depth study with Māori people who worked as volunteers on a daily basis. Applying a case study method allowed me to record the operations of the organisation and the experiences of Māori as voluntary workers. I conducted a study on a small group of social workers in a Māori voluntary organisation providing social services for the local community. The information drawn from the case study consisted of documentation, observations, and interviews (detailed in Chapter Six).

Participant observation became a process in the case study I located in ethnomethodology and grounded theory. My role involved voluntary work for the organisation observing participants, conversing and sharing lunch with them, and together we drank cups of tea. Using the words of Rubin and Babbie, (1997, 379) I participated fully with the group under study and in the words of Davidson and Tolich (1999) applied a common technique used in qualitative research, that is:

Participant observation is the most common kind of qualitative research and involves a combination of observation and unstructured interviewing 'in the field' of study. For obvious reasons, this method (actually, mix of methods) is known as 'fieldwork' but technically called 'ethnography' (p. 125).

The case study and community study methods overlapped because the studies required me to interview people face-to-face. It was essential to conduct a face-to-face interview with participants so they could see me and relate to my research. A face-to-face interview is similar to the Māori custom of *kanohi-ki-te-kanohi*. The approaches used in the case study and community study were preliminary work, participant observation, and interviews.

The interviews were a process of ‘Standardised Open – Ended Interviews’. The standardised open – ended interview consisted of questions that were written before the interview (Patton, 1990, 285). This allowed the interview “to be conducted in a thorough manner with minimum of interviewer effects and biases” (Rubin and Babbie, 1997, 392). Every time an interview was conducted the participants and I engaged in a Māori ritual of *whakawhānaungatanga*. This ritual comprised a sharing of knowledge about each other’s background, family, tribal affiliation, current community issues, and the research. It would have been inappropriate to interview participants on the first encounter without engaging in a process of *whakawhānaungatanga*. Each interview began with a sharing of knowledge and became a normal process in the research.

### 3.2.7 The Community Study

The community study was designed from literature on conducting a survey. Statistics New Zealand (1998) stated a “survey involves the collection of some (or all) units of a population using well-defined concepts, methods and procedures, and the compilation of such information into a summary form” (p. 9). Adopting a survey method to conduct the community study involved using four survey techniques:

- 1) Sampling methodology
- 2) Interview schedule
- 3) In-depth interviewing
- 4) Face-to-face interviewing.

I conducted trials to test whether the time allocated for participants to complete the interviews was appropriate. People that were part of the trials were family members who were Māori and knowledgeable on Māori voluntary activity. During the trials, I focussed on identifying areas where the process caused problems and modified the practices to make the encounter friendly.

A community study was conducted to cover a broader scope of Māori voluntary organisations and participants were selected from a list. The community study interviewed people who were Māori, in the local community, who worked in

positions of authority such as managers, trustees, or chairpersons in Māori voluntary organisations. The community study involved collecting information about the relationship between Māori voluntary organisations and Māori voluntary workers. It applied well-defined concepts, methods and procedures similar to the descriptions by Department of Statistics (1998) for surveys. The information I drew from the Department of Statistics was used to select the participants for the community study in a fashion that was unbiased. However, my contact with participants was conducted in the manner described by Te Awekotuku (1991) summarised on page 65.

### **3.2.8 The Cross Section Study**

The cross section study involved little contact with people. The majority of the information was documentation and only in a brief encounter I worked with one of the 16 organisations and described the experience. A year later the Ministry of Social Policy made available to the public on the Internet literature that related to the information taken from the cross section study. The study compared reports gathered by the Ministry of Social Policy and reviewed the comments from voluntary organisations across New Zealand including Māori and government.

### **3.3 Data Analysis**

This section discusses how data collected from the interview schedules and documentation for the cross section study were analysed. Initially I explored a range of information about analysing the data taken from readings such as Benjamin, Capie, and Nossin (1998, pp. 47-60), Tauranga District Council of Social Services (1983), Gann (1996), Allison, B., O'Sullivan, T., Owen, A., Rice, J., Rothwell, A., & Saunders, C. (1996), and Wolcott (1994). The conversation sheets, reports, and documented observations were analysed using an interpretative analysis. The interpretative approach was a systematic analysis of socially meaningful action through the direct detailed observation of people in natural settings in order to arrive at understandings and interpretations of how people create and maintain their social worlds (Davidson and Tolich, 1999, 26). This approach was useful for analysing information from the case study because more time was spent observing the participants in their natural settings and to a lesser extent the survey or cross section study. Three qualitative methods were

used to interpret the data, content analysis, highlighting main findings, with Nvivo nudist computer software.

### **3.3.1 Content Analysis and Highlighting Main Findings**

Content analysis is used to identify common trends. Content analysis was applied to the data gathered from the studies. Its primary use was to code and tabulate the occurrences of certain forms of content that are being communicated (Rubin and Babbie, 1997, 421). To review:

A set of field notes, transcribed or synthesized, and to dissect them meaningfully, while keeping the relations between the parts intact, is the stuff of analysis. This part of analysis involves how you differentiate and combine the data you have retrieved and the reflections you make about this information (Miles and Hubberman, 1994, 56).

Coding data can be at different levels of analysis “ranging from the descriptive to the inferential” (p. 58). This research applied the descriptive analysis of coding. For the case study, survey, and cross section study coding was applied after data were collected (see Chapters, Six, Seven, and Eight for more detail).

According to Wolcott (1994, 29-36), highlighting and displaying common findings determines answers to research questions. For this research, the main themes were drawn from the responses to the research questions discussed in Chapter One and were taken from common findings. The common findings were highlighted as subheadings in the ‘Main Themes’ section of Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight.

### **3.3.2 NVivo-Nudist Computer Software**

Computer software was used to analyse qualitative information and supported by Wolcott (1994) and Rubin and Babbie (1997). The name of the computer software was QSR Nudist Vivo and useful for coding data. Each interview sheet and report document was typed and copied into the programme and then the contents were coded line-by-line and paragraph-by-paragraph. The computer kept

an account of the codes, line, and documents that were coded. At the end of each coded document I printed a coding report and manually compared the documents highlighted main findings.

I encountered difficulties when analysing the data and realised my limitations with using the software. The software was a suitable tool for filing information and coding data but did not analyse data. The software was useful for making text reports and coding reports. A text report was a list of documents showing text, number of pages, sentences, and paragraphs. A coding report was a list of codes in a document, number of codes, identifying where the codes are in the document. I did not study whether other tools available in this software such as linking information to previous stored research in the software and in other programmes on the computer. Much of my knowledge about this software programme was confined to experience, going through practice tutorials in the software, reading literature provided by the programme, and on the Internet. I used this software to store data I gathered in the research and produce a hard copy of the information stored. This information was studied and analysed using 'content analysis'.

### **3.4 Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the procedures used to gather information for the research. It highlighted the problems trying to create a structure that was suitable for the research and the participants. The trial and errors I encountered were steps towards transforming the research from a general approach to a specialised approach. From theorising and testing ideas emerged the model Qualitative and *Kaupapa* Māori Paradigm Assumptions and *Te Whakata Hou* to explain the manner in which I conducted myself. The experience prepared me for the complexities of researching Māori participants in their communities. At the completion of the case study the theoretical frameworks were in place and based on the theories of *Kaupapa* Māori research and social research.

This chapter argues that conducting oneself ethically as defined by the principles of *Kaupapa* Māori Research and engaging in a process of *whakawhānaungatanga* were essential in conducting fieldwork, in a Māori community. Without community knowledge and practical applications applied in the research I would not have been able to record the stories of the volunteers. The character of the



researcher determines the success with a *whakawhānaungatanga* research process and I was fortunate to have local connections and knowledge of the community. Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight, describe in detail the case study, community study, and cross section study. In order to contextualise these studies I now provide the historical context of Māori voluntary activity from the period of colonisation to the contemporary situation. In Chapter Five I focus more specifically on the neoliberal context of contemporary Māori volunteering in order to situate my studies in their social, cultural, political, and economic context.

## **Chapter Four: Volunteerism in NZ: Developments in the Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State**

*“Ko te kākano i ruia, kua tipu – I tutuia ai te motu katoa. Rongohia ana te kakara o tō kaupapa i te puanga o ngā mahi. Tū te rā! Tū te pō!”*

*“The seed has been planted and has sprung up to cover the land and bind us all together. From its inception the perfume from the flowering of its work has permeated everywhere” (MWWL Whina Cooper 1951).*

### **4.0 Introduction**

Thorns and Sedgwick (1997, 155) contend that the development of the New Zealand State consisted of four periods of development, Colonial State 1840-1890, Liberal State 1890-1935, Welfare State 1935-1984, and Neo-Liberal State 1984 onwards. Within these periods of development voluntary associations emerged and encountered various social struggles attempting to implement a range of strategies to address the social problems of their period. This chapter describes how voluntary work for Māori became embedded in Māori communities as a cultural activity. The chapter covers three periods of development: Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State, the Neo-Liberal period is covered in more depth in Chapter Five. This chapter is divided into four sections. Section one provides background information as to how Māori people became involved in labour for the colonies from 1800s to the 1900s. Section two describes the way voluntary forms of activity were introduced to Māori. In section three, I introduce the Welfare State and the relationship to Māori voluntary organisations and section four provides some concluding comments.

### **4.1 Revisiting History in New Zealand**

In Chapter Two I provided some support for the idea that from early arrival in Aotearoa/NZ, European values and cultures were positioned as privileged and Māori people were to be made subservient. Māori did not share this view of themselves and the history of resistance by Māori has been documented by numerous authors. However, the hegemonic affect of colonisation as discussed in Chapter Two was to generalise European perspectives of Māori, including a widespread diminishing of Māori perception of their own rightful position in

Aotearoa/NZ. While Chapter Two provided a general overview of this history, in this part of the thesis I will look more closely at the involvement of voluntary associations in the re-shaping of Māori in the various periods beginning from pre-contact with European.

#### 4.1.1 Traditional Māori Societies

In pre-European Māori society, according to the National Committee on *Marae* Subsidies (1974) “most Māori people lived in villages. The *marae* was the courtyard in the centre either of grass or worn bare, open to sky, surrounded by houses” (p. 14). They add, Captain Cook and E. J. Wakefield wrote of larger villages “with dividing fences between group of houses. Each group was presumed to be a kinship unit, the *whānau*, but all shared the one *marae*, and the unit of the village was *hapū*” (p. 14).

‘Volunteering’ or ‘voluntary work’ had no meaning for pre-European Māori. The Māori way of life encompassed applying traditional activities and customs that formed the basis of Māori society. These customs reinforced a kinship and communal approach to any developments in Māori society and consisted of a set of values passed down from their ancestors in which Māori people exercised as a daily ritual.

*Hapū* defined rights and responsibilities for allocated portions of land. It was the responsibility of the families (*whānau*), to tend, work, and develop the land. The perimeter for each *whānau* area was identified using landmarks such as rocks, rivers, and mountains as boundary lines. “Each *Hapū* of the tribe controlled a defined stretch of the tribal territory, which it guarded jealously. Trespassers and poachers were punished severely and persistent border violations led to fighting” (McHugh, 1983, 39).

When considering any form of development Māori people incorporated what Western theorists might call the social, political and economical aspects of the community. However, the holistic approach in Māori society, described by Durie (1998a, 90), did not differentiate between social, cultural, and economic areas.

These categorisations belong to Western theorising and forms of organising that came out of European thinking.

#### **4.1.2 The Māori Market Economy**

Firth (1959), Henare (1991), and Durie (1998a) argue that “early Māori economy served both material and spiritual needs” (Henare, 1991, p. 215). To this Henare adds that Māori, in the past, had the capacity to administer extensive economic changes within the culture with few formal institutions to perform tasks. He states that over time the Māori economy developed into an ‘economy of affection’ and the exchange of goods between communities was common. Money was exchanged similarly to the exchange of gifts. Hyden (1980) gives an example of the ‘economy of affection’ (pp. 180-190) by referring to an African peasant mode of production that generated an invisible economy in which affective ties based on common descent and common residence prevailed.

Firth (1959), Henare (1995), and Durie (1998a) describe ‘Māori economic development’ as a means of achieving human sustenance. Firth (1959) described the economy of Māori in the past as consisting of a strong affection for ancestral ties to land and recognition that soil, water and other resources were important for survival. Human sustenance and the political environment determined the development of Māori economics, a view shared by Durie (1998a) that “land is necessary for spiritual growth and economic survival” (p. 115). The elite status of Māori was strengthened by their ability to provide effective social services to their people, retain their spiritual belief, own the land, and dominate New Zealand with a large population. The human resources available for Māori were larger than any other ethnicity immigrating to New Zealand and control over economic resources reinforced their high position in society.

Henare (1991) suggested that Māori economic development was destroyed through direct military “and legislative means, coupled with massive immigration flows of the new settlers. Māori lost control of both reproduction and production. The new immigrants came to build a European economy, first alongside the Māori one and then to replace it” (p. 215).

From the 1800s to 1835s Māori continued to use traditional land tenure methods based on their own customs. These customs exercised the importance of cultural aspects such as oral traditions, kinship relationships, and the association Māori had with the natural environment. They covered issues such as ownership to the land, form or right of title under the property that was held, the administration over land and land utilisation (Kawharu, 1977, 40-41).

In the early 1800s Māori controlled development in New Zealand and had the capacity to adjust the influences of incoming explorers, traders, and migrants. Māori operated a market economy, traded overseas, and catered for a subsistence economy. According to Kelsey (1990) “many tribes flourished economically. New domestic and Australian trade opportunities allowed Māori to develop their land and fisheries resources, using traditional labour and production practices, to dominate many areas of economic activity” (p. 13). She argued the economy for Māori “was based on ‘equivalents, relative worth and reciprocity’ not ‘possessions, absolute ownership, contracts without continuing obligations and the equation of personal wealth with status and power’” (p. 13). Once Pakeha capitalism was firmly established the Māori resource base came under attack. Subsequently, the Māori economy declined dramatically and according to Kelsey Māori resistance to the impact of Westerners grew.

#### **4.1.3 The Māori Political Resistance to Losing Control**

The Declaration of Independence arranged by Māori in 1835 achieved political sovereignty. It was a document that asserted the prestige of the Māori leaders as sovereign rulers and recognised the value of Māori kinship systems and subsequently:

A new ‘independent state’, Te Whenua Rangatira was declared in 1835 ... This imagined Māori state was a radical political and cultural development for the people of the time, given that politics, economics and social relationships were defined largely in terms of *hapū/iwi* kinship systems and boundaries (Levine and Henare, 1994, 193).

This Declaration was a testimony to two things: (1) it moved Māori from oral legitimisation of their sovereignty to include written legitimisation, and (2) it stated their ability to control change and achieve the desired outcome. This advancement was directed in a fashion that combined Western ideology (proof by paper) with Māori ideology (a paper that reflected Māori traditions and customs). The Declaration of Independence (1835) was a significant precursor to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) as described on page 36. However, the struggle for access to land by incoming Europeans accelerated social disorder.

In 1842, the British Government directed the Land Claim Commissioner to establish a court. The role of this court was to adjudicate on fairness of land claims between settlers and Māori. By 1844, the reigning Governor Fitzroy waived the Crown's pre-emptive right that returned the authority to make land sales with European to Māori and in 1846 the Crown resumed authority over the pre-emptive rights. In 1852, the Constitution Act gave settlers the first institution for self-government and within twelve years from signing the Treaty of Waitangi the Crown assembled legal institutions and implemented British laws in New Zealand securing legal governance (Glensor and Wood, 1991, 3).

From the 1840s to 1900s, Māori people were conscious that Europeans wanted the land for development. Māori resisted handing over large tracts of land to the settlers resulting in land wars and political resistances. The political organisations such as *Kīngitanga* and *Kotahitanga* were attempts by Māori people to gather tribes together and collectively stand against European taking the economic resources. Without the land, Māori knew their communities, language, governance, and religious beliefs would disintegrate. Sheehan (1988) states that:

Although the kingites were defeated and the British troops began withdrawing by the mid 1860s, the wars were not over. Fighting continued between the Colonial Government and Māori leaders Te Ua, Titokowaru and Te Kooti. In these later wars the government was assisted by *kupapa* or pro-government Māori. The fighting finally ended in 1872 when Te Kooti fled into the King Country. The wars are sometimes described as Land Wars. However they were not just about land. They

were also about sovereignty – who was going to control and run the country. In 1860 most of the North Island was still a Māori nation. When the fighting finally ended with a Pakeha victory, New Zealand was to be a country based on British laws, customs and institutions. Never again would Māori seriously attempt to oppose government with force. .... By 1911 only 10% of New Zealand’s 66 million acres remained in Māori hands. .... In 1896 there were thought to be only about 42,000 Māori left – less than a third of the Māori population on Cook’s arrival (pp. 9-12).

Cox (1993, 10) describes the movements of the *Kīngitanga* and *Kotahitanga* as a reaction to the impact of European administration (*kawanatanga*) and an attempt to interrupt the processes of colonisation by then well established. Kelsey (1990) says, “Māori communities at Parihaka and Maungapohatu, guided by prophetic leaders Te Whiti-o-Rongomai, Tohu Kakahi and Rua Kenana, further symbolised Māori passive resistance and the exercise of *tino rangatiratanga*” (p. 16). These communities fought to retain autonomy and were “harassed by the law, invaded by militia, ransacked, their leaders imprisoned, and their communities forced to disband” (p. 16). The decline in Māori population and the increase in European population further contributed to the break down of political resistance.

#### **4.1.4 Colonisation Produces a Māori Underclass**

Savage (1807) reported to Britain that Māori people were skilled for menial labour and valuable assets as servants for Europeans. Savage saw New Zealand as a country that offered great wealth for Europeans and required European power to execute colonisation. He acknowledged that Māori people would provide cheap and free labour because:

The exorbitant price of European labour in new colonies, it is extremely probable to be obviated by the assistance of the natives: their intelligence is such as to render them capable of instruction, and I have no doubt but they would prove essentially useful to a colony established in their country, as the natives of India prove to our Asiatic dominions (p.93).

Webster (1998) argues that the alienation of Māori people from land was the intent of Governor Grey's native policies and the creation of a Māori working class. In 1839, the European population was about 1,000 and the Māori population was between 100,000 and 120,000 in New Zealand (Thorns & Sedgwick, 1997, 32). "Marx ironically called Wakefield's 1830 land policies for Australia and New Zealand the 'manufacture' of a working class" (Webster, 1998, 80).

The high Māori population, scarcity of European labour, and cost to purchase labour meant Māori were perceived as a valuable commodity. Therefore, Māori provided a strong human resource base for a working class. With land depleting and war arising, kinship organisations were struggling to survive, keep their land, feed their people, and remain at the top of New Zealand society, the elite class:

Māori were the dispossessed underclass, refugees of an illicit military invasion in 1865. Pakeha, the descendants of military settlers, were the beneficiaries of that invasion. They were the landowners. They controlled the judicial apparatus, the borough council, and the commercial life of the town. They also ran the schools, the means by which the minds of the powerless were infected with the grand narrative of the British Empire (Walker, 1996, 9).

Māori were experiencing the destructive force of colonisation raised in Chapter Two (section 2.8). 'Hegemony domination' as identified by Bishop (1998b) gained strength as Māori attended Pakeha schools, lived in Pakeha settlements, and were made to follow Pakeha law.

Durie (1994) describes the Native Land Acts 1865 and 1873 as dividing Māori communities. The collective ownership of Māori land was challenged by individualisation but members of tribal groups were divided on the impact and desirability of such a change. Regardless, the loss of land led to the loss of a society and:

Māori social unity began to crumble. With the loss of land the individualization of titles, the need to remain together and to provide



mutual support lessened. An important foundation for health, the family was weakening at a time when it was most needed (p. 38).

New laws and policies increasingly enhanced British style governance over New Zealand. The establishment of a Crown entity duplicated the British society and was strengthened by the implementation of British policies into New Zealand society. The government used this entity to sign off on treaties and laws with the support of a British government so that the process to build a colonial society was eased. Laws became a tool that trapped Māori in a Western society. The law consequently:

Took over from the gun as the weapon by which colonial interest were pursued. Māori were excluded from fisheries, land title was individualised and land taken for public works, the infamous dog tax was introduced, financial assistance provided for Pakeha settlers was refused to Māori, Māori spirituality was outlawed, and the role of Māori in courts and as paid officials was terminated (Kelsey, 1990, 15).

By the 1880s capitalism had overtaken Māori society. Walker (1990) says “one of the unresolved contradictions to capitalism is the cycle of boom and depression. The decade of 1880 was one of depression, and the politicians’ panacea to unemployment was ‘back to the land’” (p. 137). When Māori went back to work the land, however, they encountered a new set of rules and regulations handed down by the Crown. Māori approached the 1900s without a kinship base that serviced the social needs of their people and a diminished capacity to retain, or even remain on the land. A new Māori underclass was now available to be utilised as workers for an industrialised state and Māori labour was an important commodity in the growing economy of New Zealand. One of:

The main characteristics of colonial economies tends to be their dependence on the colonising country, usually as a source of capital for investment as a main market for the colony’s output. Also, social dislocation, manifesting itself mainly in the weakening of traditional kinship ties, results in sometimes severe disruption. Labour is removed

from its traditional (and in the case of most Māori in New Zealand) communal setting, and is converted into a wage labour force. This simultaneously strengthens the colonial economy and weakens the traditional economy (Keelan & Moon, 1998, 11).

#### **4.1.5 The Colonial State & Liberal State Social Policies that Impacted on Māori**

In the 1890s, according to Kelsey and O'Brien (1995), social policies began to impact on Māori communities. "Historically, Aotearoa/New Zealand has enjoyed the international reputation of a comparatively advanced welfare state; with a range of social services; provided on a universal basis" (p. 1). Kelsey and O'Brien contend that the state took an active role socially and economically by producing and implementing social policies. Subsequently, from this active role grew the roots of the welfare state that "date back to the introduction of pensions and compulsory industrial arbitration in the 1890s. It was expanded in the post-depression 1930s creating an extensive network of social services" (p. 1). Kelsey (1993) related poverty for Māori families to colonisation. She contends that Māori were in a survival mode coping with the impact of colonisation and when government set out systematically to destroy the economic, social, political, and cultural base of the Māori and poverty became endemic:

Given their historically marginal place in a colonial economy, it was Māori people and communities who suffered most. Māori adults, and in many cases entire communities, were made redundant by wholesale closures of workplaces. Māori women, forced out of light industry or into low-paying part-time jobs, had to cope at the same time with heightened economic and emotional stress within the home. ... Essential postal, transport and banking services were terminated as being unprofitable, cutting off already isolated Māori communities, encouraging rural depopulation, and increasing the costs for those remaining. Even the protection of the welfare state was deliberately and disproportionately withdrawn from Māori (p. 11).

The welfare state serviced many Māori families reliant on the welfare benefits offered in this system. The implementation of welfare policies created a generation of Māori dependents on the State's welfare benefits. Walker (1990) relates welfare-dependency to colonisation, thus:

The roots of Māori dependency were traced to the history of colonisation. That history, combined with the way the department functioned, had made Māori people dependent on the welfare system, and principle consumers of its services. The most consistent call the committee heard around *marae* was for Māori people to be given the resources to control their own programmes (p. 280).

Walker (1990) stated that colonisation was driven by economic force and assimilation policies. Great Britain assumed theirs was a superior culture and justified to steal the land and resources of the indigenous people. Colonial domination:

Was justified by the 'civilising' mission of the coloniser. For this reason the process of colonisation is total, in that it involved cultural invasion and colonisation of the minds of the invaded as well. ... the founding fathers of the new nation state were therefore committed to the policy of assimilation. To this end, the missionaries, and later the state, used education as an instrument of cultural invasion (p. 146).

Assimilation was seen "as the illegitimate destruction of Māori culture. The history of colonial settlement, far from being benign and a source of pride, now appears as yet another example of European greed and arrogance" (Mulgan, 1989, 1). Assimilation contributed to Māori occupying the lower socio-economic communities in New Zealand and the very factors:

Previously seen as distinctively reputable in New Zealand's race relations – the influence of the missionaries, the Treaty itself, the degree of intermarriage and integration – are now seen as particularly insidious assaults on the Māori people, leaving them in a much weaker position than

other pre-colonial minorities with whom their situation usually had been favourably compared (p. 1).

By 1920, the traditional Māori kinship system had transformed from tribal organisations to pan-tribal ones. Political organisations such as *Kotahitanga* and *Kīngitanga* that serviced Māori tribes across New Zealand changed to an assortment of collective organisations that attempted to represent the views of the working people who had now been alienated from their former kinship support structures. These organisations were not necessarily Māori driven organisations and were collective organisations that reflected Pakeha philosophies of industrial unionism and religious beliefs whose membership consisted of Māori and non-Māori. Unions represented workers across New Zealand. “By 1914, one-quarter of the National Shearers’ Union were Māori, and in 1918 the right of Māori to district committee membership was formally affirmed” (Webster, 1998, 80).

This section of the thesis described the break-up of traditional Māori communities in which the concept of voluntary work, in western sense, had no meaning. The disruptive consequences of alienation from land based kinship, threw Māori onto the general labour market often far from home and well separated from family support. Māori participation in this new form of labour was often at the insecure and low end of the labour market – embedding Māori as an economic ‘underclass’ (Walker, 1996). In order to cope with the social consequences of this disruption of traditional social security, volunteer organisations became organised social service providers in the lives of Māori in complex and contradictory ways. In the next section, I trace the emergence of volunteer activity in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

#### **4.2 Introducing Forms of Voluntary Activity**

This section explores the types of voluntary activity that occurred during the 1800s to 1900s that involved Māori participation. It begins with literature taken from British Parliamentary Papers where various members of European descent were examined in the British Parliament. The discussions show that while there was no direct recording of Māori voluntary activity in early New Zealand history there were instances of Māori volunteering beside settlers.

### **4.2.1 Setting the Scene**

The information gathered from British parliamentary records of people cross-examined about their experience in Aotearoa/NZ provided Britain with descriptions of the social, political, or economic examples on how the observers believed Māori lived in their communities. For example, Watkins (1838), described Māori people as having councils that did not have individuals to expound laws. Instead the Chiefs would meet collectively to discuss issues in meetings. The “Chiefs [occupied] two or three hours in speaking; they [took] various topics in interest; sometimes on the subject of the wars; sometimes on other subjects; all sorts of subjects generally” (p. 29).

The differences perceived by the observers, in the typical way of colonisers, were deemed inferior or uncivilised. This perception of ‘other’ as ‘inferior’ has now significant documentation (Said, 1978, 2; L. Smith 1999, 88-92). This portrayal of Māori as uncivilised and inferior encouraged a discourse of ‘civilisation’ – an implied commitment to improving the lot of Māori. Thus Britain expressed a desire to civilise New Zealand and the Māori people for Queen Victoria and the church (Savage, 1807, 54). Montefiore (1838, 62), a resident in those times, supported the involvement of the church in the process of civilisation and it is here that the part of volunteering organisations was to become important.

### **4.2.2 Establishing Volunteerism in New Zealand**

Poverty and deprivation in Europe, described by Barnett (1996), generated charitable activity that was usually orchestrated by the church. There was a relationship between the church, the military, and collective action to form powerful labour and co-operative movements that were volunteer-based and frequently church inspired.

Clayton (1990a) argued “the concept of volunteering was established in the Anglo-Saxon psyche long before New Zealand was annexed by Britain” (vii). According to Clayton, Britain created a model for British subjects that utilised the efforts of voluntary contributions towards the armed forces. This model provided a framework on how to use voluntary work that serviced the British Empire. The

subjects (volunteers) banded together, under the reigning Queen, and trained for service. The British Empire adopted this concept of utilising voluntary work. The word ‘volunteer’ derived from the Latin word ‘voluntas’ meaning ‘free will’ and when it was used in its modern context referred to freewill, unpaid, or philanthropic activity. It was written into the English language with its modern meaning in the late nineteenth century and along with other aspects of colonising discourses, came to be transported to New Zealand.

### 4.2.3 Voluntary Work and War

“The first European New Zealand military force was an embryonic volunteer unit, the Kororareka Association. Formed in 1834, the association had an intermittent existence until 1838” (Clayton, 1990b, 9). Clayton (1990a) described European volunteers as strong, hardworking men who were committed to defending the colonies. He argued that in New Zealand:

The establishment of the volunteer tradition was not simply a response to external foes, both realized and potential. Internally the European colonists were confronted by a warlike indigenous population. Without sufficient numbers of regulars to guarantee security New Zealand volunteers formed their own military units. Faithfully serving the colony for fifty-five years ...They were seen as defenders of New Zealand’s sovereignty (pp. vii-viii).

Discussions of volunteerism in the New Zealand literature were confined to military activities. Clayton (1990b) argued that, “As a social and political force the volunteers helped knit the diverse settlements of New Zealand into a unified state” (p. x). Volunteers on active service in the 1840s won respect for the efficient and effective service they provided. Additionally, “the settlers’ willingness to band together” (p. 15) proved a valuable asset. Clayton (1990a) limited discussions to European encounters in voluntary war efforts and rarely described the contribution from Māori volunteers. However, when discussing the armed constabulary he does make a slight reference to Māori loyalists in discussions on “volunteers, Militia and *Kupapa* (friendly) Māori units” (Clayton,

1990b p. 27). The task of the Armed Constabulary was to subjugate Māori resistance to the authority of the Crown.

#### **4.2.4 Voluntary Communal Support**

According to Gardiner (1992) the early attempts to establish European economy in New Zealand failed. “British administration in New Zealand was usually in debt and at times insolvent. Yet it was able to survive these first critical years largely on Māori goodwill and economic assistance” (p. 59). Māori goodwill was not defined by Gardiner neither was there a perception that Māori goodwill was an act of voluntary work or altruism. The Western interpretation of goodwill referred to charity and organisations to help the poor. Māori provision of goodwill to European settlers was an act of altruism. Altruism is an act of “devotion to others or to humanity, the opposite of selfishness” (Paradise Press Inc, 1997, 9).

Firth (1959) and Gardiner (1992) highlight the voluntary activity Māori would perform to assist people and other communities. Firth (1959) contends that when there was a shortage of provisions amongst Māori communities resources were shared because “persons did not as a rule keep to themselves the product of their labour, but shared it out among the other people of the village” (p. 162). Māori people did not relate an act of goodwill to voluntary work or altruism because these words were from a Western culture. Māori goodwill, humanity, or sharing with others in times of need was part of a cultural behaviour.

#### **4.2.5 Voluntary Work and Crown Law**

The outbreak of war, or fear that war would erupt continued to create an upsurge of voluntary work amongst the settlers. It became extremely popular for volunteers to organise themselves into military units. The government intervention in the war efforts led to a review of voluntary services. “The ministry reviewed the service conditions of the Volunteers and allowed them to serve as independent bodies rather than as junior partners of a Militia-Volunteer combination, as originally conceived in the framing of the 1858 Militia Act” (Clayton, 1990b, 19). Under the 1858 Militia Act the government was able to double the military strength, first by reinstating the pre-eminent position of compulsory Militia and secondly by allowing the establishment of voluntary units

(pp. 17-18). Māori voluntary services were not mentioned in the 1858 Militia Act, or legally acknowledged by government for their contribution. Instead, Māori were assimilated into the process of volunteering for the government in times of war to protect the settlements and fight against Māori.

The correspondence between British military leaders and the British government revealed that British leaders did not intend to compensate Māori (voluntary servicemen), the same as European (voluntary servicemen), for their contribution in the war. Instead, British leaders expected Māori to perform their duties first before considering any type of compensation and did not imply that Māori would receive compensation. Whitmore (1864) describes how it was vital to have a Native contingent (Māori armies) to support the war efforts of Britain. The suggestion of 'caps' by Whitmore was a token gesture. He states that support from Māori was to be unpaid with minimal reciprocity so that:

A large Native contingent might now be formed ... to meet the views of Government that I would desire Tareha to raise a force for us; to be maintained by us; and to fight for us. As regards to the system of organization, pay, and armament; though I will cheerfully make the best provision in my power ... In any case I fancy no arms, uniforms (except distinctive caps or other decorations), or in the first instance at all events ammunition, would be needed. If their worth were proved by good service; the Government would probably deal liberally in all such matters (p. 593).

Earp (1844) reinforced the notion that a Native force under European offices was an advantage for the government. A Native force strengthened the European armies and would shape a probable advantage of a:

Permanent Native force under European offices, but in which Native chiefs might also hold commands; such a force would be a valuable addition to the military power of the Government and would gradually train Natives to habits of order and subordination. Report 11. Resolution of the committee; that it is expedient that an attempt should be made to raise and discipline a Native force of permanent character officered by



Europeans; but in which any of the Natives who may be trustworthy may hold command (p. 63).

Earp (1844) and Whitmore (1864) describe how Māori voluntary military services were used for the enhancement of a British government. Clayton (1990b) identifies Acts that were modified to increase military strength. Limited acknowledgement in writings from Savage (1807), Flatt (1837), Montefiore (1838), Watkins (1938), Earp (1844) Whitmore (1864) and Clayton (1990a; 1990b) that identified Māori people as volunteers highlight Māori were not recognised for their voluntary contribution towards the creation of a New Zealand society.

#### **4.2.6 Voluntary Work and Menial Labour**

While early volunteering work in Aotearoa/NZ was most intimately connected to this period and purposes of the land wars, a wider concept of volunteering service was also established. According to Gardner (2000) there were several reasons for women to engage in voluntary work. Some of the reasons were philanthropic, helping the less fortunate and a charitable activity for those descendants of British aristocracy, although, for the majority:

There was the simple understanding that in this new and sometimes lonely country they needed to help each other if they were to survive. The oldest voluntary organisation in Australasia with an unbroken record of service is the Onehunga Ladies' Benevolent Society which was founded in 1863 to care for *pakeha* refugees from war in Waikato (p. 4).

European women saw voluntary activity as a duty and created a camaraderie between those of the same ethnicity. Gardner did not mention the contribution of voluntary work from Māori women in the same era.

Flatt (1837) contends that Native labour was used to clear the ground, saw timber, garden and fence. Some Māori people were paid monthly wages of duck trousers, shirts, blankets, potatoes, flour, tobacco and various other small articles. Other Māori people were unpaid and worked voluntarily. Flatt, in cross-examination,

was asked by Parliament, “Did you pay some value to the parents or relations of the young men for those services?” His response was “No”:

Except when a slave was purchased – remuneration was given to the chief, and he would become the property of the European. .... In other cases it is practice to go to their native places and ask for men that can work; and they come forward and offer themselves. The parents and friends are out of the question; they would not object to it. If they did; that would stop further proceedings (p. 34).

The description by Flatt describes how Māori people were recruited to do unpaid work. The act of Māori coming forward and offering to work without payment or being forced showed that Māori people participated in voluntary activity.

In the 1880s, churches became the driving forces behind constructing voluntary organisations. The voluntary contribution from church organisations, like Presbyterian Support (Northern) which was established in 1885 played a significant role in the delivery of services to people in need. In each community, voluntary organisations such as religious groups addressed the social needs of the community. The role of a voluntary organisation, therefore, was to enhance the community social conditions by providing community support. Kunowski (1988) identified voluntary organisations as “groups who work for no monetary reward” (p. 12) that at times involved long hours working with the communities that needed help.

Kunowski and Thomson (1998) acknowledged that voluntary organisations were operational in the late 1800s. Policies structured for the poor were designed to suit European settlers and highlighted the support for charitable aid the communities gave to the needy in New Zealand. Thomson (1998) confined attention to Pakeha in New Zealand, saying “Māori had a quite separate history in these matters which will require a study of its own” (p. 3). The need for voluntary workers reflected the insufficient services available and pressure was placed on voluntary organisations to arrest the social problems, consequently, the voluntary

organisations pleaded to government for assistance. Hence, the state was under increasing pressure to attend to matters of social disruption.

### 4.3 The Evolving Welfare State in NZ

The role of the state, according to Cheyne et al. (2000) in the late 1880s was changing. New Zealand was faced with depression and to a larger extent social stress. “The abolition of the provincial system in 1876 led to centrally administered systems for education, public health, charitable aid, and mental health. The abolition of the provinces also had an enduring impact on the nature of local government” (p. 31). To this they add that:

Strong central government was paralleled by diffuse, weak, and fractionated local government with a dramatic proliferation of territorial and special-purpose authorities. While these often stressed economy and voluntarism over effectiveness, they created the infrastructure for a state-managed and largely state-funded system of welfare. Voluntary organisations also proliferated. Friendly societies and burial clubs provided rudimentary social insurance for many. By paying a weekly fee, members received free medical care, pensions, and unemployment relief. Members of religious orders taught in schools and ran foundling homes and orphanages. Charitable works provided an outlet for middle-class women to provide for the poor or for ‘fallen women’ (p. 31).

By the turn of the century, with traditional Māori communities in disarray, and newly urbanised Māori suffering from poverty and isolation, the state set about addressing its own ideas for Māori social problems. In 1900:

The Government blunted the challenge of the Kauhanganui and the Māori Parliament by establishing Māori Councils. The statute ensured the councils carried out state goals of political government and social hegemony by giving them low-level, non-political tasks. These included such matters as improving Māori health, *marae* sanitation, discouraging *tohunga*, and ensuring compliance with new building standards for meeting houses. After ten years, when it was deemed that the political

threat from chiefly leaders had receded, financial support was withdrawn and they became moribund (Walker, 1996, 82).

In 1903, government established Māori Councils to select “competent sanitary inspectors for native villages” (Durie, 1998) thus developing a role for Māori leaders. The role of:

Tribal leaders in health matters had been extended, and a new category of health worker emerged – Māori health inspectors and officers. Mostly male leaders in their own right, they were first generation Māori community health workers and reputedly played a major part in improving housing, sanitation, and water supplies. ... But their time as health workers was relatively short-lived. In 1909 there was a policy change and Māori health inspector positions were disestablished. Instead, district nurses were recruited to work in Māori communities ... Ironically, Māori health nurses were not encouraged to join the service. There were doubts that they could remain sufficiently objective in the face of demands from their own *Iwi*. Not only, therefore, had Māori health inspectors been removed but controversy raged as to the advantages, if any, of employing professional Māori nurses to work within Māori communities (p. 43).

Although the support from government towards Māori organisations was short lived, in part, through them Māori had acquired an understanding and limited assimilation of European values, organising patterns, and recognition in the Pakeha world. Māori were portrayed as lacking the ability to work with their people as independent health inspectors. The policy supported a belief that ‘Māori were not as good as Pakeha’ and provided a method to oppress Māori and keep society perceiving them as a Māori underclass. Poulsen and Johnston (1973) say, “the development of the welfare state occasioned much rethinking of public policy” (p. 151). The Department of Māori Affairs, according to them, applied a twofold policy involving the amalgamation of Māori land and the migration of Māori to urban areas so that from the 1930s to 1950s there was:

A very large redistribution of the Māori population within New Zealand. Rural areas, especially those of Northland and Eastland, have experienced considerable net losses, ... But the growing amount of family migration and the paternalistic attitude of the welfare state have resulted in large tracts of low-cost housing being provided for Māoris in the outer suburbs (pp. 172-173).

#### **4.3.1 The Welfare State in NZ**

According to Kunowski, “the Labour policy was that there should be no discrimination among New Zealanders in wages, labour laws, health measures, education or social security payments. The Government, therefore, did make an effort, particularly in the health area, to close the gap between the Māori and Pakeha” (p. 55). Government policy promoted uplifting Māori communities by providing funding through voluntary groups. The policies structured by government were designed to provide basic necessities, in this case money, employment, and sanitation. Māori voluntary organisations were funded to provide social services as New Zealand transformed into a welfare state.

The welfare state, according to Cheyne et al. (2000), assumed that “those in work would earn sufficient to provide for the support of their families” (p. 238). The depression in the 1930s was seen as the birth of the welfare state in which emerged:

An era imbued with the ideology of meritocracy, equal opportunity and national interest which obscured the continued class, race and gender bias of the economic and political structures. The mass media and state education system reinforced the universality of the conformist white, middle-class, two-parent, consumption-orientated family unit. Increased opportunities for education and for employment within the state service and industry helped to distance the working class children from their origins (Kelsey, 1990, 17).

Jones (1997) described the term ‘welfare state’ as “the many government strategies that effect income distribution and standards of living, especially, but

not entirely, for the lower income members of the society” (p. 4). He considered New Zealand had developed a unique welfare state. Most countries that were welfare states applied a ‘two tier governmental welfare system’. This system based the allocation of benefits on past work history, income, and a means test. Therefore, New Zealand allocated benefits on “a single tier system with a flat-rate of age benefits [and] has always been a strong underlying philosophy” (p. 5). He acknowledged Savage as launching New Zealand as a welfare state.

Thorns and Sedgwick (1997) contend that the welfare state was based on principles in which a large proportion of wages were taken from salary earners, “in order to provide certain services, which by definition are then extracted from the economic market place. The services at the consumer end are free, but they have in fact been paid through taxes and state monopolies” (p. 13).

The government continued to refashion the welfare state in the political reforms. In 1935 the Labour government restructured society by supporting domestic manufacturers and primary producers or as Dalziel (1999, 63) says ‘income stabilisation’, ‘industrial development’, ‘large-scale investment’ and ‘universal free care to specific social services’. Compulsory unionism was reinforced, organised labour forces were implemented and a moderate wage was traded off as a contribution towards welfare provisions. According to Thorns and Sedgwick (1997) this restructuring produced a “corporatist model of government which survived after Labour was defeated by National in 1949” (pp. 176-177). To this they add that the model consisted of a compromise: full employment and social welfare support for a cult of domesticity and a paternalistic attitude to Māori. Society was constructed around the Pakeha concept of ‘one nation’ (we are all one people perspective) and policies were constructed under this notion to benefit the general public. This Pakeha concept was supported by Labrum (2000) therefore:

Prosperity held out the promise of security, stability and the ‘New Zealand way of life’ for everyone. Not only had the family ‘triumphed’, but the post-war period was also the heyday of what Gael Ferguson aptly calls ‘the New Zealand Dream’: living in a family home in the suburbs. The attainment of this dream drove government policy throughout the 1950s

and 1960s. The dream was founded on the idea of the family as a ‘privatised collective identity based on the assumed mutuality of interests and the natural and essential source of effective ties and sense of belonging’. The normative, nuclear family was highly gendered, and comprised a working provider father and housewife mother who had ‘innate qualities of motherhood’ and played the ‘happy housewife consumer’ role (pp. 189-190).

The nuclear family was adopted as the standard norm to measure family benefits, wages, income tests, and other social measurements used to construct social policy. In this dream, Māori notions of *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* were quite invisible.

#### **4.3.2 The Welfare State, Voluntary Organisations, and Māori**

The social policies delivered by the Labour government provided resources for voluntary and community organisations to take care of the poor, ill health, and those who needed help. The voluntary sector welcomed a welfare state because together the state and community organisation strove for the same objective, a better life for the citizens and community enhancement. The major reforms Coney (1997) says:

Occurred with the passage of the Social Security Act at the end of the Great Depression of the 1930s, which had exposed the meagreness of state provision for those losing jobs. The role of the state progressively enlarged so that eventually New Zealanders were supported ‘from cradle to grave’. New Zealanders were proud of this state socialism, seeing themselves as leading the world in enlightened humanitarian provisions for citizens. .... New Zealand’s social security system aimed to ‘maintain and promote the health and general welfare of the community’. As well as benefits for those in particular need, such as widows or the unemployed, there were universal benefits for old people and for families (who could capitalise benefits to purchase houses), and a state health system. This programme was aimed at guaranteeing a decent standard of living for all (p. 19).

The universal welfare benefit, according to Labrum (2000) declined in value over the subsequent years. “Benefits declined as a proportion of national product, from 8.5 per cent in 1947 to 6.83 per cent by 1971” (p. 191). Since the benefits were insufficient to meet cost of living standards the “discretionary welfare services attempted to fill the gaps for many families” (p. 191). These discretionary services consisted of providing assistance such as food, blankets, money and rental assistance. The cost for these services was monitored and met by the government upon application and disclosure of certain information from the applicant.

The welfare state was established on the premise that New Zealand was a nation of one people and the nuclear family was the normality. *Tino rangatiratanga* was not represented in a welfare state because Māori sovereignty pursues a nation governed by two people, Māori and Pakeha. Māori objected to the notion of a one people nation because:

Welfarism was built on the myth of one people working together to distribute fairly the fruits of the nation’s prosperity – largely the products of exploitation of Crown resources such as land, waterways and forests acquired in violation of the treaty. The focus on the future divorced both Pakeha and Māori from the colonial past. Economic and legal realities forced Māori to urbanise, in many cases breaking the link with their *turangawaewae* and dispersing the *whānau* and *hapū*. Active assimilation demanded that Māori adopt the psyche and behaviour of the Pakeha, whilst the same society continued to discriminate against them for being Māori (Kelsey, 1990, 18-19).

The oppression in Māori communities rendered the people vulnerable so that the implementation of government assimilation policies was met with little resistance. Government handouts and support were appreciated in Māori communities that were struggling. The distressed state of many Māori communities welcomed the 1935 Labour Party welfare policies because it was an opportunity to uplift the communities from depression because a:



Monocultural state education sanitised the history, suppressed the language and rationalised Māori failure. It was a time of relative Māori political inaction. They were intent on surviving. When Labour gained power in 1935 it enjoyed extensive support from Māori who were grateful for Labour's welfare policies and dependent on the state economy. But it failed to implement its 1925 policy to appoint a royal commission on land claims and establish an autonomous Māori council. Its response to a Ratana petition was to place a copy of the Treaty of Waitangi (English Version) in every school. Despite this inaction, Māori political energies remained locked into the Ratana/Labour alliance. Advice tendered to the 1957 Labour government on the treaty suggested that no action be taken lest it 'may arouse the Māori elements to a level unacceptable to the public' (Kelsey, 1990, p. 19).

Land amalgamation and multiple-owned land placed many Māori land blocks in unattractive positions with regard to security for loans. Banks and loan companies rendered Māori land in this situation problematic because of the difficulties they would incur when making decisions over multiply owned land, or in locating someone accountable should matters arise that required immediate attention. The effects of urbanisation in the 1960s led to Māori in cities like Auckland living "either in deteriorating residential areas, or in recently-developed cheap housing (Rowland, 1973, 266-267). Māori who were unskilled or possessed very little finances landed themselves in low socio-economic areas of the cities. From 1935, the overall status of Māori life had not changed and families continued to live in poverty.

### **4.3.3 Māori Voluntary Work and World War II**

Voluntary work, over the early period of colonisation, involved Māori in the service of the Crown by supporting the suppression of resistant Māori as well as working towards a process of assimilation outside the military commitment, predominantly through Church, education, and health programmes. While the condition of Māori had been seriously eroded, World War II provided a new impetus for Māori claims to citizenship. Participation had changed from

supporting Europeans in the colonies in times of war against Māori allies to fighting for the acknowledgement of citizenship in New Zealand. Māori soldiers strove to be acknowledged and to prove to Europeans that Māori people were valuable and willing to hold their own in the war effort. Their contribution was perceived as a social obligation and the Māori people made themselves available for active service so they “petitioned the Government for the establishment of a Māori unit for active service: recruiting began for the 28<sup>th</sup> (Māori) Battalion on 9 October” (Clayton, 1990b, 27). According to Clayton the “unit served with distinction with the 2<sup>nd</sup> New Zealand Division in the Middle East [and in] Italy” (p. 27). Likewise, Walker (1990) contends that the Māori Battalion uplifted the status of Māori in the war, so:

When war broke out in 1939, Ngata and the other Māori members of Parliament persuaded the Government to establish a volunteer Māori unit, subsequently known as the 28<sup>th</sup> Māori Battalion. The valorous deeds of the battalion in the campaigns of North Africa and Italy did much to uplift Māori mana and enhance their sense of citizenship in the nation that emerged in the post-war years (p. 195).

In the wake of World War II, according to Durie (1994), tribal committees were formed to continue community work and address issues arising from wide-scale urbanisation. An independent Māori voice was:

Developing at a time when urbanization was reaching its peak. However, although the Māori Women’s Welfare League was born out of Māori enthusiasm and initiative, it was often perceived as a vehicle for supporting the aims of the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945 and too closely linked to the Department of Māori Affairs. The Department had certainly taken a leading role in the formative years and continued to maintain a watchful eye over its progress (p. 50).

Walker (1990) contends that in the post-war era Māori women led a struggle against the hegemony produced by Pakeha domination. He identified Te Puea as

a woman who encouraged Māori to move from the trauma of colonisation and develop ways to help their people, therefore:

Te Puea's leadership grew out of the tribal struggle of the Waikato people to recover their mana from the trauma of colonisation. She was followed by a new wave of Māori women, who, in 1951 established the first national Māori organisation, the Māori Women's Welfare League. ... With its foundation established, the league then undertook a survey of Māori housing needs in Auckland. The league's report of overcrowding, and insanitary slum conditions in which migrants were living, put pressure on the Māori Affairs Department to step up its housing programme (p. 202).

In 1951, the Māori Women's Welfare League was formed by the Department of Māori Affairs (Cheyne et al., 2000, 83). James (1977) argued that the Māori Women's Welfare League developed as a result of the success from the Māori war effort in World War II. From the Māori war effort came legal recognition by government in 1942 for Māori contributions towards voluntary activity. This legal recognition spirited Māori people to organise voluntary committees which kept the Māori people developing skills to contribute to the ongoing war and assist Māori people in need. Māori people adopted the philanthropic philosophies that incorporated voluntary activity and the Māori Women's Welfare League was a Māori organisation that initiated these social activities in Māori communities. The Māori women were:

Interested in educating mothers in health matters and mothercraft through a voluntary organisation based on 'self help' principles, did not envisage these activities being achieved through Pakeha voluntary associations such as church and women's groups. Although it may be argued that such groups were sufficiently interested in Māori social and economic advancement (in European terms), these associations were part of the Pakeha institutional framework and could not hope to appeal to most Māori women (p. 19).

James' discussions on the Māori Women's Welfare League exposed the struggle for Māori people to work within the concept of voluntary activity. The struggles are evident in the following areas:

- Māori had to prove themselves in war before the government legally recognised their voluntary war efforts;
- Māori organised voluntary groups to continue formal recognition of their contribution to the war and New Zealand society;
- Māori voluntary organisations were associated with Pakeha institutional frameworks.

Māori voluntary organisations struggled to implement Māori cultural ways in an environment that was designed for Pakeha institutions. The results of the struggles produced what James calls a dual framework. It is a framework that contains aspects of Pakeha and Māori structures as well as a dual system of values.

#### **4.3.4 Developing Māori Voluntary Groups from 1970 onwards**

The strength of voluntary membership for Māori organisations and the focus on political issues developed into organised protest led by Māori. In 1971 Ngā Tamatoa were calling for a commitment from government to the Treaty of Waitangi (Walker, 1990, 211). The 1975 Land March led by Dame Whina Cooper began from Te Hapūa at the top of the North Island (Thorns & Sedgwick, 1997, 177). People numbering over a thousand and composed of Māori and non-Māori marched to Wellington in protest to present government with a petition against the Crown's management of Māori land. The 1979 occupation at Bastion Point was a protest against the Crown for historically abusing Māori land owners and failing to compensate them or return their land. Although protesters were forced by military police to move off the land the seed for an uprising was planted and cries for retribution – over issues surrounding the Crown's breach were heard. By the 1970s, the Treaty of Waitangi issues were brought to the fore, and Māori were pursuing notions of sovereignty on a grand scale. The products of these

protests led to the government enforcing the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 and subsequently the creation of a Waitangi Tribunal. The backbone to the organised protests and collective participation was built on voluntary and unpaid work.

The changing of governments and continuous policy restructuring caused divisions amongst Māori communities. From these divisions emerged new social organisations and political actions to challenge government authority over Māori. Although a century and a half of colonisation had produced divisions and confusion within Māori society\*

Sufficient traditional political structures and ideology had survived to provide a basis for Māori political organisation, operating outside the colonial state. In this sense, the Māori movement was qualitatively different from women's, peace, environmental and other social movements which attempted to establish themselves as political forces in the 1970s and 1980s (Kelsey, 1993, 233).

During the 1970s and 1980s Māori women and Māori men united in the struggle to retain land and fought to have the Treaty of Waitangi honoured and acknowledged by the government. The approach to their struggle was holistic in that it took into account traditional political structures and ideology, the social imposition of Māori, the political problems with the government in achieving sovereignty, and lack of economic resources available to assist them. Much of the drive to forward the Māori movement was embedded in passion and voluntary work.

Levine (2001) states that for "140 years after the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, as Māori developed into a 'fourth world' people in New Zealand, Te Tiriti was largely ignored by successive New Zealand administrations" (p. 162). Consequently, treaties were:

Considered to be agreements between sovereign powers, prevailing legal opinion held that, once Māori became incorporated into the Empire, Te

Tiriti o Waitangi bestowed no rights to them above and beyond those of ordinary citizenship. However, in the 1980s, as a result of complex political bargaining and an actively protesting, growing and overwhelmingly urban Māori population ... New Zealand governments began to address Māori grievances and aspirations by implementing a policy of biculturalism (pp. 162-163).

From 1975 to 1984 New Zealand was led by a National government under Sir Robert Muldoon. He “introduced a universal taxpayer-funded superannuation scheme” (Dalziel, 1999, 64), the ‘Think Big’ project and “generally expansive fiscal and monetary policies” (p. 64). Although National tried to keep the economy stable by subsidies and borrowing:

Huge investments were made in major energy self-sufficiency projects in the hope of developing an alternative source of economic advantage. Instead, the ‘Think Big’ strategy added to the debt burden and produced few short-term gains. Unemployment and inflation continued to rise. From less than 3000 registered unemployed in 1975 the figure reached almost 21,000 by 1980 (Kelsey, 1993, 15).

Walker (1990), Kelsey (1993), Thorns and Sedgwick (1997), describe the movements of Māori political associations which comprised voluntary associations. These organisations used their strength of unity to protest against the injustices Māori experienced at the hands of consecutive governments. Levine (2001) reinforced the notion that biculturalism was entrenched in New Zealand. Dalziel (1999) and Kelsey (1993) showed that the policies of government created social problems across New Zealand.

#### **4.4 Concluding Comments**

The intention of this chapter was to provide evidence that during the development of New Zealand as a Colonial State, Liberal State, and Welfare State, Māori volunteerism emerged. From the provision of social security within the framework of traditional culture, through the early encounter with settlers who

performed voluntary and unpaid work, Māori were often, forced, coerced, and educated in voluntary activity.

The chapter showed that it was difficult to identify circumstances from the 1800s to the 1900s where Māori groups were documented as participating in voluntary activity. A problem I encountered reading the developments that occurred in Māori society, during the Colonial State and Liberal State, was the insufficient literature that identified whether voluntary work was motivated by a voluntary nature or social obligation. In the writings of Kunowski (1988) Māori volunteerism was given a brief acknowledgement when discussing attempts by the Māori Women's Welfare League to address social problems. Information pertaining to Māori volunteerism was encapsulated in literature describing voluntary activity in *marae* organisations and Māori service providers. This information was insufficient and failed to articulate whether the activity was voluntary or a social obligation. Writers such as Salmond (1975) and Durie (1998) described *marae* organisations without highlighting whether work performed on the *marae* was voluntary in the sense of reciprocity or social obligation that differed from the voluntary Pakeha concept of freewill.

When the chapter identified circumstances in the early 1900s whereby Māori voluntary activity was formalised, a clearer understanding of the relationship of Māori to voluntary work evolved. The state attempted to reproduce the culture of kinship exercised in Māori communities by creating Māori councils and Māori organisations to deliver social services. In doing so the state transferred responsibility to maintain the rights of citizenship (as outlined in the Treaty of Waitangi Article III), to Māori. I propose the state resisted adequately resourcing Māori councils and Māori organisations especially when these organisations were not engaging in activities that support ongoing colonisation and assimilation. This resistance, coupled with the failure from the state to fully document a history of Māori volunteerism, I argue was a way to suppress the information about this activity so Māori volunteerism would not be widely known.

I argue that evidence from some historical reports on Māori unpaid work and voluntary activity showed that Māori were used as a commodity to produce

unpaid labour and conditioned into believing they were of an underclass. Therefore, when historical documentation is made available that describes the development of how Māori voluntary work was both ignored in the records, but recruited and exploited for mostly assimilationist purposes, the consciousness of Aotearoa/NZ society may be alerted. In line with my theories on consciousness raising it is imperative to investigate the relationship government had with Māori voluntary organisations. I explore this relationship between government and Māori voluntary organisations further in the next chapter.



## Chapter Five: Volunteerism in NZ: The Neo-Liberal State

*“Ki ngā whakaeke haumi.”*

*“Ally yourself with those who have already banded together”*

*(Brougham, Reed & Kāretu, 1999, 134).*

### 5.0 Introduction

This chapter describes developments that emerged during the Neo-Liberal State and the relationship to voluntary organisations and Māori communities. It is divided into five sections where the first section describes common values in voluntary organisations (5.1). Section two introduces the characteristics of Māori voluntary organisations (5.2) and section three discusses The New Right Policies (5.3). The policies describing a Third Way (5.4) are explored in section four and the chapter concludes in section five (5.5).

### 5.1 Voluntary Organisations and Common Values

Lissner’s (1977) description of “voluntary agency” is another form of voluntary organisation. Voluntary agencies in organisational language, according to him were treated as a class of international non-governmental organisations, therefore:

A voluntary agency [was] a non-governmental, autonomous, non-profit organization, supported mainly by voluntary contributions in cash and kind from the general public, or certain segments thereof, in the high-income countries, specialised to carry out a number of functions related to development aid and emergency relief primarily but not exclusively in the low-income countries (p. 23).

An important issue raised by Lissner is the notion of autonomy and its relationship to voluntary organizations. He says, “an organization cannot be called autonomous or ‘voluntary’, if it depends to any significant degree on public funds and if representatives of public authorities have decisive influence on its policies” (pp. 23-24). He argues organisations that depend on public funds for over fifty percent of their administration are ‘quasi voluntary agencies’ and identifies the Peace Corps in the United States as an example. To him there are

two types of voluntary agencies: stand alone agencies with their own constitution, for example OXFAM; specialised service arms of larger organisations, for example trade unions, churches, and student organisations. Banton & Sills (1968) defined a voluntary organisation as “an organized group of persons (1) that is formed in order to further some common interest of its members (2) in which membership is voluntary and (3) that exists independent of the state” (pp. 362-363).

Crampton, Woodward, and Dowell (2001) state that “to be classed as a voluntary body an organisation must have a constitutional or formal set of rules, be independent of government and self-governing” (p. 3). To this they add that the voluntary body must be a non-profit body and non-business, “and have a meaningful degree of voluntarism in terms of money or time through philanthropy or voluntary citizen involvement” (p. 3).

The term ‘voluntary organisations’ when associated with community organisations appeared to contain different characteristics. According to the Ministry of Social Policy (2001) a voluntary organisation differs from the:

More general term ‘community organisations’ in that it carries the idea of ‘charity’ – serving or caring for those ‘other’, and usually less fortunate, than oneself. This understanding of ‘voluntary’ is a strong aspect of the large number of faith-based organisations that characterise the sector in New Zealand (p. 19).

Smithie (2001) suggests there are four types of volunteer activity. These activities are (1) delineated according to a final outcome or final purpose criterion, (2) mutual aid or self-help, (3) philanthropy or service to others, (4) participation and advocacy or campaigning. Cultural attributes of volunteering are also noted by Smithie who argues:

The nature of volunteering will include the economic, social and political make up of the country and its stage of development. ... In contrast industrialized countries typically will exhibit more formal volunteering

structures with a greater emphasis on philanthropic forms of activity. This is not to imply that the developed world is richer in volunteering than the developing world. Rather that the form volunteering takes is conditioned by the society in which it is based (p. 3).

The common themes that came from definitions of community voluntary organisation in the literature review were:

- The organisation consisted of more than one person, possibly four or more,
- Membership was perceived as ‘voluntary’,
- Members could expect to receive no income,
- A common interest brought the people together.

The common values shared by voluntary organisations, interested in social service delivery were:

- Independence (freedom of association),
- Altruism and philanthropy (devoted to doing good for people),
- Common belief (positive or negative),
- Co-operation and interdependence (collective action),
- Reciprocity (receiving something for services),
- Obligation (duty),
- Unpaid (no monetary remuneration).

The word ‘voluntary’, referred to as the “lack of coercion or ‘acting from one’s own free will’” (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001b, 21), had different meanings to different people. People in society, whether it be at the time of Aristotle or today, are forced, coerced, educated, manipulated, indoctrinated, or respond to environmental factors that cause them to act in certain ways that might appear ‘free’ but may be analysed to show pressure of some kind. My use of Gramsci’s notion of hegemonic control is just one example, in the case of voluntary organisations, I am interested in the extent to which the participation in them and the direction of their *kaupapa* is ‘free’ – that is uncoerced and reflects Māori culture.

When forming organisations to deliver a service that is unpaid the loss of autonomy occurs upon the acceptance of the work and should the organisation require government support it concedes control. Lissner (1977) says:

Voluntary agencies seeking government support in cash or kind usually have to submit to some kind of “quality control”. In some countries there are rather strict admission procedures; e.g. in the United States the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Aid within the U.S. State Department maintains a “register” which “constitutes the authoritative listing of those organisations entitled to apply for statutorily authorized subventions (ocean transportation reimbursement, donated foods, excess property) (p. 90).

The main point in this section is that there is a wide ranging debate about how voluntary organisations are to be defined in the contemporary context. Of interest also to this thesis, is the extent to which these organisations and their volunteers can be coerced to meet the aspirations of others.

### **5.1.1 The Relationship between Government and Voluntary Organisations**

Lissner (1977) argued that those involved with voluntary activity encounter one common traumatic experience, feeling subservient. Voluntary agencies’ policy-makers and staff members according to him, that share a relationship with governmental organisations have had feelings of an ‘inferiority complex’ and this complex was based:

On two factors in particular: (i) the fact that voluntary agencies wield less financial and organizational power and do not have the authority and status of governmental and intergovernmental bodies; and (ii) the fact that – for valid and less valid reasons – many people still identify voluntary agencies with the “old” image of charitable organizations ... an agency that has been co-opted by the government no longer has that degree of freedom. It may be able to level marginal criticism against the governmental partner but is effectively barred from raising fundamental questions (p. 108).

Lissner (1977) identified that voluntary organisations that are co-opted by government lose a degree of freedom. Also, government policy had the ability to change how an organisation was structured. Organisations that required government support to deliver social services and use voluntary workers to supplement the lack of resources were vulnerable. This vulnerability resulted in an organisation modifying structures and practices to please government.

Smithies (2001) argued organisations that contract their services to government get less than what is needed to fulfil their task. In New Zealand it is common for voluntary organisations to rely on government funding to provide social services and in some areas over fifty percent of these organisations' main income is from government:

On an individual level, government funding (for those organisations in receipt of any government funds) tends to only cover part of the cost of providing the service contracted for. Ernst and Young (1996) reported that, for most of the services contracted by the New Zealand Community Funding Agency, the contract provided for around 40-55% of the service cost. While government does tend to be the only single source of substantial funding packages for many organisations much funding comes from a range of private sources. A study of Palmerston North voluntary social service organisations found that 67% of organisations were at least half funded by government or had government as their main funding source, that the number of sources ranged from 1 to 10, averaging at 6, and that between 45% and 60% of organisations received donations of services, donations in-kind, and free or nominal use of facilities (p. 24).

When relating the comments from Lissner (1977) and Smithie (2001) to voluntary organisations in New Zealand they showed that government could change and restructure voluntary organisations whose main source of income was government funding.

By the closing of the twentieth century Labour politicians believed that the government needed to work with the community and acknowledge the value of volunteer work. Mackey (1999), the Member for Parliament in the Mahia Electorate, discussed the importance of the voluntary work, she considered:

The voluntary sector [as] an essential component of society and an independent and diverse voluntary and community sector is fundamental to the wellbeing of society. However, Labour recognises that currently many within the community sector are facing burnout, and are unhappy about funding arrangements, are over-stretched and feel undervalued. The current Government does not recognise and seems unable to address the real problems identified by the community (p. 1).

## **5.2 Values and Characteristics in Māori Voluntary Organisations**

The term volunteering according to Wilson (2001) is a class and culturally-based concept. It has interwoven notions of an activity performed by people as a leisurely activity. This activity was set on the foundations of European principles, thus:

The term 'volunteering' is frequently associated with formal social service volunteering and the 'middle-class, middle-aged' stereotype. However, people in lower socio-economic groups and unemployed, for example, often volunteer outside the structures of traditional formal volunteering. In addition, while there are high levels of volunteering amongst Māori, a literature review focussing on volunteering within voluntary social service organisations will not capture all the dynamics of, and changes in, Māori volunteering. Further research is needed to explore the extent and range of voluntary activities amongst Māori and Pacific peoples (p. 6).

Robinson and Williams (2001) identify the connection between cultures and voluntary associations. They say that different cultures can have different forms of voluntary activity and, in particular, different voluntary organisations because:

There is not necessarily a direct link between the idea of voluntary association (as an activity) and that of voluntary organisations or

associations (as a structural form). The rules or laws affecting the venues and spaces within which voluntary activity takes place reflect the norms and values of the dominant culture and this may become imposed on all other cultures and communities within that society. For example, Māori generally express their voluntary activity through the family and tribal networks, then they will establish forms of association accordingly. These may or may not comply with the rules (legislation) set out by the dominant (European) culture. In this case, the area where these structures are developed and maintained is likely to become a battleground between Māori values and the “enabling” environment or laws imposed on them (p. 67).

To establish the characteristics of a Māori voluntary organisation requires an investigation into the culture that distinguishes Māori from mainstream organisations. Barnett’s (1996) perspective of Māori people and their relationship to voluntary work highlights the positive characteristics. Like the Ministry of Social Policy, Barnett says in Māori culture there is no single concept of ‘volunteer’ or ‘voluntary work’. Māori volunteerism described by Barnett is a combination of the following three distinct concepts: *Aroha* – love in the sense of the Greek word *agape*, implying universal and total love; *Poha* – duty; and *Tikanga* – justice (p. 61).

The interpretation of *poha* given by Barnett as duty differs from Williams (1992) who defines *poha* as full. The different meanings of *poha* are dependent on the person defining or interpreting the word. Barnett describes *poha* as duty, William’s definition for *poha* is full and both interpretations are different to Māori people on the East Coast of New Zealand. A participant in the community research, 80 years of age (detailed in Chapter Seven), said “*poha* is when you open up a *kina*” (7/8/02) and did not refer to voluntary activity.

The Ministry of Social Policy (2001b) suggested Māori voluntary work was based on the following principles:

- *Tika* – that which is right and proper,

- *Pono* – having integrity,
- *Aroha* – having compassion,
- *Manaakitanga* – the implementation of *aroha*, caring for each other (p. 20).

Barnett and the Ministry of Social Policy acknowledge *aroha* as a value incorporated in Māori voluntary work. Barnett's concepts are related to the concept of *wairua*, which he interprets to be collective dimensions comprising the little bit of each of us which belongs to all of us. He suggests *wairua* to be:

The acceptance of common and community interest. It is that *wairua*, or connectedness, which is the driving force for us to engage in volunteering. These concepts reach the heart of volunteering – dry definitions may well be required so that we know what we are talking about, but volunteering can more expressively be described as the glue of community (p. 9).

The definitions of *Tikanga* are:

- 1) Rule, plan, method
- 2) Custom, habit
- 3) Anything normal or usual
- 4) Reason
- 5) Meaning, purport
- 6) Authority, control
- 7) Correct, right (Williams, 1992, 416-417).

The concepts described by Barnett and defined by Williams are an elaboration of the idea when trying to understand a Māori interpretation of volunteer. Volunteer defined by Ryan (1994, 207) and Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (1996, 139) is *Kaituao*. Ngata (1993) defines volunteer as *tuao* and adds, “all the soldiers of the Māori Battalion were volunteers” (p. 523).



Stokes (1978) described the difficulties for Māori committees made up of voluntary workers. Volunteers endured heavy workloads and often performed more than one service, hence:

Māori Committee members were honorary community officers and unpaid. It was acknowledged that voluntary services were necessary and performed a role which could not be filled by officers in public service because such people were usually closer to the local community than officialdom (p. 42).

When the New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Organisations (NZFVO) and Voluntary Welfare Agency Training Board (VWATB) (1987) held a seminar on biculturalism for voluntary participation, Māori volunteers present voiced strong views on voluntary activity. It was identified that:

Many voluntary organisations have been created for Pakeha needs. If a *whānau* is strong enough not to use their services, that is admirable. Māori children should not be taken out of their own place. But Māori groups need access to resources through our organisations. The crucial question is therefore, who has power over the resources and how do Māori get access to that money? Most of the money to be shared comes from Pakeha society because that's where all the money is. Pakeha groups are very adept at applying for money, because they felt comfortable about going to the co-ordinators (p. 10).

The comments raised by NZFVO and VWATB (1987) highlighted the difficulties for Māori voluntary organisations that relied on government funding to deliver social services. Hence they received less resources than non-Māori voluntary organisations. Pakeha voluntary organisations were described as better equipped to apply for funding and therefore resourced accordingly because they knew where and how to access resources.

The Ministry of Social Policy (2000) claimed Māori participated in higher levels of unpaid work than non-Māori and highlighted that:

Women are more likely than men to spend time caring for people outside their household and providing services, whereas men and women spend similar amounts of time on unpaid administration for organisations. People who received income-tested benefits spend more time on unpaid work than other people, as do people who are not in full-time work. Māori are more likely than non-Māori to undertake unpaid work outside their home and on average spend more time on it ... Māori have higher rates of involvement than non-Māori in sports clubs and cultural organisations. Nearly one in four Māori belonged to a cultural organisation (p. 89).

In 2000, the New Zealand government launched a group of advisors to report on voluntary activity in the communities. The role of the advisors was to listen to the concerns raised by the volunteer sector of society and report on their findings. The Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party completed a report during April 2001 (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001b). For Māori, the report by the Ministry of Social Policy showed that Māori voluntary organisations could not be defined or compartmentalised. The concepts of Māori volunteerism were diverse and government needed to be cautious when talking to “Māori, community and voluntary organisations not to presume that these constitute a coherent grouping with a single voice. Clearly, ‘one size fits all’ approaches do not accommodate the diversity and pluralism that are the strengths of the community sector” (p. 18). The Ministry of Social Policy (2001b) took up the argument that there is no equivalent definition for voluntary in the context of Māori culture:

This is likely to be a significant factor in Māori consistently under-reporting their ‘voluntary’ contribution in census and other research. Working together for the benefit of *whānau*, *hapū* and *iwi* is a concept intrinsic to *ngā tikanga* Māori, and not considered ‘voluntary’ in the sense of ‘self-chosen’ or ‘serving others’. Providing care and assistance is simply the way it is – “you know your place and you do your bit”. The *whānau*, *hapū* and *iwi* must be cared for, the work done (p. 20).

### 5.2.1 Māori Voluntary Organisations from 1980 Onwards

From the 1980s, Māori began asserting increased insistence on designing and delivering services based on their own cultural values. Particularly successful were those organisations intent on raising the *mana* of the people through language and revitalisation. The:

Establishment of *kōhanga reo*, total immersion Māori language preschool programmes, was a proactive Māori response to the imminent death of Māori language which had been brought about by educational policy. The first *kōhanga reo* was established in 1982, and by 1990 there were over 600 throughout the country. Significantly, while *kōhanga* now receive some government funding through the National *Kōhanga Reo* Trust, they operated for many years completely outside the state system. They were self-funded and based largely on the unpaid work of Māori women. Consequently, *Kōhanga Reo* represent a powerful practical expression of self-determination, one which Māori are unlikely to give up in return for the limited state funding which is now available (Mikaere, 2000, 20).

Despite decades of hegemonic pressures associated with the assimilation practices of colonisation some values exercised in traditional communities were retained by Māori and were ready to be revived in a contemporary society building on the activism arising from the 1970s. The motivation by Māori people to contribute to *iwi* and *hapū* life was best understood in European culture as volunteering.

Discussions by the Department of Industries and Commerce (1967), Love (1994), Te Puni Kōkiri (1996), and Durie (1998) on the social problem of Māori communities throughout New Zealand highlight a common cause to Māori underdevelopment to be the ‘lack’ of finance, education, human resources, health, and housing. This insufficiency produces a flow-on effect that begins in one area and flows on to the next; for example if Māori suffer a lack of finance this leads to poor housing and ill health (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1996, 92). Any attempts to formulate methods of achieving parity with non-Māori need to start at the bottom of society. Māori are over represented in New Zealand Income Support as beneficiaries to the state’s social systems (Durie, 1998b, 92-98).

Responses to the unenviable status of Māori are prolific in state and voluntary organisations. In the voluntary sector, these organisations may be ‘mainstream’ with no real distinction made on the basis of race or they may be mainstream organisations with a focus on Māori clients perhaps serviced by Māori. They may be Māori organisations set up to serve Māori clientele such as *whānau* organisations. Even with Māori driven organisations there is a wide variety of approaches – ranging from providing service delivery for the state to pro-active, autonomous organisations seeking *te tino rangatiratanga*.

### 5.2.2 The *Whānau* as a Māori Voluntary Organisation

In modern times, according to Durie (2001), *whānau* can be used to describe groups who do not *whakapapa* to the same tribe but share a common mission such as a *kōhanga whānau*, a *whānau* support group, and teammates. Even though:

There are no blood ties, the group acts towards each other as if they were bound by similar codes of loyalty and mutuality. In other words, the metaphor of the *whānau* is used to highlight the group’s common interest in their commitment to a single cause as well as to each other. Metaphorical *whānau* developed after the disruptions caused by urbanisation (post-World War II), when many Māori were isolated from kinship *whānau* yet felt the need for closeness and support. Māori community organisations such as *kōhanga reo* (Māori language kindergartens) and cultural clubs often describe themselves as *whānau* and employ *whānau* processes to guide their relationship. In contrast to *whakapapa whānau*, there is a greater degree of flexibility towards entering the *whānau* and then exiting when the voluntary association is no longer useful. Processes that underpin *whānau* interaction constitute *whānaungatanga* and have been used to formulate a model for education (p. 192).

In Mulgan’s (1989) discussions on voluntary associations he states “other groups to which Pakeha belong may be more like the typical association of the rational choice model, a purely voluntary association entered into solely for reasons of

personal interest” (p. 71). Mulgan identifies trade and professional associations as organisations of choice for personal gain in which people leave when it no longer is beneficial to them:

These organisations are different from other voluntary associations such as churches, sports groups, service clubs, towards which individual members feel a strong sense of loyalty and personal identity. If one is looking to define the contrast between the Pakeha and the traditional Māori social activity, it is not so much in the attitude of persons towards social groups to which they belong, as in the number of such groups. In Māori society of pre-European times almost all individual needs were met within the *whānau*. Even today, the Māori family takes on a much wider role than the Pakeha family (p. 71).

Another description of Māori voluntary organisations has been encapsulated in the concept of *whakawhānaungatanga*. Māori social provision within the framework of *whānaungatanga* has relied heavily on voluntary contributions (Ministry of Social Policy, 1987, 718) and acknowledged internationally:

In Ghana, a volunteer is a *nwoboa*. And in a recent visit to New Zealand I learned that a central principle to Māori culture is *whānaungatanga* – a commitment to others in a sense of the interconnectedness of people and communities. I believe that the contribution of volunteerism in creating and enhancing economic and social capital is one of the best kept secrets of the modern world. Volunteerism remains largely undervalued and overlooked as a positive force for social development (Capeling-Alakija, 2000, 2).

Mulgan (1989), Durie (2001), and the Ministry of Social Policy (2001b) related Māori voluntary organisations to the *whānau*. These organisations took care of the individual needs in families. Capeling-Alakija (2000) linked the Māori concept of *whānaungatanga* to Māori volunteerism.

Smithies' (2001) discussions on basic information on volunteer organisations in New Zealand indicated that many Māori voluntary organisations were not included in the figures compiled by the Ministry of Commerce to identify charitable trusts in New Zealand, accordingly:

The Ministry of Commerce figures from 1998 indicated that there were about 22,500 incorporated societies and 9,000 charitable trusts in New Zealand, with approximately 60 more being created each week ... However, data did not include organisations established under the Māori Trust Boards Act, Māori Community Development Act, Te Ture Whenua Act, or bodies such as Boards of Trustees. Further, the data did not include any community organisations that were not legal entities. Te Korowai Aroha Aotearoa Inc et al. seek to give some appreciation of the number of organisations thus excluded by pointing out that around three-quarters of *marae* who responded to a recent survey were administered under Te Ture Whenua Act and so would not be included in Ministry of Commerce data (pp. 23-24).

### **5.3 The New Right Policies**

Preston (1996) stated that during the 1980s those experimenting with the New Right policies failed in the United States of America, United Kingdom, and Australia. The experimentation “produced unemployment, reductions in general welfare, declining manufacturing production, and mountains of debt” (p. 62). To this Preston adds “in development theory circles the work of the New Right, in particular as it has been vehicled through the IMF and World Bank, has been regarded as less than helpful” (p. 62).

In 1984, David Lange led the fourth Labour government to an election victory. Kelsey (1993) and Dalziel (1999) comment that MP Roger Douglas forwarded an Economic Policy Package that removed the state from the economy. The package contained various changes including decreases in funding to the social security system. The Roger Douglas package invoked debate inside the Labour caucus because “the Party’s policy council were asked to reverse their historical and organic relationship with the interventionist welfare state and support the Douglas

programme” (Kelsey, 1993, 18). Treasury were not supporting a welfare state and were taking steps to “reorganise and gradually undermine, the welfare state” (p. 76). Treasury in 1987 achieved its desired objective by appealing to the individuals in government and communities with notions such as the individual’s right to choose, freedom, and liberty. Their notion gave rise to the notions of Free Market and New Right, therefore:

1984 saw the dawning of the Free Market over Aotearoa/New Zealand. The interventionist welfare state, we were told, had taken away our freedom as New Zealanders to choose our own priorities, and to control our lives. First Labour, then National promised to reinstate that freedom. ... Market-based policies became the norm, not because they were desirable, but because they were apparently inevitable (p. 9).

The New Right policies allowed the state to remove itself as caretaker for the welfare of the citizens. The philosophy of New Right Policies according to King (1987) were that:

New Right advocates seek not only to revive the role of market mechanisms and to end collective state policy but also to dismantle the citizenship rights established during the last two centuries. ‘Citizen rights’ refer to the civil, political and social rights established under the impetus of economic development in advanced industrial societies and the extent to which they are available to all members of such societies (p. 3).

According to Coney (1997) the New Right “claimed that private welfare would provide the benefits that they believed philanthropy had produced in the nineteenth century”. To this she adds that elements of “voluntarism and choice” were introduced and that the:

Private-sector benefactors could use their discretion in distributing assistance as opposed to the compulsion on taxpayers to fund welfare. Private welfare was favoured because it brought the dispenser of charity into much closer contact with the recipients than could be achieved

through the remote bureaucracy of a state department. This provided opportunities for intimate policing of the attitudes and behaviour of beneficiaries, and the chance to make welfare ‘dependency’ a thoroughly unattractive prospect (p. 16).

King (1987), Kelsey (1993), Preston (1996), Coney (1997) and Dalziel (1999) discuss the policies designed to implement concepts of the New Right. Preston states these policies increased unemployment and failed to help social problems in societies. Kelsey and Dalziel describe how the Labour Party moved away from their policies on social democracy to implement policies of freedom of choice for the individual. King describes how the policies placed the rights of the market before the rights of citizens. Coney alludes to the unattractive position in society for those dependent on social welfare.

### **5.3.1 New Right Policies Create Hegemony**

Kelsey (1993) says “between 1987 and 1990 the welfare state was undermined by a piecemeal erosion, rather than wholesale demolition” (p. 82). The government continued support towards health, education, and housing with decreasing funding and other social services were approached with less conviction.

At that time beneficiaries became the target of much criticism. In communities across New Zealand media, welfare departments, government agencies, and individual citizens promoted that being dependent on the state as a beneficiary was shameful. Beneficiaries were stereotyped into a class below the lower working class, lazy, and undeserving of state support. The National government began to decrease social welfare benefit payments to beneficiaries and the:

Stand-down period for unemployed people who had quit their jobs voluntarily, or would not take jobs offered, was increased from six weeks to six months. People were deemed ‘voluntarily unemployed’ if they refused two job offers, or failed to attend an arranged job interview. ... For those affected that meant a drop of 24.7 per cent, from \$143 to \$108 a week. Social Welfare Minister Jenny Shipley reasoned that ‘generally younger single people are competing for jobs which attract lower wages



and they generally have more ability to change their circumstances'. .... The package predictably drew flak from welfare organisations, some economists and social workers, who promptly labelled it 'social warfare' (pp. 82-83).

Kelsey described how government encouraged people in New Zealand to shun those receiving welfare benefits. In effect it created a belief that those dependent on social welfare benefits were lazy and government was justified in decreasing support provided for beneficiaries.

### **5.3.2 The Impact of New Right Policies on Māori**

Mulgan (1989) argued that social democracy in Aotearoa-New Zealand was more relevant than liberal democracy. "Through most of our history, political values and attitudes have been more towards the social rather than the liberal end of the democratic spectrum" (p. 67). According to Mulgan the government was seen as a major source of economic development and assistance during early settlement. "The Liberal Government of 1891-1912 and the Labour Government of 1935-1949 each significantly extended the role of the state in economic and social policy. Most of their innovations were accepted and built on by the more conservative governments" (p. 67). Also, New Right policies represented a shift towards government releasing their social responsibility and:

Only since the election of the fourth Labour government in 1984 and its conversion to the virtues of the free market has there been a radical break with the interventionist tradition. Politicians from both political parties now argue that the role of government should be severely reduced and that the market, based on individuals' personal resources and choices, should be given much greater control in deciding the country's direction (p. 67).

Kelsey's (1990) discussions on the 1984 Hui Taumata Māori Economic Summit Conference, held at Parliament, in October 1984, contend that the "state goals of the *hui* were a variation on the economic summit theme – to reach an understanding of the nature and extent of problems facing Māori; examine strengths and weaknesses of Māori in the current position" (p. 35). The focus was

to “discuss key policy issues and seek endorsement of policies leading to truly equal status in economic and social life of New Zealand; and obtain the participants’ commitment to help and co-operate in dealing with difficulties facing Māori” (p. 39). She says that at a non-commercial level:

A series of Māori review committees from 1985 onwards sought ways to restructure the department, often as a corporation, to meet Māori economic and social needs more efficiently and effectively and as defined by Māori. But they were swimming against the tide as Treasury and the State Services Commission subsumed Māori Affairs in its general devolution programme, aiming to reduce the department to a small residual policy ministry. ... On 24 June 1987 Lange and Wetere claiming support from the Hui Taumata, announced ‘a progressive transfer of responsibilities for management of government programmes to *iwi*’. According to Wetere, the department would be reshaped and become the Ministry of Māori Development. Devolution would ‘fulfil the guarantee of *rangatiratanga* in the treaty’. Labour’s approach to devolution reflected a miscalculation which Labour would make repeatedly over the five years from 1984 – the belief that it could dictate the form and the pace of change. Government could, and did, deny Māori the resources to achieve the goal. But they could not make the goal itself disappear (p. 41).

Poata-Smith (1996) stated “the Labour government had assumed that by the introduction of the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act in 1985, the state could somehow take control of the direction of Treaty issues and shape the nature of Māori demands” (p. 108). The introduction of the Waitangi Tribunal provided the opportunity for Māori to seek redress for historical injustices so that:

From 1985, *iwi* and *hapū* diverted time, energy and meagre resources into researching and presenting claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and the judicial system. However, it quickly became apparent that the Tribunal was a body without ‘teeth’, restricted to making recommendations on particular claims upon which governments were under no obligation to act. As the demands for political and economic self-determination became

more strident, a contradiction quickly emerged between the economic programme of market liberalisation and the treaty settlement policy (see Kelsey, 1990; 1993). The fourth Labour government's Māori policy was motivated by an overriding objective of reducing government expenditure at a time of economic fiscal crisis (p. 108).

Mulgan (1989) discusses how the New Right policies allowed government to relinquish social responsibility. Kelsey (1993) described the establishment of Māori committees to manage government programmes so that government were able to transfer responsibility to tribal authorities. Poata-Smith (1996) shows that Māori pushed forward to pursue treaty rights by using the Waitangi Tribunal. The government created the Waitangi Tribunal to take care of treaty grievances and provided it with insufficient resources to obstruct the process of dealing with claims.

### **5.3.3 Voluntary Organisations Suffer under New Right Policies**

Wilson's (2001) concepts on contract culture and volunteering stated that the economic and social reforms in New Zealand produced a restructuring of social services. Subsequently, the purchase-of-service contracting had introduced contracting to a range of social service "provisions by voluntary organisations and [had] caused a shift in the organisational structure and priorities of many voluntary organisations with the adoption of increasingly bureaucratic and professional practices" (pp. 6-7). As a consequence, organisations unable to secure contracts worked under duress.

Under the commitment to neo-liberalism, from 1984, decreases in government funding towards community driven initiatives and the decline in money for social welfare beneficiaries hit the heart of the voluntary sector. Poor people became poorer and the need for voluntary services soared. "Government spending for 'low priority' areas such as community grants and training programmes and Māori development was cut, affecting more than one hundred organisations" (Kelsey, 1993, p. 83). This meant that voluntary organisations servicing poor communities were in demand, especially Māori communities.

Simpson (1993) argued that research into the effects of current policy on voluntary organisations was needed so that the individual could understand what policy-making meant at a government level. To this Simpson adds that organisations needed to be aware of the implications and impact of policies on management and co-ordination to provide an effective service to the clients. “Training, data collection and particularly research at this critical time of change are all needed. Research into the effects of current government policy on clients and agencies are areas where we can work together” (p. 24).

#### **5.3.4 New Right Policies – A Way to Shed Responsibility**

The notion of New Right and individualism promoted by the government came with a new concept ‘devolution’. The government, who under social welfarism, had taken the role to protect the welfare of its citizens, stepped away from being responsible and handed over the responsibility for its citizens to communities. Local communities accepted responsibility for communal members with the expectation that it came with resources and autonomy over decision making. However, autonomy was not realised and the transfer of responsibility came with insufficient resources. Kelsey (1993) writes in her characteristically sardonic way that the:

Government [retained] power over essential resource and policy decisions, while delegating delivery to the voluntary or private sector. This dominant/subordinate relationship was termed a *partnership*. The level of popular access to services would be determined by the consumer’s resources, bolstered by needy cases by vouchers or negative taxation. *Accountability* would be achieved through market efficiency measures of profit or contractual performance criteria. All this would empower individuals to take control of their lives as free and equal actors on the level playing field of life. *Liberation* was defined by Treasury to mean ‘the promotion of the dignity of people through direction of their own lives’. There was no room for putting altruism ahead of self-interest, compassion ahead of efficiency, or mutual obligations and collective identity ahead of individual benefit. Nor was there any doubt about the intrinsic superiority of the market-place (pp. 78-79).

Mulgan (1989) argued that Māori were able to survive in a democratic society. “Indeed, the pluralism of modern democracy provides a social and political structure in which they can not only survive but flourish. A pluralist democratic society recognizes the right of particular groups to manage their own affairs” (p. 72). Mulgan stated:

The devolution of Māori matters to Māori control and greater autonomy for Māori tribes is thus fully compatible with democracy. In principle, it is similar to leaving the business of local bodies or the affairs of a church or sport in the hands of those directly involved. Nor are Māori required to abandon their extended family structure or their lives within the larger *whānau* or *hapū*. They can continue with collective ownership of property and an emphasis on the rights of the group at the expense, sometimes, of the freedom of individual members (1989, p. 72).

Mulgan (1989) contends that “some Māori have expressed concern that this devolution to the *iwi* is intended simply to reduce public expenditure and rid the state of responsibility for Māori welfare” (p. 129). Accordingly, the responsibility to take care of Māori social needs would fall on the tribe and:

The devolution of centralized state power [fitted] with the wider neo-liberal theory associated with Treasury and ‘Rogernomics’, that the role of the state should be reduced in the interests of efficiency and equity. It also fits with the radical Māori agenda which sees the state as an instrument of colonial oppression and the future of the Māori people as lying in the recovery of lost tribal independence. Using the *iwi* as a basis of Māori organization avoids dependence on Pakeha imposed structures such as the Māori Council and its districts (p. 129).

Kelsey (1990) states that media, politicians, and many Māori made it fashionable “to talk of this devolution process as transferring power to the *iwi*. Yet the *iwi*, or those who would eventually be deemed by government to be such, would gain no power over resources or policy making” (p. 251). To this she adds that the *iwi*

“would merely be a private-sector delivery mechanism for social services, as Treasury itself confirmed to Caygill in February 1989” (p. 251). According to Kelsey, the devolution policies were a government response to fulfilling their treaty obligations in Article 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi. While settlement grievances may appear to be based on Article 2, she also suggested it allowed the Crown to make its own policies and govern (p. 252).

Towards the end of the 1990s, the direction of Māori development had reviewed a number of legislative Acts with a direct input in the Māori voluntary environment. Te Puni Kōkiri’s review (1999, 4) of the Māori Community Act 1962 was an attempt by government to determine whether it could meet the development requirements of Māori communities. The determination process included consultation between Māori who represented groups all over New Zealand and the Crown (represented by Te Puni Kōkiri). The review published recommendations by Te Puni Kōkiri as ‘food for thought’ for the Crown and acknowledged that Māori were consulted and their concerns noted. From this review, Māori communities identified Māori Wardens as an important part of the community and confirmed that the wardens were “operating under legislation that has not kept pace with the changing demands that are facing the communities today and tomorrow” (p. 21). The legislation left the Māori Wardens “performing services, often with little or no reimbursement” (p. 21) and placed pressure on them to fulfil a social obligation and duty by continuing to work.

#### **5.4 The Third Way – A Global Perspective**

There are several reasons why political leaders might want to avoid the ‘third way’. The term is an old one that has surfaced often before in the history of political thought and political practice, only to disappear again. ... Moreover, the ‘third way’ came back into politics in a rather specific context (Giddens, 2001, 1)

According to Giddens, Bill Clinton in the late 1980s and then Tony Blair resurrected the idea of a ‘Third Way’ as a response to growing criticism of the social outcomes of economic policies. It followed the ‘Second Way’ that consisted of neo-liberalism or market fundamentalism. He contends that the Third

Way was about “how left of centre parties should respond to change – not only to the changing ideological map itself, but to the transformation which stands behind this shift” (p. 3). Parties on the left of centre preach doctrines of socialism and democracy. The Third Way is an approach towards constructing policies for ‘Modernizing Social Democracy’ and consists of key areas of suggested structural reform:

1. “Reform of government and that state is a first priority. Modernizing social democrats must avoid the traditional leftist strategy of putting more and more tasks into the hands of the state” (pp. 5-6).
2. “The state should not dominate either the markets or civil society, although it needs to regulate and intervene in both. Government and the state have to be strong enough to provide effective steering for the promotion of social development and social justice” (p. 6).
3. “An understanding of the core role of civil society is a crucial feature of new left thinking. Without a developed civil society, there cannot be either well-functioning government or an effective market system. Yet just as in the case of the state and markets, there can be ‘too much’ of civil society, as well as ‘too little’. Important as civic groups, special interest groups, voluntary organizations and so forth are, they do not offer a substitute for democratic government” (p. 7).
4. “A need to construct a new social contract linking rights to responsibilities” (p. 8).
5. To not give up on “the objective of creating an egalitarian society” (p. 8).
6. “The creation of a dynamic, yet full employment economy has returned as a feasible goal” (p. 9).
7. “Social and economic policy must be connected” (p. 10).
8. “Reform of the welfare state” (p. 11).
9. “Active policies are needed to combat crime in the here and now, as well as in a longer-term sense”.
10. “Policies have to be forged to cope with environmental crisis” (p. 12).
11. “We need to establish an effective framework of responsible capitalism” (p. 13).

This perception of the Third Way shared by Giddens is a framework of the approach to social democracy and economic reforms. The intricate details or major implementation of this approach has to be adopted or modified by those states and governments that will utilise a Third Way framework for governance.

#### **5.4.1 The Third Way – A New Zealand Perspective**

In New Zealand the Third Way follows the First and Second Way that were used by the state and government. The ‘First Way’, according to Dalziel (1999) occurred when the Labour Party (1935) came into power as government. Under the leadership of Savage and Fraser a framework of economic management was constructed which involved a range of policies for employment and health in the urban and rural districts and:

Was on the basis of the conference’s belief that unsound economic management over many years – what I am calling here the first way – had produced ‘poor economic growth’, ‘an unacceptable level of poverty’ and ‘rising unemployment which is historically high by New Zealand standards’ (p. 65).

The ‘Second Way’ was when the Fourth Labour Government (1984) came into power. The Labour Party began to remove agricultural subsidies under the leadership of David Lange with Roger Douglas as the head of finance. Economic reforms failed to deliver. “Community groups [had] been saying for years that poverty increased dramatically during the reforms, and this claim is now being confirmed in a number of academic studies” (p. 66). Since the economic reforms did not lessen unemployment the poverty levels were on the rise. The citizens that increased their income during this reform were in the top ten percent of New Zealanders.

Dalziel suggested the Third Way for New Zealand is based on economy as a social system of “(i) property rights (ii) specialised production (iii) income distribution and (iv) monetary exchange” (p. 71). To this he adds that this way goes beyond government stepping away from social responsibility without returning to government re-introducing the welfare state. Unlike Giddens who



considers the Third Way to be a modernization of social democracy, Dalziel considers ‘Domestic Capital Production’ as an appropriate method for the Third Way in New Zealand in high-productivity employment for lengthy periods:

Unemployed workers have no production to exchange and people on subsistence wages have no surplus available for exchange; this lack of exchange weakens the overall economic fabric of society. Above all, third way economics must aim to include as many people as possible in high-productivity employment for lengthy periods of their working lives (p. 69).

In 1999, the fifth Labour led government headed by Helen Clark steered New Zealand into the new millennium. The Labour Party began their governance immediately, forming a coalition with the Alliance Party led by Jim Anderton as a minority government. The immediate action restored faith in a coalition agreement that was lost under a National and New Zealand First coalition. The following year the government strove forward to build a relationship between government, the community, and the voluntary sector of society.

Cheyne et al. (2000) state that the “Labour Party, for its part, now toys with a Third Way, borrowing from the electoral and public-relations success of Tony Blair’s New Labour in the United Kingdom” (p. 45). To this they add that there are similarities and differences between National’s new conservatism and Labour’s Third Way. With the minor parties there seems to be pressure to form policies that cater for their needs, thus:

Real distinctions are more likely to be forced by the needs of both parties to cooperate with the ACT Party – the Association of Consumers and Taxpayers – and the Alliance respectively. In returning to office after almost a decade in the wilderness, Labour will inevitably be returning to many of the social-policy debates left unfinished in 1990. These changes and the extent to which they draw on continuities from the past are discussed in greater depth throughout the rest of this book, and in particular in the case studies on Māori social policy, income support, children and families, and healthcare. ... The notion that there are laws of

social policy which define what is good for everyone in New Zealand and which can be applied to all people at all times must be discarded (p. 45).

#### **5.4.2 A Māori Third Way**

A Māori Third Way is a new concept. I would suggest that this Third Way include frameworks that are bicultural and incorporate a Māori voluntary sector where Māori are in control of decisions and resources.

Durie (2001) argued that policy development for Māori must recognise a “Māori philosophical base and a relevant framework centred on a Māori worldview. Crown policies for Māori often attract criticism because they appear to be a fragmented policy jigsaw puzzle” (p. 255). Policies that included a Māori component are added on to existing frameworks that have a sectoral focus. This process uses a “basic format [that] has been unchanged even though the ‘Māori values’ may have been interposed. Typically Māori approaches to development are holistic in so far as they do not recognise clear demarcations between social, cultural and economic areas” (p. 55). Requirements for Māori to:

Fit in with government policies have frustrated many Māori authorities. A lack of cohesion between sectors in terms of priorities, funding criteria, and joint activities has highlighted the differences between integrated development, preferred by Māori organisations, and the sectoral approaches that characterise government activities (p. 255).

Kelsey and O’Brien (1995) state that social development in Aotearoa/New Zealand must include the government honouring the Treaty of Waitangi. This recognition will be costly because:

There is no easy, cheap or politically safe path to honouring the Treaty of Waitangi. The crucial issue has always been and remains the recognition of Māori sovereignty. However much colonial governments and courts might try to rewrite the Treaty and engage in divide and rule, they cannot change that political reality. Any attempt to close the door on the Treaty

without addressing the issue of constitutional reform is doomed to fail. Until this is done, there can be no secure or just foundation for social development in Aotearoa/New Zealand (p. 11).

Māori social policy, according to Cheyne et al. (2000) is rooted in the Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty seeks to “maintain and improve the well-being of Māori based on a world-view and values that emphasise collective tribal identity and a unity between the spiritual and material worlds” (p. 47). They say that in achieving “well-being in the face of colonisation, Māori engaged in very different strategies, depending on their own tribal perspective and their interpretation of the challenges they faced. Both resistance to and cooperation with the state have been employed at different times” (p. 47).

Mulgan (1989), Kelsey (1990), Kelsey and O’Brien (1995), Cheyne et al. (2000), and Durie (2000) discuss social policies and Māori. Although these writers may approach social policies for Māori from different perspectives a common theme from their literature are that policies for Māori are still structured on Western concepts. Durie (2000) raised a concern that existing social structures need to change and incorporate aspects of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Building on the reviewed literature, my description of a Māori Third Way would include:

- descriptions of a bicultural society (Mulgan, 1989),
- honouring the Treaty of Waitangi (Kelsey, 1990; Kelsey and O’Brien, 1995; Durie),
- the concepts of high productivity employment for lengthy periods (Dalziel, 1999),
- the key Māori social policies (Cheyne et al., 2000),
- a critical analysis of the relationship between the state and Māori.

Most importantly, a Māori Third Way must seek a commitment from the government to document the relationship Māori have to voluntary work, voiced

by Māori volunteers in a way that is not controlled or administered by government but in a fashion whereby research is conducted following the concepts of a *kaupapa* Māori approach that is supported by government. Unlike earlier sections (5.1 and 5.2) where it was argued that voluntary organisations that received funding from government conceded autonomy, I purport that Māori as partners to the Treaty of Waitangi take another position. As treaty partners, Māori are positioned beside the government to share resources and entitled to financial assistance to develop their communities. Therefore, under this notion, Māori would not require funding from government because they would have access to government resources.

### **5.5 Concluding Comments**

Mulgan (1989) argues that the “role of the wider community and the government is not to tell the Māori what to do but to make sure that resources are made available for the Māori to use as they wish” (p. 30). To this Mulgan adds that supporting such “expenditure regularly and without resentment, the Pakeha and their politicians need to accept the goal of biculturalism, with its commitment to the continuation of a distinctive Māori culture” (p. 30).

The chapter introduced the different interpretations to describe voluntary organisations. By doing this, it showed the complexities encountered when endeavouring to define a voluntary organisation. Moreover, it highlighted a greater problem in attempting to define a Māori voluntary organisation or the reason for Māori participation in voluntary work. It also highlighted that the scarcity of documentation available that described the relationship of Māori voluntary work to European, churches, and government the experiences, values of Māori volunteers were silenced throughout history. The New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Organisations and Voluntary Welfare Agency Training Board (1987) document a Māori voluntary experience that identified the difference in access to resources between Māori and Pakeha and reinforced the concept that many Māori voluntary organisations were created for Pakeha needs. Although the literature on Māori voluntary work increased after 1900 the understanding and descriptions of the activity remained diverse and mingled with Māori cultural values and European values.

This chapter asserts that Māori voluntary organisations delivering social services are positioned in social policy frameworks. These policies direct the type of social services that were, and continue to be, delivered in Māori communities. I suggest policies determine the types of social services delivered by voluntary organisations because government holds the power and the funds. An organisation that relies on government funding to deliver social services is subject to conceding autonomy. Organisations that use the services of volunteers to deliver a substantial amount of social services and require government funding to operate concede organisational autonomy and place volunteers in an environment where as human beings their value becomes expendable. When the funding from government to voluntary organisations decreases, the social problems increase and communities encounter uncertainty.

This chapter described the impact that government social policies have on Māori voluntary organisations and Māori communities. Each time a government takes the helm to lead the state after an election, major structural reforms are set in place to live up to the election promises that delivered a successful campaign. It is during these reforms that government modifies social policies to reflect the aspirations of the governing party. Across the sphere of political positioning there is an invisible line that is drawn which shows the left, centre, and right. This line, in relation to social policies, describes the left as parties whose policies revolve around a social democratic society and collectivism. The right reflects a party whose policies acknowledge a social democratic society and collectivism but supports individualism. In the centre lie the notions of collectivism, individualism, and freedom of choice. How far a government party swings left or right from the centre is largely dependent on the policies they are selling to the people and support they gain in election year.

Neo-liberalism developed in New Zealand as the State/government took away regulations to make way for the 'free market'. When the State took back social welfare benefits and support to community organisations, social responsibility was placed on communities and voluntary organisations to take care of the social needs of people. It occurred as a process of devolution. In addition negative

descriptions of welfare dependency circulated in New Zealand and a belief was perpetuated in the neo-liberal era that the plight of oppressed Māori communities was a Māori problem and not a government responsibility. The 'free market' pushed individualism which was opposite to the Māori values of social responsibility, and hence Māori suffered in this economy or under these policies.

The chapter purports that the Treaty of Waitangi in social policy is a move towards a Māori Third Way. For government to acknowledge the Treaty in social policies requires a concession of power and working equally with Māori. Until government acknowledges the Treaty of Waitangi in social policy Māori voluntary organisations continue to be at the mercy of funding agencies. What is missing from this chapter is the grass roots voice and perspective of the workers who deliver social services under social policy reforms. In the following Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight the grass roots voices surface.

## Chapter Six: The Case Study

*“He iti rā, he iti māpihi pounamu.”*

*“It may be small, but it is the finest greenstone. Small things too have their value” (Riley, 1990, 5).*

### 6.0 Introduction

Located on the East Coast of New Zealand and just west of the International Date Line, Gisborne was the first city in the world to see the dawn of the new millennium (Gisborne District Council, 2000). Gisborne City is situated in the Tairāwhiti district where the climate is warm and approximately 45% of the residents are of Māori ethnicity (Statistics NZ, 1998) making Gisborne City the town with the highest population of Māori in New Zealand (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998). Over 250 voluntary groups provide social services in Gisborne city. The population is 45,000 and approximately 15,000 people participate in voluntary work (Clarke, 2000).

The Mayor of Gisborne John Clarke (2000), in an address before the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party (CVSWP), raised the issue that the increased workload for volunteers was a direct result of government decreasing support towards social services. Clarke discussed the pressure from, what I describe as developments which occurred during neo-liberal state and devolution policies, placed on voluntary organisations as a direct “result of government’s pulling back or simply pulling out of social service provisions in areas essential for community development” (p. 1). In addition, Clarke commented on the current review of the relationship between government and the community and voluntary sector by stating:

Let’s be quite clear – volunteers and voluntary organisations even though they do a great job are no substitute for services that should be provided by government, and I guess a danger in a review such as this is that this question is not addressed. In other words what is an acceptable level of voluntary input to the well-being and enhancement of a community (p. 1).

The issues raised by Clarke highlighted the social, political, and economic problems voluntary organisations were trying to address in the Gisborne region. During discussions between the Mayor, CVSWP, and the Gisborne community problems were identified by voluntary organisations trying to administer social services with insufficient funding, and insufficient resources. Communication barriers with government were also presented. In Gisborne, constructive solutions were at times overshadowed by the deep seated and unresolved anger felt by the community towards the government. For me, a scribe for CVSWP and member of the Gisborne community attending this meeting, it was evidence that new right policies were a way for the government to shed social responsibility and coincided with issues described in 5.3.4.

Gisborne City was an ideal location to explore Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities. The high Māori population and strong voluntary commitment in the community provided a wealth of knowledge for those interested in researching Māori voluntary work. For me, having grown up in the district and interested in Māori voluntary work, Gisborne City was the ideal place to research Māori voluntary organisations and Māori volunteers. The research was also an opportunity that combined family life and study life.

This chapter describes a case study conducted in Gisborne City. It is separated into seven sections. In section one the Method (6.1) used in the research is discussed followed by 6.2 Organisation Overview that describes the case studied. Section 6.3 details the Interview Responses and the results of my case study are discussed in 6.4. In 6.5 I discuss the issues raised and 6.6 describes Personal Reflections, then concludes with 6.7. The descriptions integrate research techniques, personal experience, and community knowledge.

## **6.1 The Research Method**

In keeping with the aspects of *kaupapa* Māori research methodologies described in section 3.2.1, aspects of my identity as a Māori researcher of Māori issues are significant to my ability to research with the Māori community in Gisborne. My community experience, communication skills, and the ability to adjust the



research approach based on my responsiveness to many issues unique to Māori of this region, remained significant throughout the process. My extensive community experience was essential as a member of this society for researching with people who delivered social services on a voluntary basis because it required one to use appropriate language and behaviour in conversations. My experience in this community also provided me with the necessary contacts that were knowledgeable about voluntary work performed by Māori. The communication skills helped me explain this research in a way that was clear and transparent and I was able to overcome the resistance to research so often expressed by Māori communities discussed in section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

Regardless of my experience in and identification with this community, researching a Māori voluntary organisation was challenging for me. In the past, I encountered situations where voluntary organisations lacked human resources to fulfil duties. To support them I offered my services to them. Accessing the potential impact of becoming involved with this voluntary organisation was difficult. Such involvement promised to enhance a relationship of trust and reciprocity (section 3.2.2) but also risked the possibility that my attention might be affected from the research. I proceeded cautiously in the field.

In 1998, I compiled a list of 56 Māori organisations with Māori names in the Tairāwhiti district. The information on the list came from data in the HB Williams Memorial Library Gisborne, searching through community organisations published by the Gisborne District Council, and telephoning community organisations in Gisborne City to ascertain their involvement of Māori. When telephoning organisations I asked specific questions such as: “Does your organisation provide a voluntary service? Is the organisation registered? Are there Māori volunteers in your organisation? Is this organisation a Māori voluntary organisation?” Many people I contacted questioned what a Māori voluntary organisation was. They were uncertain as to whether or not their organisation was a Māori voluntary organisation because there was no definition or description available. I could not answer these questions and expected the groups, like voluntary organisations with Māori names, to have the answers. The experience felt like the ‘blind leading the blind’ when searching for an answer. Those I

contacted did not want to be responsible for providing a description and put the responsibility back on me in comments such as: “Well that’s what your research is about, you’ll have to find out”. My response to this challenge was to construct a basic description that would assist me in this research.

To proceed with my attempts to identify Māori voluntary organisations and with the mandate of my early contact, this would identify whom I chose to include in my study. For the purposes of this research, a Māori voluntary organisation was defined as an organisation that:

- 1) had operated for over five years;
- 2) performed more than 20 hours each week of work;
- 3) was recognised formally in the community (for example, a registered community service provider);
- 4) had a large proportion of Māori voluntary workers;
- 5) followed some type of *kaupapa* that was Māori;
- 6) provided a service to Māori.

The guideline was used to eliminate from the list of 56 Māori organisations those that did not possess all the characteristics. The majority of the organisations still on the list participated in voluntary activity so the process of elimination advanced to striking off those organisations that were not in Gisborne City. Researching organisations that were located outside Gisborne City would be costly. I began to contact the organisations in close proximity and discovered that contact details changed. Finally I was left with three organisations that were in close proximity whose current contact numbers were correct and could be contacted. I approached the contact person(s) of each organisation. The first organisation had over twelve trustees that lived along the East Coast and only the administration people lived in Gisborne City. The second organisation was made up of an entire Māori membership, however, internal circumstances had left the organisation providing a voluntary social service to Māori for less than twenty hours a week. The third organisation provided a voluntary social service to Māori for more than 20 hours a week and their membership was 95% Māori. I selected this organisation and gave them the fictitious name of *Te Rōpu Awhi* (A Helpful Organisation) in the attempt

to provide the anonymity. All literature that showed the original name of the organisation was replaced with *Te Rōpu Awhi* except on the formal list of references at the end of this thesis. The organisation is concerned with providing support for men with violence issues.

### 6.1.1 The Case Study

*Te Rōpu Awhi* met all the criteria set out in the guidelines and I knew the people in the organisation. It was an extra value to have a personal relationship with the organisation because we shared a common understanding of history and current situation of Māori in the region and could communicate with each other. I understood the valuable work the organisation contributed to the community and felt a sense of duty to acknowledge this value in my writing. For over nine years my father was a volunteer counsellor at *Te Rōpu Awhi* and in my view, immediate *whānau* and I never whole-heartedly appreciated the work he performed. I failed to understand why anyone contributed a vast amount of unpaid working hours. Many times he talked about the *aroha ki te tangata* (love for the people) and loyalty to the *kaupapa* (topic/plan). The hours of voluntary service he provided for the Gisborne City and for Māori communities was five days a week contact time starting from 9am to 3pm at the office and a 24-hour help line. The service included weekend work; meaning my father gave a 24-hour, seven-day a week service. He was very passionate about providing support to men with violence issues.

The passion of what fuels a person to offer unconditional voluntary services especially in a context when 1) paid work is desperately needed 2) the unpaid work is both necessary and highly skilled raises questions and an important aspect of this research. To find answers I conducted this case study to allow the volunteers to explain what kept a Māori person involved in an organisation that delivers social services for the local community – important work for no pay when paid work was a significant need in this community. The information from the case study would help construct a view of what voluntary work means for Māori people in the community.

From December 1998 until May 2000, I kept regular contact with *Te Rōpu Awhi*. I established a research relationship with the participants to ease any tensions participants may have felt about being subjects of research. The process involved a series of meetings:

- December 1998 I approached *Te Rōpu Awhi* to discuss the research,
- July 1999 I returned to discuss whether *Te Rōpu Awhi* would consider participating in this research. I gained verbal approval from the administrator of *Te Rōpu Awhi* that the organisation would participate,
- October 1999 my research proposal was approved by the university,
- February and March 2000 I maintained contact with *Te Rōpu Awhi* and enhanced our relationship,
- April 2000 I attended a *Kaupapa Māori* Research Class,
- May 2000 I worked as a volunteer for *Te Rōpu Awhi* performing cleaning duties.

In May 2000, I began working for *Te Rōpu Awhi* as a volunteer. While volunteering I came to know the participants and how the organisation operated. I learned as an insider, to understand the dynamics a volunteer for this organisation would encounter. Most of all, I volunteered to reciprocate the goodwill the organisation had shown me as a researcher (refer to the *Kaupapa Māori* section of this thesis).

Working as a volunteer at *Te Rōpu Awhi* was a humbling experience. I compared the work ethics learnt in *Te Rōpu Awhi* with the *marae*:

- *kanohi kitea* – meeting the participants face to face and letting them know who I was,
- *whakawhānaungatanga* – getting to know the participants,
- *whakakoha* – respectful to the participants for allowing me to come into their place,
- *tauuutuutu* – reciprocity by providing unpaid work as payment for the hospitality,

- *maioha* – appreciative for their approval,
- *ngākau pāpaku* – humility, working in silence.

On the *marae* it is common practice to start ‘from the back’ and slowly move to the front. This meant working in the kitchen, cleaning the toilets, and mopping the floor as an apprentice before moving forward to the front of the *marae* to participate in ceremonial roles. My role in *Te Rōpu Awhi* did not include a desire to advance upward in *Te Rōpu Awhi* as one would advance to the front of a *marae*. My role as a researcher dictated that once the research was completed I would leave *Te Rōpu Awhi*. Menial labour was a good starting point to observe and understand volunteers because it was simple, required little skill, and did not interfere with the major operations in the organisation.

The advantages of working in the organisation were that it enabled me to identify two main barriers encountered in the research and find ways to overcome them. The first barrier was the length of time (eight weeks) taken to obtain ethical consent from the university to work in the organisation as a volunteer. Supervisors and the Ethic Committee informed me that data gathered without such approval in place from participants could not be used and specific consent was required from the organisation to document my experiences while awaiting approval from the Ethics Committee. After two months, I obtained consent from the organisation and Ethics Committee to document my experiences.

The second barrier to my ability to work in the organisation was that some participants in the organisation were concerned and unsure about my presence. The participants who were concerned did not openly disclose this information. It was the members who approved of my presence who brought it to my attention. One day while performing cleaning duties two participants (volunteers) asked me, “What is the real reason you are here, we’ve been talking amongst ourselves and want to know?” (Notes, 12/06/00). My response to them was a recollection of inadequate feelings for not doing enough to help this organisation and the contribution I could make through research as a step toward reconciliation. Underlying this recollection was the guilt for not valuing my father’s work and the desire to understand volunteers. Once I shared this with the volunteers they

were empathetic and spoke of *whānau* (family) members not supporting or understanding their voluntary work. The volunteers recalled experiences when family members criticised their work and told them, “to find a real job that paid wages”, and failed to understand the “value of the service they provided”. The subsequent one-to-one discussions with the volunteers were rich with information and we shared similar experiences when discussing how our *whānau* responded to voluntary work. Through work ethics, transparency, and honesty members came to accept that I had a genuine interest in the organisation that was not harmful. The preliminary stages of research were completed in the following months:

- August 2000 - the Ethics Committee granted formal approval to research *Te Rōpu Awhi*,
- October 2000 - the President of *Te Rōpu Awhi* approved in writing any research conducted by me in the organisation,
- January 2001 – the last interview was conducted.

For over seven months I performed menial tasks in this organisation as a volunteer for four hours two days a week. The formal stage of the research was conducted in the last three months of this time. The approach was a combination of social research techniques such as ethnomethodology and exploratory inquiry (discussed in Chapter Three). While not originally familiar with the ethos of *Kaupapa* Māori research, my adherence to what I understood to be Māori values in my research, ensured that I had unwittingly taken up many of the ideas these researchers advocate. After completing a *Kaupapa* Māori Research class in June 2000 I learned the formal terms to describe the research approach I had already chosen. My conduct throughout the research followed the principles identified by Mead (outlined in Chapter Three) and endorse ‘culturally based methods’ as discussed in 3.2.1.

The information I gathered to describe my case study was written in journals. The journals were 1B5 exercise books and entries were recorded during a work-break or in my spare time. I attempted to write in logs, as advised by Bloom, Fischer, and Orme (1994), to accumulate qualitative and quantitative data. The log entries recorded the date, time of day, place, the activity, who was present, and what

happened. Bloom et al. (1994) recommends four journals. The first journal is a condensed log and the second a more detailed log that included the researchers own thoughts. The third is a running log in which data would be analysed according to grounded theory method associated with this style of research and the fourth a log of problems encountered during the research. I began with three journals:

- 1) a journal that included my own thoughts,
- 2) a journal of problems encountered during the research,
- 3) a journal of ideas, thoughts and reflections on experience studying a case.

After using the three journals I discontinued this practice. It was difficult recording information in three different journals or separating my thoughts into three areas: thoughts, problems, ideas and reflections. I realised my thoughts were mixed and preferred to record thoughts, ideas, and problems in the same journal. Many times entries were written reactively and thoughts were recorded in the moment. Writing in this fashion, reactively, allowed my ideas to flow without the pressure of being grammatically correct or separating my thoughts into different journals.

When recording information I tried to look for 'domains of interest'. A domain of interest recorded information in social, political, or economical interest highlighted by the participants. My reason for choosing these domains was that they formed a holistic approach to Māori development and this approach did not differentiate between the social, political, and economic areas (Durie, 1998, 90). I assumed that recording information in these domains of interest a *kaupapa* Māori approach would be reinforced because information would be categorised under headings to represent a holistic fashion. This information could have been linked to the theories of Māori development. However, I learnt these domains of interest were promoted by universities, government, literature, and academics, and rarely discussed by Māori voluntary workers. The participants concentrated on social issues such as servicing the clients and surviving with insufficient resources. Economic development was perceived as having no money and political

development was seen as a job for the Prime Minister. Social issues overshadowed the holistic approach to development. I discontinued using domains of interest because it was a response to literature rather than the realities described by participants. For my research, learning the realities of the participants was an example of grounded theory and partial ethnomethodology identified in 3.1.2.

### 6.1.2 Ethical Issues – A Major Hurdle

I had made a commitment to report back to *Te Rōpu Awhi* with information about the outcome of the research and the thesis when it was completed. One of the provisions involved scheduling a presentation to the organisation. Since a friendly relationship developed between participants and I an extra incentive of updating participants about the research when visiting them in Gisborne was put in place. The research did not involve any concealment of information or deception.

An ethical issue that weighed heavy on my mind was conducting oneself as a Māori person and not just as another researcher researching Māori knowledge for my own personal gain. I approached this issue in two ways. The first way was attending a *Kaupapa* Māori Research class to learn theories on rules of appropriate conduct. The knowledge I learnt helped me construct interview questions that were not insensitive or time wasting. The experience exposed me to other Māori researchers in this field who shared their experiences.

My second approach to my concerns about engaging with Māori in research was to use personal experience of how Māori people perceived researchers and research. In previous research of a Māori voluntary organisation in the district, I learnt that a Māori community had gatekeepers and access to the community was by *whakapapa* (genealogy) and *kanohi kitea* (meeting the people face to face). Approaching the Māori community, as a researcher was like going on to a *marae* (place of work, meeting area) as a *manuhiri* (visitor), even though I was part of the community or could *whakapapa* (use genealogy connections) to the community. The unwritten lore, learned from elders and Māori teachers at that time, helped in the current research. That lore, in a simplistic form, was: *to*



*respect the people, be honest and up front about convictions when entering on to their (this instance participants') domain, mihi (greet) them, lay the 'take' (reasons for approach) down and leave it with them. It is up to them to pick it up or turn it away. If they pick it up then you must work hard to gain respect and trust from them: if they do not, thank them and walk away.* This knowledge from experience made me aware that researching Māori people must not be superficial. Researching Māori people must come from a desire to truly help Māori and be conducted in an open and transparent way. There were no easy roads and the best way of gaining respect from participants was through hard work and achievement.

During the initial stages of the research I experienced a state of *tapu* (sacred, uncommon) (Tauroa, 1993) when researching *Te Rōpu Awhi*. Although the consent forms were signed, and participants had read the information sheets, and I worked unpaid, there was still an atmosphere of resistance. It seemed that for the organisation or some time participants required me to work for their knowledge by gaining their respect. For them knowledge was not handed over lightly. I recognised in this process caution and a process expressed in traditional cultural ways of integrating new comers to a community. In the Māori culture visitors that came on to the *marae* were *tapu* and followed a process that began with the *karanga* (calling visitors on to the *marae*) to the *hariru* (shaking of hands). During the process visitors moved from a state of *tapu* to *noa* (common) within a day. When visitors are *noa* their role changed from visitor to *tangata whenua* (people of the land) (Tauroa, 1993, 47-90). The role of *tangata whenua* allows people to participate in activities on the *marae* as dictated by the *kaumātua* (elders) or *kawa* (protocols). Unlike the *kawa* on the *marae*, as a researcher, my role did not change in a day and it took time and work before the resistance subsided and I was accepted. I attributed this experience to the mistrust some participants had in researchers and my role as a university student which caused the participants to exercise caution before they shared their knowledge.

### **6.1.3 Designing the Interview Approach**

The research approach to this thesis was designed to incorporate a range of techniques. These included extensive literature reviews about the changing context affecting of Māori volunteering in Aotearoa/NZ and the impact of

colonisation on Māori. In addition, the literature allowed me to integrate known and appropriate research techniques to satisfy the requirements of a PhD, as well as addressing research resistance and meeting Māori expectations as outlined by *kaupapa* Māori researches. These searches were conducted at the University of Waikato Library, the Internet, *Te Rōpu Awhi* correspondence, School of Māori and Pacific Development resources, documentation sent to me by supervisors and personal collection of resources. I conducted extensive but unrestricted observations while in the exploratory phase of relationship building. Later, structured interviews allowed me to have some focussed discussions with participants. Ongoing informal discussions continued to broaden my insight.

With regard to formal interviews, participants chose whether they wanted to be interviewed at home or at the workplace. The participants were given options so the interview was not stressful or inconvenient. I met the expenses for travel to their home. Before any interviews were conducted the participants read the information sheet and signed a consent form. The participants selected interview times suitable for them and my work was altered to suit them.

The interview schedule was designed by a combination of methods. I used the research questions in the proposal as a guideline and with a series of trials I designed the conversation sheet. Family members were chosen for the trials who had similar backgrounds, age, work experience, and educational achievements as the participants. Any questions in the pre-trials that were confusing or difficult for the family members to understand were modified.

The interview schedule titled: Conversation Sheet, consisted of 34 open-ended questions. I labelled the sheet this way because experience gained in a *Kaupapa* Māori Research class and preliminary work identified that participants preferred a label that represented a conversational style. The participants shared a concern with me that a paper labelled 'interview sheet' invoked experiences of interviews with the Department of Social Welfare, Department of Probation Services, and other agencies. In my exploratory work participants reported feeling unequal in an interview situation with government agencies. The label 'conversations' brought forward positive memories. The interview schedules were labelled

'conversation sheets' to break down negative images and to create an environment of equality. Video cameras or tape recorders were not used in any part of the research because participants indicated that video cameras or tape recorders were intimidating.

#### **6.1.4 Interviews**

Five out of seven participants were approached and consented to be interviewed. Four interviews were conducted at *Te Rōpu Awahi* and one was conducted in the home of a participant. Four out of five participants preferred me to write their responses on the conversation sheet. Each participant was handed an information sheet and signed a consent form. The information sheet contained my personal details, contact numbers, and information about the study, and the consent form verified that the participants agreed to be interviewed.

Two out of the seven participants were not approached for interviews. On the days I worked in the organisation two participants were either absent or very busy. These participants operated the reception area and their roles consisted of administrative duties. One was a part-time worker who came on specific days to work while the other was a full-time worker and managed another business. Both participants were paid female workers and responsible for a family. In observing the workload these workers carried I decided not to add further pressure to their busy lives by interviewing them.

#### **6.1.5 Analysis**

While working with the data I realised that content analysis was suitable for analysing a small amount of data. The five questionnaires were analysed using content analysis and main themes were taken from the data. The data analysis concentrated on analysing the findings and drawing out main themes. The documents were placed beside each other so that the data could be analysed. I looked for common responses that reflected the question, for example demographic details indicated the responses would identify background information. The headings (in section 6.3) highlighted the content in the questionnaire. When analysing the responses I looked for common responses to reflect common themes.

## 6.2 Organisational Overview

*Te Rōpu Awhi* is a voluntary organisation who provided Living Without Violence Programmes for Men. Our mission is to work towards the reduction and prevention of violence in the community (*Te Rōpu Awhi*, 2000).

In 1986, *Te Rōpu Awhi* began a Violence Intervention Programme ‘Living Without Violence’ formed by a tutor at Tairāwhiti Polytechnic and the Gisborne Counselling Service where the organisation provided a service to counsel men who were violent and aggressive. In 1988, *Te Rōpu Awhi* were registered as an Incorporated Society delivering counselling services to violent men in the Tairāwhiti district. The Tairāwhiti district covered Wairoa, the East Coast, and Gisborne. In 1995, Durie and researchers published a book on *Te Rōpu Awhi* and recorded that five people worked in the organisation; a full time employed paid administrator, a full time employed paid counsellor, and three part-time unpaid voluntary workers. My father was an unpaid full-time voluntary worker who worked more than 40 hours per week and a participant in the research. Today there are seven workers, four support workers, in *Te Rōpu Awhi*:

- one paid full-time administrator,
- one paid full-time employed counsellor,
- one paid part-time receptionist/secretary,
- two unpaid part-time counsellors (work from 10 to 20 hours per week),
- one unpaid full-time counsellor (works 40 hours per week and operates a 24 hour service to the Gisborne community),
- one unpaid president.

The support people provide community support and experience to help the organisation function. There are eleven objectives *Te Rōpu Awhi* strive for and it has been my experience that their current situation allows them to only meet the first five:

- 1) “To stop male violence, starting by examining and changing where necessary our own attitudes and social power.
- 2) To work towards an Aotearoa that is free from violence in its various forms, including the violence of racism, sexism and male abuse and power reflected in physical, sexual, emotional and economic forms.
- 3) To carry out services that are beneficial to the community:
  - (i) in supporting violent males to change their attitudes and behaviours and in changing the social attitudes and structures that result in male violence.
  - (ii) in supporting the victims of male violence, so far as is possible and appropriate, and to consult closely with victims and women’s organisations that support them who are working to change the social attitudes and structures that result in male violence.
  - (iii) in raising awareness through education of the causes of violence and in particular to work with young men to promote values and behaviour that prevents violence.
- 4) To network with other similar organisations.
- 5) To be sensitive to Māori as *tangata whenua* of Aotearoa recognising the different cultures require responses appropriate to each” (Durie et al., 1995, 59).

The remaining six objectives requires *Te Rōpu Awhi* to become involved with national politics. To achieve these objectives *Te Rōpu Awhi* would need to develop their volunteers and educate them on political processes. This is hard for an organisation that struggles to provide a voluntary service with insufficient human resources to service the needs of the community. Below are the remaining six objectives:

- 6) “To promote or oppose bills, acts of parliament, regulations, by-laws or other measures.
- 7) To seek redress of wrongs from which all or any of the people serviced by the group may suffer; and to make representations by the way of deputation or otherwise bring to notice of central and local Government or

of any other constituted authority such matters as in the opinion of the group require attention or alteration.

- 8) To raise and use the funds of the group as the group may consider necessary or proper in payment of costs and expenses and furthering or carrying out any of the objectives of the group.
- 9) Have the power to subscribe to, become a member of, and co-operate with any other group or society, whether incorporated or not, whose objectives are altogether or in part similar to those of the group; and to procure from and communicate to that other group such information as may be likely to promote the objectives of the group.
- 10) Have the power to do all things as are necessary, incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objectives.
- 11) The group will be non-political and non-sectarian” (p. 60).

**Figure 1. Structure of the Organisation – *Te Rōpu Awhi***

<b><u>Position in the Organisation</u></b>	<b><u>Roles</u></b>
Executive Committee (Three People)	President Vice President Secretary/Treasurer
Committee Members (Four People)	
Supervisor (One Person)	
Client Services Team (Two People)	Co-ordinator Clerical Support
Counsellors (Six People)	

**Source: Notes (4/11/00)**

Figure 1 shows the positions in *Te Rōpu Awhi*. In the year 2000, there were 16 positions occupied by eleven members in the organisation. One of the members held three positions the secretary, treasurer, and co-ordinator. Another member was a supervisor and counsellor. Four were support people and the others actively participated in the organisation. In subsequent years, the membership changed and some members are no longer in the organisation. Before I completed the research the President resigned and was replaced by a Māori leader in the Gisborne community. There are three paid staff and four volunteers. The client services team, counsellor, and the volunteers work regularly in the organisation and the Executive Committee meet when called by the client services team. The administrator is in charge of the management systems and the manager manages the volunteers and the organisation. The volunteers' roles have not changed and they continue to provide a voluntary counselling service. There are four

counsellors who deliver a service on a weekly basis, three volunteers and one paid worker.

During my research *Te Rōpu Awhi* office was located on the second floor in a building on a main street in Gisborne City. The office consisted of five rooms: a room for the reception area and secretary, a room for one-to-one meetings or counselling, the manager's room, a room that housed the computers, printer, and photocopier, and a large room.

In the large room there was a lot of communal activity, group meetings and an area for cafeteria facilities. The cafeteria facilities or kitchen area consisted of a sink, hot water cylinder, a table, fridge and chairs, arranged so that there was a kitchen area, conference area, and smoking area. *Te Rōpu Awhi* provided the refrigerator, table, chairs, crockery, groceries, and most of the furniture and carpet were donated.

The organisation relied on the contribution from members to assist in maintaining the work area. The walls were coloured a soft yellow and painted by my father, his grand children, members in the organisation at that time, and people from the Department of Periodic Detention. The walls were adorned with *tukutuku* panels, posters about violence, large sheets of paper with the rules of conduct, and next to the kitchen area was the notice board with a plan of the floor and buildings and fire safety rules. Every day the participants met in the room for a cup of coffee or tea and conversed. The room was used for group or community meetings and the door was open for people to come in. Since my research *Te Rōpu Awhi* had moved premises.

The Executive Committee of Management met on a regular basis. The duty of the Executive Committee of Management was to “ensure the functions and responsibilities of *Te Rōpu Awhi* staff and counsellors were followed. The committee reviewed and monitored the financial, administrative, and counselling services and programmes (Durie et. al, 1995, p. 12). The Living Without Violence programme consisted of 12 sessions, an intake session, and a mix of



one-to-one or couple counselling and group sessions. The course structure is outlined below:

**Week 1: Initial interview and completion of intake sheet**

Engagement and assessment.

Introduction to the programme and provision of service information (1.5-2 hours).

**Week 2: One to one counselling**

Taken through treatment programme.

Develop trusting relationship between client and counsellor (1 hour).

**Week 3: One to one counselling**

Techniques for anger management discussed.

Taken through treatment programme.

Prepare men for entry into group sessions (1 hour).

**Week 4-12: One to one counselling or group therapy**

Counsellor decides when client should enter into group settings.

Clients may return to one to one counselling if appropriate (2 hours).

The Living Without Violence programme required *Te Rōpu Awhi* to record the outcomes of a client's visit. The records were kept on file, in the computer database, and a profile was made of each client that documented client progress throughout the programme and history with the organisation. Each client was assessed and evaluated using evaluation forms. The Department of Justice had access to the assessment and evaluation of clients. The Department of Justice reviewed the evaluation form and could request the form be modified. When the Department of Justice forwarded a request the organisation complied. A positive client outcome such as the client's ability to complete the programme, and compliance with the Department of Justice's requests were essential for *Te Rōpu Awhi* to access funding from the Department of Justice.

The clients came in contact with the programme by:

- Referrals from Family court, community corrections, and police diversion. These departments request that the clients attend a 12 week programme, and attendance is compulsory;
- Referrals from schools require the client and their parent(s) to work out a programme with *Te Rōpu Awhi*. Attendance is not compulsory;
- Voluntary attendance. Clients that volunteer to attend the programme work through the 12 week process, attendance is not compulsory;
- Referrals from another agency such as Family Counsellors. Attendance is not compulsory and the client works through the 12 week process.

*Te Rōpu Awhi* provides a service to different ethnicities in Gisborne. In 1999, *Te Rōpu Awhi* provided a service for 234 clients. Below is the ethnic makeup of the clients:

- Māori – 179,
- Half Caste (Māori and Pakeha) – 7,
- European – 40,
- German – 1,
- Fijian – 1,
- Tongan – 2,
- Tongan and Spanish – 1,
- Tongan and Māori –1,
- White American Apache – 1,
- Australian and New Zealand –1 (Notes, 15/8/00).

The volunteers reported that a twelve-week programme provided for clients was insufficient time to make an impact on their lives. I realised that researching this information could assist in assessing how many counselling sessions a client required before they deterred from violent behaviour. Also, the number of clients *Te Rōpu Awhi* voluntary workers counselled each year did not reflect the overall work they and the organisation provided to the community. In essence, this experience opened up the door for further research.

The organisation could never access sufficient funding to deliver their social services. The administrator would forward an application to various agencies such as Lottery Board, Community Funding Agency, Te Puni Kōkiri, and Community Organisations Grants Scheme to ask for funding. Successful applications were often less than what was requested and applications were forwarded approximately every six months or when the previous funding was due to run out. The organisation, in the words of the administrator, “runs on the smell of an oily rag” (Te Momo, 2000, 01/05/00) meaning it struggled to operate on the funding that was allocated.

The volunteers strengthened *Te Rōpu Awahi* by providing the human resources to deliver a service for the community. The programmes delivered by the organisation had a heavy reliance on volunteers. It was recorded by Durie et. al (1995) that more volunteers needed to be recruited and trained because trained staff had worked under considerable pressure and burnout was becoming a distinct possibility. The duties of the volunteers are broad:

- Counsel clients,
- Enter client information on to a computerised database,
- Assess the clients’ performance,
- Organise and run group discussions,
- Work with the Department of Courts on matters concerning client performance,
- Perform basic receptionist duties,
- Work with client families when required,
- Monitor the office facilities and daily duties when paid staff are unavailable.

The paid workers had similar duties. The manager monitored the volunteers and counselled clients. The part time secretary performed secretary duties and operated the reception area. The administrator performed various tasks such as applying for funding, administered the financial aspects of the organisation, kept everyone and everything operating, monitored the behaviour of the workers, and

kept in contact with outside agencies. The inability for the organisation to capture adequate funding placed pressure on the volunteers to deliver the programmes.

*Te Rōpu Awhi* offered services on and off the premises. Once a week a volunteer travelled to Wairoa to counsel clients. Sometimes volunteers were asked to attend Court to support clients, go to the home of a client, or attend family meetings. Each time a volunteer worked outside the office they did so with care and prior knowledge of the client and the situation. They also followed a formal code of ethics provided by the justice department.

### **6.3 Responses**

The interviews were conducted over a three-month period from October 2000 to February 2001, detailed earlier. The following sub headings were constructed from the interview guides. The advantage for using headings was to make the process of sorting data easier. The headings were: Demographic Details (6.3.1); Māori Voluntary Work (6.3.2); Voluntary Duties and Job Skills (6.3.3); *Tikanga* Māori (6.3.4); Work Place (6.3.5); Research Issues (6.3.6); Future Māori Volunteer (6.3.7); and Further Comments (6.3.8).

#### **6.3.1 Demographic Details**

Five participants were interviewed, four were volunteers, and all were asked 34 questions. The conversation sheet began with recording the participant's code, the date, time of meeting, age, gender, ethnicity, and tribal affiliation. The participants all lived in the Tairāwhiti district. Three lived in Gisborne and two lived in the rural areas. Five participants identified their ethnicity as Māori. Two named more than one *iwi*. Three named Ngāti Porou as an *iwi*. Two identified Ngāti Kahungunu as an *iwi* and one named Ngāti Konohi. The age of participants interviewed ranged from 45 years to 69 and all were male.

*What type of skills (or life experience) do you possess?*

One participant possessed a university degree. All five had various qualifications including life experience, counselling certificates, and New Zealand Qualification Authority Certification for various fields of work. Two were past Union Representatives and four had been associated with the Union.

*Are you on a social welfare benefit that allows you to work voluntarily for the organisation?*

All volunteers received Work and Income NZ benefits. One was not on a benefit or a volunteer.

### **6.3.2 Māori Voluntary Work**

*What brought you to this organisation and why do you volunteer?*

Three participants came to the organisation because of the *Kaupapa* “helping those who unfortunately never understood what violence is all about and to stop the hurt and harm in families and individuals”(W4, 2000, p.1). Two participants came to the organisation because of the job description to counsel and one of them was a volunteer.

*What do words like social, economic and politics mean to you as a voluntary worker in this organisation?*

Four participants identified working with people to be a social issue. Five participants considered economics issues related to money. Four had no concept of what politics meant to a voluntary worker but one said, “politics, assistance from the government and other organisations” (W7, 17/2/01).

*How do you define Māori voluntary work?*

Five participants had five different answers to define Māori voluntary work.

Below are the answers:

- “Slaves to the hierarchy. The Māori voluntary work is *aroha*. *Aroha* doing something for nothing, no money at all. *Aroha* got no price but help the people. Perhaps fringe benefits get a packet of smokes. A definition for a Māori voluntary worker is *aroha* to help the people, don’t put money in front of me unless you can back it” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “It comes from the heart meaning that I will do anything for the people within reason” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “I would be assuming to define Māori voluntary work is Māori working for an organisation that they believe in doing voluntary work” (W5, 28/11/00).

- “Bunch of squabblers, but when it comes to the crunch we all pitch in and do our bit” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Māori volunteer work is done by love (*aroha*) for others. The upbringing on the *marae* are characteristics that make a Māori volunteer because they (elders) teach you everything in a *marae* situation. It teaches you how to look after children to adults. It’s a *whānau* concept” (W7, 17/2/01).

*What is positive and negative about working as a Māori voluntary worker?*

Two participants said helping the clients was positive about being a voluntary worker. Two participants said the client achieving their goal was positive. One said, “the result is achieving the outcome a volunteer set out to do. Negative I don't believe in negative, there is always a way to do things” (W7, 17/2/01). Five participants gave four different answers to what was negative about being a volunteer:

- “Negative. When they (the staff) leave everything (all the workload) to you and you make one booboo (mistake) you’re in trouble. Half the time staff aren’t here and decisions are left to you” (W3, 7/10/00).
- “Negative. Having the gentlemen come here under a court order. I want to see them come voluntarily that they need my help” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “The bad side is the politics that go with it. Politics is the paper work government directed, ie accountability for everything” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Negative –Learning (the pressure that comes with having to learn more things)” (W6, 18/10/00).

*Do you know of any policies that affect you as a Māori voluntary worker?*

Five participants did not know of any policies that affected a Māori voluntary worker. Five participants said voluntary work is not given the recognition it deserves. Two participants said voluntary workers are taken for granted. One participant said “volunteers are used and abused” (W4, 18/10/00). One said, “Because people do not know and do not see how much workload that a volunteer does is more than a paid worker” (W7/2/01).

*Do you think voluntary work is given the recognition it deserves?*

Five participants said volunteers should be recognised in the organisation.

### **6.3.3 Voluntary Duties and Job Skills**

*What is your role in this organisation?*

Four participants were counsellors. Three were voluntary counsellors. Four participants performed one-on-one counselling and facilitated group discussions. Four participants had over two years' experience as counsellors. One participant was the president.

*What type of training is needed to work in this organisation?*

Three participants identified training in communication with people skills. Three participants said listening skills were needed, two said life skills, and one said humbleness. Four possessed basic computer and receptionist skills.

*Do you have access to support for training or increasing your skills? And if you did would you take advantage of training if the opportunity arose?*

Two participants said they did not have access to support or training to increase their skills. Four participants said they would take advantage of training if the opportunity arose. One said, "I get that from the ministry" (W7, 17/2/01), referring to his position as a religious minister.

*How many hours do you volunteer on average a week and are you happy with the amount of hours you volunteer?*

One participant volunteered 40 hours a week and monitored a 24-hour telephone. One participant volunteered 20 hours and two volunteered ten hours a week. One participant was a paid worker and did not volunteer any hours to the organisation. Two participants, one working 40 hours and the other working 20 hours a week were not happy with the hours they volunteered.

*What do you think is a fair number of hours you should volunteer a week?*

Two participants considered 20 hours a week to be a fair number of hours to volunteer. One participants said, "nobody should be a volunteer worker. All should be employed as full-time workers" (W6, 18/10/00).

*What makes you volunteer a high number of hours per week that you would not normally do?*

The participants that were volunteers said the clients would make them volunteer a higher number of hours than they would normally do. For example, if they provided 20 hours per week of voluntary counselling they would increase their hours when clients needed more time to work through violent issues. One participant, the paid worker answered “I don’t know”.

*If you were to volunteer a high number of hours do you think you would be entitled to some type of compensation?*

Five participants said that volunteers should be compensated if they volunteer a high number of hours. Three said monetary compensation should be given.

*How do you deal with working long hours?*

Four participants gave different answers to how they would deal under pressure. Below are the answers:

- “I deal better under pressure all based on priorities and you can always guarantee I get the job done” (W3, 17/10/00). (Volunteer)
- “I am handling it pretty well considering” (W4, 18/10/00). (Volunteer)
- “I wouldn’t work long hours voluntarily, I would stipulate the hours because I have a family and a life” (W5, 28/11/00). (Paid Worker)
- “Don’t sleep much” (W6, 18/10/00). (Volunteer)
- “Doesn't worry me. I have been used to it from way back. For over sixty years, of unpaid work for the community. It’s a culture thing and starts on a *marae*, they're got no money so you have to volunteer” (17/2/01). (Volunteer)

*Have you volunteered for any other organisation? Did that organisation look at social, political and economic issues concerning volunteers? What was your voluntary duty in the other organisation?*

Three participants volunteered for other agencies and these agencies looked at social, political and economic issues. Social issues referred to providing family



support, political issues focussed on looking at ways to provide appropriate governance structures, and economic issues centred on issues of money.

#### 6.3.4 *Tikanga Māori*

*Do you bring to work any Māori customs and apply them in this organisation (for example open meetings with a karakia)?*

Five participants said they brought *tikanga* Māori and applied it in the organisation. Four identified opening meetings with a *karakia*. Two participants said that the *karakia* is followed by explaining the *kaupapa*. One participant said “*kaupapa* (subject/topic) is based on safety factors and protocols. We have protocols similar to Māori customs the do and the don’ts. We call it group rules compiled by clients of the past that still operate today. *Karakia* compiled by past clients and your father put it was safety of the clients like blessing the house. Non-believers can stand outside until we finish the *karakia*. We respect their religions. Only a few stand outside” (W3, 17/10/00). The *karakia* was considered a method towards calming the spirit of clients because at group meetings more than four people attended with violent problems. By calming the spirits of clients it assisted in creating a safe environment.

*If you apply Māori customs in this organisation why do you do it? Is it for political or social reasons?*

Five participants provided different answers:

- “Every time when the Family Courts and Probation changes their systems we have to adjust. By adjusting to the system it is a new thing for our clients” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “I think it is customary. That’s what I learnt from way back there, personal upbringing in a Māori environment” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “Because I am a Māori. It doesn’t mean political” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Both (political and social reasons), but mainly to show the people I’m not a prejudice fella” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Because I was brought up that way. Actually it is for both no matter what it is. A *karakia* is to settle peoples’ thoughts because thoughts are

scattered and bringing them together, drawing them together in peace” (W7, 17/2/01).

### 6.3.5 Work Place

*What is needed to make the environment you work in better (socially, economically, and politically)?*

Five participants provided five different answers, below are the answers:

- “Socially: a better work station, offices, paint work, space. Socially: the environment needs to be upgraded. Economically: more money for the amount of work I do. All I know is these politicians look at our work because violence is global” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “Social issues [is to focus on] honesty (political). Economically: perhaps the voluntary worker to be funded. Transparency (political) so we know what the voluntary role is in the organisation” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “More funding, better funding, direct funding instead of going through the family court give it directly to us” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Publicity and a more accessible place to come to” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Social issues: maintain listening skills and humbleness. Strengthen ties with other organisations. Keep the workers working together. Economic: Maybe access to more funding so the volunteers can be paid for their work. Political: Make sure the workers read the rules” (W7, 17/2/01).

*How does everyone work together and keep under control?*

Three participants said that working together and talking to each other is how everyone works together and keeps under control. One participant said “excellent co-ordinator” (W6, 18/10/00). One said, “through prayers and good leadership. Good leadership such as the organiser maintaining control and keeping everybody happy” (W7, 17/2/01).

*How does the organisation deal with internal conflicts?*

Three participants said that by talking and communication the organisation dealt with internal conflicts. One participant said, “we have a constitution of rules and a complaints procedure to follow and adhere to” (W6, 18/10/00). One participant

said, “we have a committee that problems come to us and we deal with it at that level” (W7, 17/2/01).

*What do you think is needed to strengthen the organisation you work in?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question. Below are the answers:

- “Everybody pull their finger and work together as one happy family instead of splitting us apart” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “I go back to the *kaupapa*, work that is here, honesty, integrity and empathy. I feel the organisation doesn’t show empathy” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “More people who are prepared to put the time in to do the work. People that have lived life, doesn’t matter what type of skill” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Better communication and access to resources – more access to clients and victims for impact” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “More workers that is the main thing” (W7, 17/2/01).

*Are you pressured from outsiders (agencies or other people) about the service you or the organisation provide?*

Four participants said that they were not pressured from outsiders (agencies or other people) about the service they or the organisation provided. The fifth participant said “yes” (W5, 28/22/00) but did not elaborate.

*What kind of support would you like from Māori communities to help you provide a better service?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question:

- “Support by way of *putea* (money). If they can unite with us we can be a strong unit” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “I don’t trust other Māori organisations. I have no faith in them. They start one thing, get pretty things and find out at the end they have got no money. Our people are their worst enemies” (W4, 18/10/00).

- “Understanding of what we do, getting out of the closets, stop hiding it (violence) away. Accept it is happening and do something about it” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Constant surveillance – to be transparent and answerable to whole community” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Keep contacts open, networking and for the Māori communities to inform you of what they are doing. The main one is information” (W4, 17/2/01).

*What kind of support would you like from the Gisborne community to help you provide a better service?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question:

- “To give us what we want *putea* (money). Have you looked at the Pakeha volunteers they are well set-up. I would like to see that in *Te Rōpu Awhi*” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “I’ve never really got into that. I won’t comment” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “Understanding of what we do, getting out of the closets, stop hiding it (violence) away. Accept it is happening and do something about it” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Recognition, community awareness, less rates and taxes, free parking, no meter fee (eg)” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Keep contacts open, networking and for the Māori communities to inform you of what they are doing. The main one is information” (W7, 17/2/01).

*What kind of support would you like from the Government to help you provide a better service?*

Three participants said they would like money and funding from government to help them provide a better service. One participant said “perhaps looking at giving me paid work for the job I do” (W3, 17/10/00), one said “advance practical laws in this field of work and family violence on the whole” (W6, 18/10/00).

*What kind of support do you or the organisation get from Māori communities?*

Three participants said they get no support from the Māori communities. One participant said “sometimes money” (W3, 17/10/00) and one said, “not very much, don’t get any monetry”(W5, 28/11/00).

*What kind of support do you or the organisation get from the Gisborne community?*

Four participants said they received no support from the Gisborne community. One said “ very little except Tairawhiti Abuse Intervention Network (T.A.I.N) some minor funding from groups” (W6, 18/10/00).

*What kind of support do you or the organisation get from the government?*

Two of the participants said they get nothing personally from the government. Three said the organisation receives some meagre funding.

*What kind of support do you or the organisation get from other agencies?*

Two of the participants did not know what kind of funding the organisation received from other agencies. Two said networking and minor funding. One said, "we get some financial support from the court. They send referrals plus the money" (W7, 17/2/01).

### **6.3.6 Research Issues**

*What do you think researchers should research in Māori voluntary organisations?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question:

- “Heaps of avenues, ways of getting *putea*, looking at improving conditions, comparing Māori organisations to Pakeha organisations and see how they operate” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “Researching the working conditions of a voluntary Māori worker and work overload” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “The capability of doing what they (Māori organisations) should be doing” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “If they find out as much info as they can then it would be sufficient but not enough – funding and resource training” (W6, 18/10/00).

- “Increase in work and decrease in funding. Compare the work ethics, history, and workload of a *rūnanga* (*iwi* agency) to a grass roots community group (like *ataarangi* and *marae*)” (W7, 17/2/01).

*How does Māori voluntary work contribute to the development of Māori communities?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question:

- “A few of our guys (refers to the clients) make it and do something positive. As a Māori volunteer the work I do helps Māori people in the community. My proof is in the papers that show their (refers to clients) achievements. Some of the guys doing well for themselves” (W3, 17/10/00).
- “By helping the clients as a Māori voluntary worker I also help the *whānau* and that helps the Māori community. My work helps better the lives of clients that better the lives of Māori communities” (W4, 18/10/00).
- “Couldn’t answer that, guessing. The Māori Women’s Welfare League, Māori Wardens help the Māori communities by providing a policing service and working with Māori people” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “To be recognised both by white and Māori on the whole and not just by a group that is run by Māori would be nice” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “Māori volunteers have a nurturing instinct that is important for how our Māori communities function. Māori volunteers exercise love which is *aroha teetahi ki teetahi*, to all the people, and this in turn creates the basis of a Māori community and determines how we work and live with each other” (W7, 17/2/01).

### **6.3.7 Future Māori Volunteer**

*What type of future do you see for a voluntary worker?*

Five participants provided different answers to this question:

- “Hope that one day they come into full-time work. My concept of voluntary workers is helping poor people overseas, going down, dying with the people, staunch to the cause. “A good captain goes down with the

ship and sinks with their crew but the captains today they've got life boats and the voluntary workers go down with the crew". I got this from your dad" (W3, 17/10/00).

- "Trying to widen the hole because I talk about tunnel vision, it's time to open up and pay them for what they do. What the voluntary worker wants is payment for the amount of time they spend as an organisation" (W4, 18/10/00).
- "Hopefully a bright future, become full time or permanent workers, at the end of the tunnel there is a paid job for them, for the younger people hopefully a job. Elderly motivation and gets them out as long as they enjoy what they are doing" (W5, 28/11/00).
- "If all what is considered from the past questions is put into play then a fair future for a volunteer worker could be something to encourage more volunteers" (W6, 18/10/00).
- "More work, less money stressed out person. Attracting younger people but the older people do the work. Attraction by giving funding" (W7, 17/2/01).

### 6.3.8 Further Comments

*Would you like to make any further comments?*

There were five different responses to this question:

- "A volunteer worker wants a fair amount of hours. If there is a crisis I will answer that cause. My loyalty lies with the wife. If the staff ring me and say ... (... represents real name of participant) we need help I will drop tools and come. The Māori voluntary worker is no less than the Pakeha voluntary worker. What I am looking at is the hierarchical system within the organisation. Instead of looking at the voluntary worker the organisation looks at who takes the credit, volunteer is not recognised. A volunteer worker is shredded paper blowing in the wind and who gets the credit not the voluntary worker but the hierarchy (W3, 17/10/00).
- "Better working conditions, access to up skilling and communication within the organisation" (W4, 18/10/00).

- “The government has an expectation that everything should be done by volunteers, they should get off that *kaupapa* and look at rewarding them” (W5, 28/11/00).
- “Excellent survey good questionnaire. *Kia ora*” (W6, 18/10/00).
- “The respect of volunteers is often lost. Years ago I volunteered because payment was in helping the community, there was a community need and no one would do the job. But you find it is a spiritual background that was established at the beginning such as attending Sunday school” (W7, 17/2/01).

## **6.4 Main Themes**

Themes were derived from the interviews and are displayed under the headings Describing A Māori volunteer (6.4.1), Māori Voluntary Work (6.4.2), Working Conditions and Workload (6.4.3), *Tikanga* Māori and Holistic Development (6.4.4), Recognition, Value and Consultation (6.4.5), and Future Aspirations for Māori Volunteers (6.4.6).

### **6.4.1 Describing A Māori volunteer**

A Māori volunteer in this study is a person over forty-five years of age and receiving a type of Work and Income NZ benefit. This person possessed a range of skills and had a strong affiliation and experience working in the community. Above all this person was Māori.

### **6.4.2 Māori Voluntary Work**

Māori voluntary work was perceived as a combination of Māori customs and unpaid work. There was a strong sense of social obligation and performing one’s job as a volunteer that contributed positively to community enhancement. In addition, Māori voluntary work was described as oppressive in the following comments:

- Slaves to the hierarchy
- Used and abused
- People do not see how much workload that a volunteer does is more than a paid worker.



### 6.4.3 Working Conditions and Workload

The physical structures, equipment, and furniture were modest and donated from people or groups in the community. The working interface between volunteers and management was unclear. As a group the participants communicated with each other and provided group support. However, individually the volunteers felt they were not viewed the same as a paid worker because they were unpaid in the organisation. The volunteers felt that people were classified differently in the organisation by their role and income. A person who received a wage and was working in an administrative position was classed high and the volunteer low.

The workload for a volunteer ranged from ten to forty hours per week. The person who worked 40 hours a week also operated a voluntary 24-hour help line in the organisation. Individuals found their own ways to cope with increased workload. Community needs such as clients requiring counselling services and insufficient resources were stated as reasons why volunteers increased their workload.

### 6.4.4 *Tikanga* Māori – Māori Development

The organisation exercised aspects of *tikanga* Māori on a daily basis. The volunteers perceived *tikanga* Māori to be a normal part of their upbringing. *Tikanga* Māori was shown in the way volunteers behaved such as performing a *karakia* (prayer) before meetings and *aroha* (genuine concern for the clients).

The terms social, political, and economic development were seldom used in the organisation. Social enhancement centred on upgrading the physical environment and increasing the access to human resources. Economic enhancement focussed on government giving the organisation more money so that the volunteers could move from unpaid work to paid work. Political enhancement was not seen as an important issue in the organisation. The majority of the volunteers saw social, political, and economic issues of development as something impacting on the organisation rather than something developing in the organisation.

The volunteers believed that voluntary work helped develop Māori communities in a positive way. Helping the clients by providing a counselling service that

addressed violence issues was seen as the way volunteers enhanced Māori communities.

#### **6.4.5 Recognition, Value, and Consultation**

It was highlighted that volunteers in general were not recognised or valued. This was a major discontentment aired by participants. The lack of recognition was described on a minor scale as existing inside the organisation and on a major scale, a reflection of society. Without recognition and value the organisation felt chained to a service delivery that in essence was significant but in reality offered little rewards of any kind.

There was little consultation between the organisation and outside agencies. The government, Māori communities, and community organisations failed to engage in discussions with volunteers in *Te Rōpu Awhi*. This communication gap created an environment of distrust between *Te Rōpu Awhi* and outside agencies.

#### **6.4.6 Future Aspirations for Māori Volunteers**

The future goal for a Māori volunteer was to accomplish paid employment. Volunteers hoped that the future would bring forth prosperity such as employment, better resources, decreased workload, and involve the participation of youth. The volunteers identified research avenues that would achieve this prosperity.

### **6.5 Discussion**

*“Reciprocity is at the heart of our culture” (Ngata, 1993, 380).*

The participants believed in the community or the organisation reciprocating unpaid work with paid work or acknowledgement. While working with participants I searched for a type of reciprocity that adequately reflected the voluntary work. Many times there was no reciprocity and participants performed the same duty as a paid worker and worked longer hours unpaid or uncompensated. Participants appreciated my tasks as a volunteer and the feelings of pressure to contribute more were always present especially when observing a volunteers’ workload.

I was disheartened to observe unbalanced reciprocity. An incident that reflected unbalanced reciprocity was observing a participant work twenty hours a week unpaid. This person felt guilty asking for a small bag of coffee (worth approximately \$3.00 at Pak N Save) and signed a book to record that a bag of coffee was taken by him as payment for work. I spoke to the participant and inquired why there were feelings of guilt since the work performed was worth more than a bag of coffee. I learnt the way a volunteer measured work done was different from my understanding. The concept of *aroha* (love) was very strong and the participant felt that working for *aroha* was payment in itself and receiving anything else would be what I would term: “creaming the top” (to take extra than what is required). This strong sense of loyalty to the organisation, loyalty to the clients somehow rendered itself as a type of payment. The participant would like to be paid for work or equally compensated. However, there was work to be done and if it called for voluntary work he did it. When I grappled with this understanding I realised the Māori concept of *aroha* had taken on a new meaning to include self-sacrifice because the participant was willing to forego issues of resisting to work for nothing. The participant was unhappy about the circumstances but felt a sense of social obligation and duty to accept the circumstances.

The people who formed *Te Rōpu Awhi* in the 1980s were Europeans who no longer participated in matters concerning the organisation. Māori people were left to keep the organisation afloat. The organisation survived on the voluntary service provided by Māori people under frameworks designed by Europeans, and Māori worked in this structure. While I was present the organisation did not challenge the structure or existing framework and continued to modify practices when pressurised from funding agencies.

The organisation concentrated on enhancing the communities in Gisborne City by providing a service to stop violence in the homes. This focus trapped the volunteers and developed into a social obligation that delivered no reciprocity. When volunteers complained about the conditions of work their sense of loyalty and commitment to the organisation overshadowed any intention to leave. Ever

present was a sense of hope that the community or government would recognise their value and pay the organisation and volunteers accordingly.

The organisation needed to plan for the future. The planning required a shift in focus from the clients and meeting the needs of agencies to identifying the individual needs of the workers in the organisation. The organisation had become stagnant and was not developing because it tried to fill a gap that society had created. The gap was the increase in violence amongst families that demanded social services and counselling. The insufficient funds from government agencies to resource organisations to provide adequate services had left the responsibility to take care of the social problems on voluntary organisations. This gap needed workers to counsel men and volunteers were the cheaper option to fulfil the role of a paid person. *Te Rōpu Awhi* were caught in this void trying to provide a counselling service. There were insufficient human resources in the organisation to provide advocacy services and insufficient research that could strengthen the organisation's chances for increased funding and better service delivery. The professionals and past researchers who were once involved in *Te Rōpu Awhi* had left the organisation to voluntary workers.

## 6.6 Personal Reflections

The volunteers in *Te Rōpu Awhi* were Māori and males with a range of skills. The skills and character of the volunteers provided the organisation with an informal culture. The culture created a 'warm, down to earth atmosphere' and was expressed in dressing attire and spoken language. The dress code was casual and the spoken language included Māori colloquial jargon. An example of the casual dress code and spoken language was expressed on the 30 May 2000. That day one of the volunteers dressed in a tee shirt and pants greeted me by saying "*Kia ora, hows your day today, come and have a cup of coffee*". My response was to inform him I had to start the cleaning duties and the volunteer responded, "Don't worry about that, plenty of time for that" (W3, 30/05/00). This behaviour transcended to the clients, as soon as a client came to the organisation the volunteers would greet them and tell them to grab them a cup of coffee or tea. The reaction from clients was calm and the tension brought to the organisation subsided. The volunteers were common people applying practical Māori etiquette

used on the *marae*. The etiquette was to welcome the people, get to know them, and offer hospitality before getting down to business.

The volunteers welcomed me and offered hospitality each time I arrived. In the presence of the volunteers the atmosphere was calm and I felt *noa* (meaning accepted) amidst them. The volunteers were honest in their feelings about their work, other members, the organisation, and my position as a researcher. By working along side the volunteers I learnt humility watching them work unpaid, as well as support their families on a Work and Income NZ benefit. Since they were not employed they worked harder to be recognised by their families and the Gisborne community. The hours spent meeting my research deadlines, travelling backwards and forwards to Hamilton for meetings with supervisors, and reviewing literature fell short of the hours the volunteers worked unpaid each week.

The organisation experienced constant pressure from funding agencies to meet funding criteria. I observed instances where participants in the organisation were required to increase their workload to meet criteria outlined in funding applications. An example of an increased workload was to provide extra details on qualifications, service delivery, and daily tasks. This increased workload was expected to be delivered without increased funding or access to human resource development and did not include the work with clientele. The work with clientele was added onto the existing workload of the volunteers.

The funding agencies were in a position of power that dictated to the organisation rather than a partnership where the organisation worked with the agencies to create criteria. An irony I perceived was the New Zealand government promoted yearly a national programme to prevent violence in the homes and spent millions in advertising. However, these resources seldom reached the grass roots organisations such as *Te Rōpu Awhi* that provided a practical approach to prevent violence in the homes. Instead, the government and funding agencies kept organisations like *Te Rōpu Awhi* in subservient positions by setting criteria that increased the workload and determined whether the organisation operated the next day. The reaction from *Te Rōpu Awhi* was to learn how to operate on funds that

decreased every year while clientele and workload increased. *Te Rōpu Awhi* had few resources to develop the organisation and challenge how funding agencies set the criteria. The organisation was caught up in delivering a social service to the community that placed the needs of the community before the organisation. When changes were requested from funding agencies *Te Rōpu Awhi* adjusted or faced the prospect of operating with no funding. Sadly I observed *Te Rōpu Awhi* as an organisation being propped up by Māori people who worked in an oppressive environment whose members worked hard to make the situation comfortable by relying on personal commitment and donations.

### 6.7 Concluding Comments

The case study was an introduction into the life of a Māori volunteer in an organisation managed by Māori. It provided a deeper understanding of what occurs in voluntary organisations. The experience identified struggles the organisation and volunteers encountered internally and externally.

This chapter acknowledged that the levels of autonomy and self-control in *Te Rōpu Awhi* were managed by individuals. It suggested self-control was the responsibility of each individual in the organisation. The volunteers and paid workers perceived autonomy in the work place to rest with the manager and administrator and levels of self-control to be good. The manager and administrator made the decisions on how the organisation functioned on a daily basis and allocated roles and responsibilities. Each week the organisation held group meetings where issues such as the attitude or behaviour of a worker were raised. The organisation dealt with these issues collectively and solutions were achieved through consensus in group meetings.

The expression of culture in the work place was highlighted in the chapter. *Te Rōpu Awhi* operated in a way that was Māori because the workers were Māori and exercised Māori etiquette. The volunteers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour mirrored the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour exercised on the *marae*. The constant use of casual dress, informal language, decorative surroundings (such as hanging tukutuku panels on the walls), and hospitality reinforced their relationship to the Māori culture.

This chapter showed that the volunteers never received a type of reciprocity that adequately reflected the work done. The volunteers expressed the disappointment with no reciprocity and never receiving the material benefits they felt entitled to. The desire for paid work or equal compensation was strong but never rectified. The demand for the volunteer to provide an unpaid service was high and pressure on the volunteer came from the organisation, community, and clientele.

The work of a volunteer was taken for granted. The volunteer was positioned at the bottom of the organisation and the first person called upon when the community or paid workers could not meet community needs. The clients were singled out as the people who valued the work of the volunteer. Clients were described as openly appreciating the value and the deeds of the volunteer by speaking directly to the volunteer about their deeds.

There was a void in communication and consultation between the volunteer, organisation, community, and government. Only one volunteer knew that there were policies that affected them. *Te Rōpu Awhi* received correspondence about policies and changes in social services. However, the lack of human resources in the organisation to summarise the correspondence and explain the changes in social services to the workers resulted in the information not being distributed or discussed.

The pressure from outside agencies directed the service delivery of *Te Rōpu Awhi*. Agencies that provided funding to *Te Rōpu Awhi* monitored the delivery of services by setting criteria in funding applications. Agencies set rules that oppressed voluntary organisations such as requesting changes from the organisation without sufficient resources.

The characteristics of a Māori volunteer were broad. The nature of the Māori volunteer required love for the people, loyalty, commitment to the cause, and belief in the service delivered. The nature of the person gave a volunteer the strength to work extreme hours under pressure in unpaid work. Māori voluntary workers contributed to the development of Māori communities through their

deeds. However, these deeds were being exploited and the volunteers were performing a duty for Māori, the wider community, and the government. The concepts of *aroha* and *kaupapa* were being used to support a government programme and produce oppressive working conditions by exploiting the volunteers. *Te Rōpu Awhi* were busy putting the needs of the community and everyone else before the needs of the organisations. *Te Rōpu Awhi* were at the bottom of society and struggling to cope. Subsequently, the organisation relied heavily on the passion of the volunteers to survive. In this chapter I provided the in depth insight into an organisation run by Māori for a predominantly Māori clientele. In the next chapter I describe the research I conducted to provide a wider context of volunteering in Gisborne.



## Chapter Seven: The Community Study

*“Nāu te rourou, nāku te rourou, ka ora te manuhiri.”*

*“Your food basket and my food basket will satisfy the guest”*

*(Brougham, Reed, & Kāretu, 1999, 27).*

### 7.0 Introduction

The case study described in the previous chapter presented a view from one encounter with a Māori organisation that participated in voluntary work. This chapter discusses a community study conducted in Gisborne City in order to extend the insights gathered in the case study. The chapter is divided into five sections. Section one describes the method of research (7.1) and section two details the interview responses (7.2) followed by analysis (7.3). Section four discussed the main themes (7.4) of the research and concludes with section five.

### 7.1 The Research Method

Gisborne City has many voluntary organisations that deliver social services to the community. The social services that are delivered covered areas such as caring for the elderly, counselling violence, delivering health services, monitoring truancy, and family support. Some organisations utilise the skills of Māori volunteers to deliver a social service to Māori families and the community study was designed to explore whether various issues raised in the case study were reflected in the wider community. The community study differed from the case study in that I interviewed people in voluntary organisations that had an authority over volunteers (such as managers and chairperson) to describe how volunteers contributed to the development of their organisation.

Designing a research approach for a community study involved reviewing literature and marshalling together my knowledge of theory and practice. The literature covered survey designs and experience from the case study provided the practical techniques. The design involved a range of activities such as reading literature, questioning researchers, creating an interview schedule, and incorporating the findings of the case study into this part of my overall research design.

The 'conversation sheet' was designed using the case study as a guideline. The draft copies of the conversation sheets were sent to university supervisors for critique. The questions included how do you define voluntary work? How many volunteers work in the organisation? The case study findings highlighted that a Māori volunteer had to be of Māori ethnicity and voluntary work was conceptualised as working for the family (including immediate family, relatives and families in the community). Including the questions about characteristics of Māori voluntary workers was a way to compare studies. The case study showed that all volunteers were over 45 years of age and a community study would reveal whether this age group was common in other organisations. Two questions were included in the community study conversation sheet on age, how many volunteers were over 45 years of age and how many volunteers were under 45 years of age. The purpose of the interviews was to examine the extent to which the themes emerging from the case study were common in other community organisations servicing the Gisborne region.

### **7.1.2 The Selection Process and Data Collection**

I used two techniques to select the organisations that would participate in the community study: representation and random selection. The technique used to select a representative group was to look through the names and services of the Māori organisations and highlighted common areas of service delivery. The common areas were health, education, and community support services. When I selected organisations that represented these areas favour was given to those organisations that had operated for over ten years. Using the list I contacted each organisation by telephone and in person until five agreed to participate in the research. Only five were selected using this technique, the other five organisations were selected randomly.

Random selection proved to be an easier approach. The first step was to revisit a list, I had compiled over four years, and count the number of Māori organisations. It totalled 56 organisations. I then crossed out the organisations used in the 'representation process' and 11 *marae* organisations that were outside Gisborne City. These 11 *marae* were crossed out because to reach them required more than

forty minutes of travelling. From these two steps a remaining 40 organisations were left to survey and five were randomly selected from the list.

The managers or chairperson/trustee (in an organisation where there was no manager) were approached and interviewed. Each participant was given an information sheet and consent form. Those who signed the consent form were provided with a copy of the conversation sheets.

### 7.1.3 Fieldwork

Conducting field research in Gisborne City helped me develop networks in the community and gain a deeper understanding of a Māori relationship to voluntary work. Fieldwork provided the primary data and an experience that literature or universities cannot express. Only through conducting this type of research one is able to capture what voluntary work means for Māori people in their daily lives.

Community experience— being a Māori from the community— proved to be a necessity in this community study. My community experience was tested when meeting participants face-to-face (*kanohi kitea*) to discuss the community study. This experience differed depending on the background and characteristics of the participants. The elder participants knew my father who worked for years as a volunteer in the community and based on his work they welcomed me, whereas, the younger participants possessed educational backgrounds and encouraged research performed by Māori in higher education. In some instances I met the participants in past work as co-workers or attended a meeting where they were present. Participants, young and old, offered their support to participate in the research and their decision rested on two things, the *kaupapa* (Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities) and *kanohi kitea* (meeting me).

The conversation sheets were modified after the first three people were interviewed. Before completing the community study I analysed the data for the cross section study (see 3.3.8 and Chapter Eight) and found that the Treaty of Waitangi was omitted from the policies in mainstream organisations delivering voluntary social services. I had overlooked to include questions on the Treaty of Waitangi in the case study and current survey questionnaire. Knowing the

importance of the Treaty of Waitangi for Māori development I took the initiative to modify the conversation sheet. The remaining seven participants were questioned about the Treaty of Waitangi.

## 7.2 Interviews

The interviews were conducted over a period of four months from September 2001 to January 2002. The participants were selected from a list then recruited by telephone or in person. The participants represented an organisation that used the social services of Māori voluntary workers. The interviews lasted about an hour. The information sheet covered a participant's right to withdraw or refrain from answering any questions. Given the urgency to complete the interviews and write the thesis before the completion date in July 2002 the participants waived their right to withdraw by signing the consent forms. Only the participants who signed consent forms were interviewed for the community study.

The interviews were conducted in the work place or at the homes of participants. There appeared to be no potential risks or discomforts for the participants and proper procedures were followed in a way to make sure the encounter was enjoyable, convenient, and not time-consuming. I adjusted my approach to suit the participants. An example of adjusting my approach was shown when interviewing a participant at their place of work who went outside for a smoke and I followed behind them with my questionnaire.

Systems were put in place to protect the confidentiality of the participant and the name of the organisation. The interview sheets were coded and the name of an organisation was not recorded. Each participant was given a different code and after the completion of the research the data were destroyed. Only I had access to the information provided by the participants and there was no specific compensation given to participants for their contribution in the research. However, in interviews I brought *hangis*, joined the organisation, or contributed to the organisation in some way.

*Whakawhānaungatanga* was the paramount entry into this field of research (also discussed in Chapter Three). Each time I approached a participant we would

engage in a process of *whakawhānaungatanga*. This process was exercised with all participants. The participants who did not know me before the interview required the process to be longer. A *whakawhānaungatanga* process was engaging in discussions about *whakapapa*. It required me to answer questions from the participants about my tribe, *whānau*, and upbringing. Once I discussed *whakapapa* the participant could make a connection as a relation or knew family members. This connection created a safe environment and participants were comfortable to let me talk about the research. Since I was from the community the participants felt a sense of camaraderie because I could talk their language and understand them.

### 7.2.1 Responses

Ten participants responded to the interview questions. I documented each response to the questions. From the ten participants seven were asked 34 questions and three 30. The questions were structured under the headings A: Māori Voluntary Organisation, B: Māori Volunteers, and C: Volunteer Resource Development and D: Comments. In doing so, it allowed the participants' voices to emerge.

#### A: Māori Voluntary Organisations

##### 1) *Why do you work in this organisation?*

Ten participants identified having a passion to work with people and enhancing the Māori community as reasons for working in the organisation:

- “Because I love the *Kaupapa*. *Kaupapa* from the grass roots up, connection to *whakakapapa*. The *kaupapa* is to strengthen and support artists in visual language performance” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “Because it gives me great satisfaction to work towards development of our people especially in Māori land” (O9, 11/1/01).
- “Passion to make Māori kids go forward. The teaching has to change in mainstream. The mainstream blame the *whānau* and it's not true. Blaming children is a cop out for them (mainstream). I want to be in there (this organisation) to make changes that is suitable for Māori. Most of the children are in poverty. ... If you come from an undesirable background they (Māori

children) are labelled. Principal and teachers are Pakeha and can't fix the problem (with at risk kids). There has to be changes in education and I want my race to do well. I'm on the ground level so I see what's happening so if you are on the ground you can see what's happening. I love the underdog (less fortunate) and I love to help them" (O4, 7/7/02).

2) *How do you recruit volunteers?*

Ten participants identified different ways they recruited volunteers. Recruiting members was done by word of mouth, asking people in the organisations, or public advertisements. One member highlighted the use of national recruiting by "word of mouth, brochures, meetings, newsletters, national *hui* to gather members from around New Zealand" (O1, 27/9/01).

3) *Why do volunteers work in this organisation?*

All participants shared that they believed that volunteers had a genuine interest to contribute their skills to further the organisation and enhance the community they lived in because they were experienced volunteers:

- "Sometimes I think because they are artists and they want to improve the quality of life as a whole and others do it because NPW (abbreviated name of the organisations) has a strong *whakapapa* history. *Whakapapa* have a generation of members and family who have been members of NPW" (O1, 27/9/01).
- "Passionate and want to help. Really nice people. Always a reason, *kaupapa* of the organisation, to understand what's going on in their own families" (O4, 7/2/02).
- "Work experience and increase their skills for employment" (O5, 7/1/02).
- "A strong commitment to the well being of its *whānau, hapū, tamariki, mokopuna*. To make a difference in the service delivery to Māori people and their communities. To keep influencing policies which are more appreciated to meeting Māori needs" (O6, 8/2/02).
- "They have a passion for their *marae*. They want to see it there for their *mokopuna*" (O10, 11/01/02).

4) *Are volunteers employed to fulfil services that are not funded by government?*

Eight out of ten participants stated volunteers were employed to fulfil the services that were not funded by government. Two participants weren't sure whether volunteers were employed to fulfil the services funded by government.

5) *What are your thoughts on how the government treats volunteers in general?*

All participants thought that government ill-treated volunteers:

- “Poor actually, the government is ill informed to the extent of how much support the volunteers give. Because it is not reflected in the amount of money given to volunteers and their work” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “I don't think they (government) have a thought at all. I don't think they (government) realise how much volunteers are needed to run an organisation, they don't care about volunteers” (O4, 7/01/02).
- “They are not very nice. I think government take advantage of volunteers, they really [are] not recognised” (O5, 7/01/02).
- “Like crap. It's like they'll (volunteers) do it (work for government). Maybe they (government) are good but it doesn't come across that way [because] volunteers carry the load (work) for government” (O8, 7/01/02).
- “I don't think they (government) realise their (volunteers) worth and the money they (government) save. If they (government) saved money they won't jump in [to help volunteers]” (O9, 11/01/02).

6) *What type of working conditions does a volunteer encounter? (For example: Do they work long hours? Do they have to provide their own transport)?*

Nine out of ten agreed that volunteers work long hours and to a great extent provide their own transport. Only the participant from a private company representing a Pakeha organisation using the services of Māori volunteers said

“We don’t expect our volunteers to work long hours. Whatever suits them is the time period. We are flexible” (O5, 7/1/02).

7) *How do you define or describe a Māori voluntary organisation?*

Ten participants provided views to define a Māori organisation as being managed by Māori with Māori volunteers:

- “Probably a *whānau*, *hapū* organisation, community based where everyone knows everyone. We probably make our *whānau* Māori work harder and place pressure on them because they’re our own” (O2, 1/ 10/01).
- “I see the workers as doing a lot of voluntary work and they are Māori” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “Big hearts and big hands. Māori voluntary organisations are prepared to work if their heart’s there, long hours for nothing or for the purpose of helping our Māori people” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “I think it is Māori doing the work that we always do automatically and didn’t have a name” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Enlarged hearts, full of emotion and lacking in economic base” (O10, 11/1/02).

8) *What kaupapa should a Māori voluntary organisation follow?*

All participants stated that the Māori voluntary organisation should follow a *kaupapa* that is Māori:

- “One reason I find it hard to answer is the *kaupapa* was set by *Tupuna*. I follow the aims and philosophy of NPW. I can only talk to this organisation. Part of the organisation is you agree with what was set by those who first established it. There are 12 regions NPW each of the regions are allowed to develop their own ideas, and there are no hard and fast rules. Each region has a *tikanga* and *kawa* rules and guidelines” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “Obviously *tikanga* Māori, keeping with our concepts of *whānau*, spiritual beliefs, *kawa*, consultation, talking rather than the dictatorial stuff (working with the people and the people determine the *kaupapa* rather than being told a



*kaupapa* and tell the people to follow the *kaupapa*). Above all, whatever is fair and *tika*” (O2, 1/10/01).

- “*Aroha ki te tangata* is what you need. Helping people, caring for people, taking them at face value. Input into voluntary work comes from the heart and you can only do the best you can. The work has moved from the *marae*, otherwise we would have done it on the *marae*. A service you did for nothing on the *marae*. Statutes, did not come out of the streets (from the communities), in the time the Act was formed, it was done to take care of alcohol problems. That’s what the (name of organisation) were about especially during wars. ... No Māori women were appointed as (name of organisation), it was the men, until the wars [then] there was no men left on the *marae*” (O3, 28/9/01).
- “A Māori way of doing your job description. Working outside the square that Pakeha put in place and finding ways to help Māori. It includes working with *whānau*” (O4, 7/2/02).

9) *Does this organisation have a policy about voluntary services?*

Nine out of ten did not have specific policies for voluntary services. Only the private company had policies about volunteers:

- “Yes. Programme manager as a supportive role to the organisation. Support the volunteers, free training for volunteers and Māori organisations. We can assist in training development, culture development, and work experience and tutors involved in cultural events” (O5, 7/1/02).

10) *What kind of relationship does this organisation have with government?*

Six participants stated they had a good relationship with government and four participants identified the relationship as poor.

11) *What type of consultation process exists between this organisation and other agencies such as local government, churches, iwi representatives funding agencies?*

Ten participants had a good consultation process between them and other agencies:

- “Strong partnerships between mainstream agencies and other organisations delivering services to Māori are essential. (Name of organisation) is represented nationally and regionally on a great many panels, advisory committees, agencies, which seek its advice and participation in policy decision making” (O6, 8/02/02).

12) *Does the government/local council/iwi representatives provide funds to this organisation for the services of voluntary workers?*

Nine participants said that they do not receive any funding for the services of voluntary workers. One said they did:

- “Government. Yes through the ... (Name of Organisation) undertaking major service delivery contracts through its members regionally and nationally. [We are] left improving immunisation rates among Māori children (Ministry of Health). Developing parenting skills where supportive networks are lost. Ensuring a safe nurturing, and educative environment for our *tamariki mokopuna*. Employment, self sufficiency issues, training of membership. Development of cottage industries utilising (Community Employment Group Support) community employment, the skills of the membership towards self sufficiency” (O6, 8/02/02).

**B: Māori Volunteers**

13) *What words would you use to define and describe the characteristics of a Māori voluntary worker?*

All participants identified being Māori and a passion to help the Māori people as characteristics of a Māori voluntary worker:

- “Humble person, can’t be an arrogant know-it-all because you are working with grass roots. A good listener, you’ve got two holes to listen with don’t let your mouth take over” (O3, 28/9/01).

- “A lot of heart, *aroha*, passionate about their people, seeing their people do well. Its about getting the job done, not paid. Love in the community they are loved back but it doesn’t pay the bills. Reward is love back” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “A man who does things for nothing. I do it because I love helping the people because I am on a pension I can do it and not dependent on a weekly wage. I don’t know about Pakeha organisations” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “I think committed to being Māori and a desire to retain all things Māori and be recognised as such” (O10, 11/1/02).

14) *How many volunteers work in this organisation? How many are under 45 years of age? How many are over 45 years of age?*

Six out of the ten participants had volunteers over 45 years of age. Two participants stated that all their volunteers were aged over 45 years. Two participants stated that half were under 45 years. Two organisations had more volunteers under 45 years of age and three had more volunteers over 45 years of age. One participant had a large membership. “The (name of organisation) is pan tribal with a membership of 3,000 people and 150 branches throughout New Zealand. Age ranges are junior branches (schools) to senior branches, 16-90 years” (O6, 8/02/02).

15) *What service does a voluntary worker provide?*

All participants stated a range of services a volunteer worker provided to their organisation:

- “Workshops, seminars, conferences, tuition, support for other organisations. Advisory link on local authorities, national arts council, school holiday programmes, assist in education, tertiary, and health education (O1, 27/9/01).
- Reception duties, secretarial, and administration. Back home (on the East Coast) can’t beat having a Māori face, someone they know. Important to employ a Māori who is from the community” (O2, 28/9/01).
- “Support, policing, and training” (O3, 28/9/01).
- “On an education programme it is assisting with looking after the safety of children, cooking, cleaning, supervision, life skills and after a two week seven

day holiday programme we are stressed out. We give a koha to the *marae* and food, petrol, and programmes we provide voluntary” (O4, 7/12/02).

- “All sorts, reception, filing, one-to-one tutoring, general house cleaning. Doing the things I would normally do and I give them responsibility and administrative work” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “Information gathering, co-ordinating, communication between people and our organisation and administrative work” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “Counselling, visiting *whānau* homes, support, transport for clients, provided personal funds to feed clients” (O8, 9/1/01).
- “Administration, research, and fieldwork” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Anything necessary, all practical jobs like catering, grounds man, and community work” (O10, 11/1/02).

16) *How many hours does a volunteer work on average per week?*

Six participants stated volunteers work an average of 20 hours per week and four participants gave different hours: 8, 12, 30, and 40.

17) *How does voluntary work contribute to the organisation?*

Six participants identified voluntary work as the foundation of the organisation that allowed it to operate. Four participants offered different answers:

- “It gives us the opportunity to train our own young people to become administrators, managers, and develop our own Māori people” (O2, 28/9/01).
- “Strengthens the *whānau* and anybody that gives services for free. It has to benefit the *whānau*” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “Relieve pressure of organisational workload” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “The main stay, it has knowledge of day-to-day work and feelings of *hapū*” (O10, 11/1/02).

18) *Do volunteers volunteer as a stepping-stone to paid work?*

Eight participants stated that volunteers volunteer as a stepping-stone to paid work and two stated the work to be a lifetime unpaid commitment:

- “It happens, but I don’t think they do it deliberately. It can and has happened but in most cases there isn’t much money, there is a lot of work to get a little funding and that’s why it doesn’t happen. There is much effort in applying for funding to run programmes and there is little time left to apply for funding to get a paid worker or paid position that you are doing voluntary. Finding time to put together a proposal is hard. If you are unsuccessful with your application you get disheartened and the funding you get is unrealistic. I’ve turned down funding because it is too small to get the job done so I turn down the funding. Those who accept can’t complete the job and sell themselves short and someone else gets the credit for what’s been done” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “No. I haven’t seen that happen they come because they want to be a (name of organisation). Some go into security training, three districts handle truancy, and that changed when (name of organisation) came into the picture to deliver truancy services” (O3, 28/9/01).
- “I never looked at that, that’s what we should teach our young people. Look for the day we can step into paid work” (O7, 8/1/02).

19) *What is the turnover rate for volunteers?*

Five participants stated there was no turnover rate because it is a lifetime commitment. Three said low, one said high, and one did not know.

20) *How long do volunteers stay?*

Eight participants stated that volunteers stayed for a lifetime, one said six months, and one said six months to two years:

A lifetime with NPW all the people have been there for a very long time, over twenty years. Because of *whakapapa* links they are not there for money or anything else, the other thing is the successes. We are Māori and made up from a whole lot of different tribes. Usually it goes against each other [but] not in NPW, we can sit down and talk, our tribal differences are not raised because our common goals are the arts and enhancing Māori art. Even with money we still don’t fight (O1, 27/9/01).

21) *Are there any social, political or economic reasons for having voluntary*

workers? *If yes please comment?*

All participants stated that there were social, political, and economic reasons for having voluntary workers, for example:

- “Because the organisation would be non-existent. You need people to donate their time for free” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “Social part is about Māori development, upskilling our people and giving them employment. Economic is in the dollars, as far as work is the volunteer is [a] successful [worker], greeted positively rather than a trained person [from the] outside. Political is recognising our own Māori who in the Pakeha world would [not] get acknowledged because, no skills etc. Developing our own is a political development, knowledge of *whakapapa*, putting value on our Māori knowledge” (O2, 28/9/01).
- “Economics, it allows the organisation to function, cheapest organisation and yet our people know at the end of the day they get a couple of dollars but never say I am sick of this job I am not coming back. The first priority is everyone else. It is harder to recruit *rangatahi* because of economics, no money for them and they’re not easy to come by. You can’t get this (money for income for work) from where we are. Like today at the *hangi* the [name of organisation’s volunteers] paid for their *hangi* but stand aside and wait for everyone else to get their [*hangi*]. So on the whole they are pretty good and selfless” (O3, 28/9/01).
- “When volunteers are upskilled and employed outside the organisation it’s positive feedback. The social reasons are job skilling. A volunteer, her reasons for not being paid was that she was pulling the strings. If she was paid she felt she would be controlled by employment, she was in control of her own voluntary work. Māori voluntary work in the organisation and she wanted to upskill herself” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “The *Kaupapa* of the (name of organisation)” (O6, 8/02/02).
- “Social reason to help the *whānau*. Economic no funds to pay them. Political is to raise the political awareness of the people they help” (O7, 8/1/02).

- “Couldn’t afford to pay workers, there was a need in social problems for Māori families that needed to be met in school systems. Too many Māori children falling through the mainstream system” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “It’s hard to get people, get a Māori organisation without voluntary workers because they don’t have the initial funds” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Because the *marae* is the main stay of a *hapū*, if the *marae* burns down *hapū* feel floundered. Social, political, and economic goes on in the *marae*” (O10, 11/1/02).

### **C: Volunteer Resource Development**

22) *Do the voluntary workers have access to upskill themselves and support when necessary? If yes please comment?*

Nine participants stated that volunteers have access to upskill themselves. Four of the nine participants identified receiving funding from government for Capacity Building as the supportive income to upskill volunteers.

23) *Do the volunteers receive any type of compensation for services like petrol vouchers?*

Nine participants stated they gave a type of compensation to the volunteers and the compensation ranged from petrol vouchers, money, upskilling and food and these organisation compensated from their own funding.

24) *What type of support is necessary to make sure a voluntary worker is able to perform his or her duties?*

All participants identified providing the voluntary worker with access to basic resources and support as a necessity to perform duties.

25) *How are volunteers monitored?*

Five participants stated that the volunteers monitored themselves. Four participants said the volunteers were monitored the same as the employees and one participant never monitored them.

26) *What future do you see for Māori voluntary workers?*

All participants expressed it was essential to enhance the conditions of voluntary workers:

- “It looks dismal. Unless money is put into it the sad fact is people’s (volunteers) patience and time is dwindling so volunteers need to be paid. Government needs to put up money to finance the volunteers” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “Oh, I think there is a big future for voluntary Māori organisations. I can’t see them falling away, they just need a helping hand like little things in hospital where you get visits. There are so many of them but where does the money come from. Like my old man, things are left for the old ones. (The elderly people provide a lot of voluntary work to help those in hospital and fund raise to do their work)” (O3, 28/9/01).
- “Absolutely nothing. I can’t see them being paid. Things need to change dramatically. They gain experience which may lead to something positive. As for monetary [nothing]. My experience with volunteers is why I do well today” (O4, 7/1/02).

#### **D: Additional Comments**

27) *Does this organisation apply any type of Māori tikanga? If yes can you describe the tikanga that is applied?*

All participants applied a type of *tikanga* in their organisation similar to the following response:

“Te Reo Māori, Māori protocol. *Whakawhānaungatanga* is the relation in uniting your *whānau*. It comes about through the protocol and the *reo*. You can’t *whakawhānaungatanga* without *reo*. *Manaaki* is hospitality. Question “what is *poha*” (literature suggested it described Māori volunteers)? “*Poha* is when I open a *kina*” (the *kina* was a sea urchin that is opened so that the content inside can be eaten). (My response was it is written in literature that Māori voluntary work means *poha*). “Don’t mean *poha*. If that volunteer goes in and all he knows is Pakeha you have to open him up like a *kina* to get the Māori out of him” (O7, 8/1/02).

28) *Volunteers have expressed that they are lower than paid workers because they are not paid and Pakeha volunteers received more benefits than a Māori volunteer. What is your response to this expression?*



Three participants did not know what happened in a Pakeha organisation. Four participants agreed that Māori volunteers feel lower than a paid worker. Five participants identified that Pakeha volunteers were perceived as being in a better position to secure funding and access resources:

- “I agree, lower than paid workers because they are not paid. As for Pakeha volunteers I don’t know because I don’t belong to a Pakeha organisation. My thoughts are because I have always belonged to a Māori organisation and they have all been broke” (O1, 27/9/01).
- “Like I say, I haven’t got a lot of what happens in a Pakeha voluntary organisation I don’t know what happens there. Volunteers are paid less because of their experience in this organisation” (O2, 28/9/01).
- “Actually, I believe that Māori volunteers last longer in the employment than Pakeha volunteers last longer in the employment. I really don’t know the answer to this question” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “I suppose a lack of knowledge on what Māori can access” (O7, 7/1/02).
- “They do. Pakeha receive more than a Māori volunteer and they go out of their way to help another Pakeha” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “All voluntary workers have that enlarged heart syndrome. They are all working because we all have big hearts and strive for the same goals” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “I don’t think so. Both are treated the same but work in different areas. Heart commitment and passion is the same for both” (O10, 11/1/02).

27) *Do you think volunteers contribute to the community and Māori development?*

All participants confirmed that voluntary work contributed to the positive development of Māori communities and to a greater extent reinforced that Māori voluntary work was the essence and basis from which organisations could operate:

- “Yes, absolutely. They’re involved with increasing arts in our Tairāwhiti community, arts in school projects and Māori communities. In terms of Māori

development when a Māori artist develops so to does the *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*. Māori art is an investment in Māoridom” (O1, 27/9/02).

- “Yes, because they become responsible, empowered, positive role models and take pride in themselves” (O2, 28/9/01).
- “Yes because they are bringing skills to share and help educate, support, and teach *whānau*” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “Yes, they, some volunteers, have gone into *kōhanga* as a volunteer. I think that even though they are employed I encourage them to upskill and help someone else, when they do well their *whānau* does well, some volunteers moved schools and are employed and helping the community” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “Yes without them there is no development” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “Definitely. When a client is helped and they develop positively the *whānau* community enhances. Even though the client is helped and reverts to the same behaviour the *whānau* still see that at least someone tried to help” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “Yes. The volunteers are the mainstay. People come and go but there are those that stay (the volunteers)” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Yes. They are the essence of community development” (O10, 11/1/02).

This section includes the discussions on the Treaty of Waitangi. It details the responses of seven participants.

*29b) Does your organisation have any Treaty of Waitangi Policies? If your answer is yes could you describe the policies? (The b after the 29 identifies the modified questions answered by the last seven participants).*

All participants believed that principles should apply in their organisations and six had policies. Below are their comments:

- “Yes. Participation, protection, partnership, and work with government agencies, schools etc” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “Yes. The Treaty of Waitangi is included in this organisation. We are a Pakeha mainstream organisation. We are in line with the Treaty of Waitangi

for cultural development, the tutor involvement in cultural events understanding that” (O5, 7/1/02).

- “The Treaty underpins all the [name of organisation] activities” (O6, 8/02/02).
- “Our whole *kaupapa* is inclusive of the Treaty. We don’t have a written one but we take it as it’s there” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Yes, because we are the partner, so we host the partner and government” (O10, 11/1/02).

*30b) What does the Treaty of Waitangi mean to your organisation?*

All participants described what the Treaty of Waitangi meant to their organisation. Below are some of their comments:

- “Everything, the three P’s (participation, protection, and partnership)” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “It is our founding document” (O6, 8/02/02).
- “It means control and Article I, II, III, IV of the Tiriti o Waitangi Māori version” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “We acknowledge and have respect for the land and anything Māori” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “Partnership to the Crown” (O9, 11/1/02).
- It means partnership, being recognised for that part in the partnership with local bodies and voluntary organisations. Any Māori organisation should be a partner. *Manaaki* is being able to share knowledge skill and information. *Poha* means shell out, open up, it doesn’t mean a duty, it means *pohara*” (O10, 11/1/02).

*31b) Did your organisation access any capacity building funding from government? If your answer is yes could you describe how the capacity building fund helped the organisation?*

Three out of seven participants did not receive any capacity building funding. One participant did not know and three received funding:

- “We accessed funding to restructure the commercial arm, strategic plan and now we are implementing, restructuring initiatives, re-developing the governance structures” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “Yes. Strategic plans and capacity building” (O9, 11/1/02).

32b) *What are some ways to develop your organisation?*

Seven participants provided different answers to develop their organisation:

- “Continue to develop our management practices and endorsing some accountability policies. Finding ways to identify and measure our services. Sometimes we do a lot more and aren’t recognised” (O4, 7/1/02).
- “We are doing it now, introduce more work experience and jobs. Maybe a nicer venue” (O5, 7/1/02).
- “Regular strategic planning” (O6, 8/02/02).
- “Implement capacity building plans and information technology website” (O7, 8/1/02).
- “Maybe new strategies, ways to get funding, even if its minimum to keep workers and their families. Workers must have some income” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “Increase the database and capacity building” (O9, 11/1/02).
- “Yes. Workshops and provide resource material for future use” (O10, 9/11/02).

34) *Would you like to make any further comments about Māori volunteers?*

Seven out of ten participants made further comments:

- “I think they’re awesome and should be paid [and] respected for their input, they (volunteers) are not appreciated” (O4, 7/2/02).
- “I think that Māori volunteers are great because they decided to become volunteers to help the *whānau* because it rubs off into employment and they get employed in the end. It’s a requirement in this organisation that volunteers read the policies, we sit down and go through it with them. We have over sixty policies in this manual and we read every policy. Volunteers sign a form that they have read it. This is our accountability to our clients. I let [the]

volunteers have a say in the organisation. I am proud of them because they are Māori. They are treated like staff” (O5, 7/1/02).

- “They (volunteers) all do good work to help our Māori people” (O8, 9/1/02).
- “I think we need to be constantly aware and appreciate the volunteer no amount of work can replace the volunteer” (O10, 11/1/02).

### 7.3 Analysis

Once the interview schedules were completed the information was typed on the computer. The information was then transferred into QSR Nvivo software so that the contents could be coded electronically. The text was coded using a variety of codes that reflected the contents of the data such as legal structures, Māori voluntary work, and Māori development. A coding report and a text report were generated from the computer and the contents analysed. Main themes were drawn from the coding reports and appear as subheadings in the next section.

### 7.4 Main Themes

The results reflected the main themes drawn from the data and placed under six subheadings. The subheadings are: Describing a Māori Volunteer and Māori Voluntary Organisation (7.4.1), Working Conditions (7.4.2). *Tikanga* Māori – Māori Development (7.4.3), The Treaty of Waitangi (7.4.4), Relationship with Government (7.4.5), and Future Aspirations for Māori Voluntary Organisations (7.4.6).

#### 7.4.1 Describing a Māori Volunteer and Māori Voluntary Organisation

A Māori volunteer had to be of Māori ethnicity and “passionate about their work, hard working, patient, dedicated, [and] loyal. [They were] skilled, [with] unrecognised skills in most cases, good jugglers, lot of juggling time with work in NPW and other things” (O1, 27/9/01). This person was expected to:

- a) have a passion for the work they entered into,
- b) possess a big heart and be a friendly person,
- c) work long hours,
- d) be experienced in community work,
- e) be prepared to work in oppressive conditions and unpaid.

A Māori voluntary organisation had to have a *kaupapa* that was Māori and service predominantly Māori clients. The legal structure for a Māori organisation was Charitable Status or an Incorporated Society and:

The organisation is to service predominantly Māori. The volunteers that are involved [must] understand the needs of the *tikanga* Māori, *whakapapa* ideology, because the volunteers *whakapapa* to members [and] there is a sense of caring, maintaining, and increasing the services in the organisation that separates it from other organisations (O1, 27/9/01).

#### **7.4.2 Working Conditions and Workload**

The working conditions for the volunteers were not attractive. The volunteers were expected to work on average twenty hours or more. They had to provide their own transport to deliver services and work in an organisation with little or no economic support. The volunteers provided manual, administrative, and professional services. The volunteers relied on their passion and love for the organisation and community to help them through their duties. The services of a Māori voluntary organisation were in demand because Aotearoa/NZ society had created an environment whereby mainstream New Zealand was not coping with Māori social problems. As a result the working conditions and workload for Māori increased:

Because mainstream could not handle Māori and the social reason for [having Māori volunteers]. The harder [Māori volunteers] try to do things for Māori because you are not working in the boundaries you get slapped in the face. Volunteers are not respected, looked down upon from mainstream (O4, 7/1/02).

#### **7.4.3 Tikanga Māori – Māori Development**

Human resource development was important in the organisations. All organisations provided some type of resource development services for the volunteers based on their *kaupapa* and *kawa*. The extent and level of resources were dependent on the organisation's access to resources, available funds and:

The principles and *kawa* of how we work in this organisation. *Kaupapa* Māori is the way we deliver our services and who delivers our services. We use *Te Reo* Māori amongst the community, in hospital our people have a choice to choose food they would eat at home. The services we provide are accessible and there are no barriers like free consultation and we visit them. The qualities we look for in people we choose ourselves (for delivering our services) is weighted on whether they are a local person. We provide a holistic approach and include all the family. *Karakia* for start and finish of meetings, we *pohiri* every new staff and farewell them, and attend their new *pohiri* (for a new job). *Tikanga* is an extra cost and not recognised by government. All these things, a lot (people) have gone away learning the *tikanga* and *Te Reo* (O2, 28/9/02).

The organisations were firm that Māori development existed because of Māori volunteers. They acknowledged that to deliver social services without an economic base meant relying on the contribution of the work effort from the volunteers to keep them afloat. Volunteers contributed to the social, political, and economic development of the organisation and Māori communities. Development in communities started at the 'grass roots', with basic applications:

Because [volunteers] help the *whānau* and the unfortunate. They help Māori develop positively like the youth at risk, take them out for a trip, they have a big smile on their face when they return. The outcomes are less tagging and skateboarding uptown. I say to those ones skateboarding outside the shops how would you like someone banging into your feet. Because I talk to them we have less and less at the Mall where we police. Kids are kids and they will do stupid things (O3, 28/9/01).

It was argued that Māori organisations had the necessary skills to deliver appropriate social services to Māori clients. It was highlighted that experience and being Māori were better than the current practices delivered by non-Māori social workers. Māori followed a:

*Kaupapa* and [had] genuine heart for the youth. Some (clients) voiced their concerns about the Pakeha system of doing things [that] it wasn't structured to how Māori perceived things only Pakeha. For example ... With a male psychologist (European) it was just a job for him, straight from the book, nothing outside, all rigidity. [He] goes through a process of ticking off what needs to be done according to the process in front of him. At the [end of] the weeks of counselling the youth still didn't see what he did was wrong, nothing achieved and then handed back to Children and Young Persons Services. A Māori approach to me is getting them (clients) to identify who they are, their *iwi*, where they come from the whole *kaupapa*. Because to me it gives them their identity and they should repeat it in front of elders. ... Do that identity first before addressing the problem then look at their specific problems that made them act [that] way (O8, 9/1/02).

Māori *tikanga*, *whakapapa*, *whānau*, *kawa*, and *aroha* were the reasons that kept a Māori person in a voluntary organisation. The organisation could not retain volunteers without the *whakapapa* links or the *aroha whānau* members expressed. A Māori voluntary organisation would not function without grounding itself in the cultural aspects of the Māori community. Learning the duties of a volunteer began with performing humble duties and a:

Māori volunteer [was] not a new term we have always had a passion to help our people develop their lives. We will always volunteer because that's what we have on the *marae*. No doubt you have to spend your time on the *marae* to be a good volunteer, peeling potatoes, cooking the kai to standing on the *paepae*. That's your training for a volunteer. When you're peeling spuds there always something going on like stories of your *tipuna* (O7, 8/1/02).

#### **7.4.4 The Treaty of Waitangi – Sovereignty**

The organisations were adamant that the Treaty of Waitangi signalled a partnership with the Crown. Their perception was the Crown and Māori shared control over resources and the people. "*Tino rangatiratanga*, the organisation is in



control of developments. Making sure the organisation enhances tino rangatiratanga over the property through wānanga and capacity building” (O7, 8/1/02). All participants acknowledged that the Treaty was a powerful document and meant:

Quite a lot and very important that’s why we have policies in place. We offer videos, games, written material, available copies of the treaty and *kapahaka* for our clients. Māori attitudes are kept and maintained by staff, all staff goes through the policies on cultural awareness and development. *Taha Māori* will not isolate as a separate subject but will be integrated throughout programme areas: understand spoken Māori, pronouncing people’s names and places correctly, expressing simple greetings, farewells, and useful phrases, understanding and appreciating Māori values and attitudes. Where necessary a cultural advisor will be involved with the tutor trainee for cultural development, support and guidance only (O5, 7/01/02).

#### **7.4.5 Relationship with Government**

Participants who communicated with government agents considered the relationship between the government and organisations to be fair. The organisations had consultation processes between them, government agencies and local authorities. Only some organisations had access to funding to assist the volunteers or applied for community funding and were successful. One organisation said the relationship was improving:

[A] relationship and consultation exists with community of the Coast. We go out to the *marae* and recognise community as *hapū* base. The government agency relationship is now a little better and they come up and contact us to get their services for example WINZ, CCS, if it helps our people we are quite supportive. The relationship with *rūnanga* has improved (O2, 1/10/01).

In addition, participants believed that Pakeha voluntary organisations had better access to funding than Māori. “It is because Pakeha look after their people better than Māori (pay them and have access to better funding)” (O4, 7/1/02) and:

Our volunteers do feel that they are lower because we are all volunteers and we do our damndest for nothing but it could affect the young who have families to complement voluntary work. I don’t think it is right that Pakeha receive more benefits than a Māori volunteer, have they done a review? Pakeha organisations are resourced better (O3, 28/9/01)

The participants came to accept that government would not acknowledge Māori volunteers. They expressed a concern that because Māori incorporate voluntary activities in the culture it can be perceived that the action of a volunteer is a normal behaviour in the community. “Maybe they (government) rip them (volunteers) off, if you’ve got Māori volunteers government think maybe they (Māori volunteers) don’t need funding for that service because they are Māori” (O2, 1/10/01). “Voluntary workers provide a cheaper service for governments than mainstream providers. [The] expectation by government of volunteers are much greater than voluntary organisations who work to provide [a service] with limited to no finances” (O6, 8/02/02).

#### **7.4.6 Future Aspirations of Māori Voluntary Organisations**

Māori organisations needed the services of Māori volunteers to deliver a range of social services when funding was insufficient. Māori communities failed to function without the contribution from Māori voluntary organisations because of insufficient resources to deliver social services. Government does not adequately fund enough organisations at the grass roots to deliver social services. The organisations stress that it is important to value the volunteer and put systems in place to make the environment they work in better because they are the:

Mainstay, volunteers stay there all the time. We have the passion to stay there and have the goal to achieve Māori economic development. People are passionate about the diverse range of *hapū*. We have a broad spectrum of the whole area and manage to work together. *Manaaki* is respect and

hospitality that will bring us together. *Poha* is not our duty (in response to a question on Māori volunteerism) it is a misinterpretation of our concepts (O9/ 11/1/02).

Even though Māori voluntary organisations struggled to survive there was hope that the circumstances would improve and that there will be:

A better future for volunteers because it is hard to put the hand out to the government and ask for assistance. I can't see it not being around in the community. I help to run (name of an organisation) office people come and say "gee you still here". I am lucky my husband is a (name of the organisation the participant worked for) so he understand I try to do my share" (O3, 28/9/01).

## 7.5 Concluding Comments

This chapter confirmed several of the themes drawn from the case study described in Chapter Six that Māori voluntary work is the essence of development in Māori communities. Māori organisations that delivered services to the community were predominantly lacking in an economic base and relied on the voluntary activity provided by the people to operate. The services these organisations delivered to the community required volunteers to work long hours to address the social problems mainstream organisations were not fixing. Māori volunteers worked to provide social services for government, the local community, and their tribe.

The chapter confirms that the majority of Māori voluntary workers worked in an oppressive environment. An oppressive working condition consisted of working five days a week putting in at least four hours a day and not a leisurely duty, rather a social duty. The services they performed were varied and sometimes were the duty of a professional paid worker.

The organisations were not funded for Māori voluntary work and only a few had policies on voluntary work. There was an overwhelming sense that the exclusion of policies was because the volunteers performed a duty that was natural and the organisations never thought to incorporate a policy in the structure. The

monitoring process for volunteers was delivered in an ad hoc fashion where the volunteers monitored themselves.

The Treaty of Waitangi was seen to possess *mana* and the organisations were proud to acknowledge they incorporated the principles in their work. The majority of the organisations preferred to sit down with the Crown as a treaty partner to discuss social services if given the chance. The organisations had a relationship with government.

Overall, the organisations agreed that volunteers were taken for granted and not given the recognition they deserved. When comparing the access to resources and funding between Māori and Pakeha the organisations identified that Pakeha had better access to resources and funding from government because they knew how to work within the structures. Pakeha were seen to have better systems to access support. The next chapter describes a cross section study that was done while I was conducting the community study.

## **Chapter Eight: Cross Section Study**

*“He koānga tangata tahi, he ngahuru puta noa.”*

*“At digging time only one man will turn up; at harvest time there is no limit to the number of helpers” (Reed & Kāretu, 1999, 68).*

### **8.0 Introduction**

In the year 2000, the government made a commitment to meet face-to-face with community organisations across New Zealand that participated in voluntary activity. This encounter between the government and local communities produced data which the Ministry of Social Policy developed into a report. This chapter describes a cross section study of some of the data produced from the encounter between government and the communities and is separated into five parts. Part one: The Government meets the Community and Voluntary Organisations (8.1) and provides a brief description of the encounter. Part two discusses the Research Method (8.2). The Analysis (8.3) covers part three and part four shows the main themes (8.4) followed by part five: Concluding Comments (8.5).

### **8.1 The Government Meets the Community and Voluntary Organisations**

The Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector, the Honourable Steve Maharey, established a working party to meet community organisations. This working party was called the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party (CVSWP). The role of CVSWP was to develop a framework for an “agreement between the Government and the community and the voluntary sector” (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001a, 1). On 15 August 2000, the Minister announced the members of the working party. The members numbered 12 and were chosen from three hundred and forty nominations forwarded by community groups representing a cross section of voluntary organisations throughout New Zealand. Three of these members were appointed because of their senior positions within the civil service. The 12 members were Sandra Alofivae, John Angus, Don Clarke, Enid Leighton, Malcom Peri, Atareta Poananga, Sir Paul Reeves, Donald Shand, Jenny Smith, John Stansfield, Pam Warren, and the chair Dorothy Wilson.

The CVSWP visited communities in New Zealand with the intention of developing this framework by gathering reports from community groups. The community groups which were visited had to deliver a type of voluntary social service. The strategy used to develop a framework was to ask the community specific questions and record the responses. The questions were:

1. What would a good relationship between the government and your organisation sector look like?
2. What are the existing barriers to such a relationship?
3. How could those barriers be removed?
4. How does the Treaty of Waitangi affect relationships that you have in your sector?
5. On a broad front, what are the issues you wish to raise?

By conducting workshops and recording the information the working party were able to gather data that was given to the Ministry of Social Policy for analysis. From the individual reports, gathered from the voluntary sector of society, the Ministry of Social Policy summarised the government's overall position on the voluntary sector and community responses in a report.

When CVSWP met community organisations they heard the individual voices of volunteers. Many of the issues raised by the volunteers reflected the tension and anger towards government:

Listening to people from *iwi* and community organisations throughout the country, the Working Party heard an overwhelming message of anger, burnout, profound mistrust and cynicism. It became clear that the relationship-building process could not go ahead without properly acknowledging this depth of frustration and resentment among many people active in their local communities. Many felt the period of economic and social reforms had left their organisations to pick up vital services from government, while also leaving them out of the policy-making loop. People felt they had been undervalued, treated arrogantly by officials and regarded as second class citizens. Some Māori spoke

positively about opportunities for service provision which had developed over recent years, but many were experiencing barriers similar to those faced by other community and voluntary groups. Further, many Māori felt passionately that unresolved issues round the Treaty of Waitangi presented an additional barrier to a better relationship (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001b, 5).

In December 2000, the individual reports from the communities were available on the Internet. I downloaded 16 reports from different communities over the North Island and South Island. The reports were primary data taken from the individual encounters between the CVSWP and communities. The reports were rich with information and I decided to make a study of the data from 16 communities. On the 19 April 2001, the Ministry of Social Policy made the final report available to the public.

## **8.2 The Research Method**

When the Ministry of Social Policy held workshops in Gisborne City I was fortunate to scribe for them. This experience positioned me amongst community voluntary groups that covered a cross section of ethnic representation in the area and strengthened my community networks that proved helpful in the research. I met members in CVSWP and learnt they were visiting communities over New Zealand and the information gathered would be published. I observed the frustration community representatives felt toward government representatives and the eagerness of communities to have the overall situation of volunteers enhanced across New Zealand.

### **8.2.1 The Selection Process and Data Collection**

After reading through the 16 reports I decided it was sufficient data to analyse. The names of the communities in alphabetical order were, Auckland, Blenheim, Greymouth, Invercargill, Kaitaia, Manukau, North Shore, Rotorua, Tairāwhiti (Gisborne), Tauranga, Te Taumata Runanga (Waitakere), Timaru, Waitakere, Wanganui, and Whangarei. With the approval from my supervisors I conducted a cross section study on the data representing the 16 communities.

### **8.3 Analysis**

The data were transferred onto the computer software QSR Nvivo. In the computer programme I created a project called the Cross Section Study. Each document was copied into the project individually under the names Vol-1 for the first document, Vol-2 for the second document, until Vol-16 for the sixteenth document. Then each document was checked to make sure the responses for the five questions asked by the Working Party were included. After checking each document I began to code the responses.

A process of trial and error was used to amend problems discovered while transferring documents from Word (a software programme) to QSR Nvivo. The problems occurred when making text and coding reports. In a text report the software programme displayed the original document and included extra information such as the number of the line before each text on each line down the page. The original documents contained a range of information including extra discussions, large fonts, and pictures. The relevant information in these documents were the responses to the five questions. The display of information, pictures or large fonts, meant that the relevant information would begin further down the page, sometimes on line 18 or 19. In the software tutorial it was suggested to edit information before transferring the documents into the software programme. Therefore, I worked backwards and copied the documents back into word, edited the information and then transferred them into the software programme. Each document was coded using a range of codes such as government relationship to volunteers, barriers, working solution, treaty issues, and Māori voluntary work.

#### **8.3.1 Editing the Data**

Analysing the information on the reports was a major task. Once the information was edited so that the reports produced from the software programme were clear and uncluttered other problems arose. Although I modified the documents so that the fonts and format were consistent I did not envisage that some of the documents did not follow the five questions asked by the working party. I assumed that all the documents answered the five questions and that the responses would follow a general guideline where question two follows question one, and



three follows two until the five questions were answered. Instead, some documents started with question three or four while some did not place the information into questions and entangled the answers to five questions in paragraphs.

The data represented more than 16 communities. When the reports were downloaded I expected it would produce 16 responses, however, some of the documents had more than one response to the questions. The reports represented community responses to workshops for large numbers of people that were divided into groups. The documents were named in order such as VI for the first document. To help me keep this information in a type of order so that the content from individual groups could be analysed I created a list of the individual groups. The documents with questions out of order were edited and the contents put in order beginning with question one to question five. Selecting which information would be placed under the five questions was made on the basis of the information provided, for example if the information discussed a relationship between government and the voluntary sector it was placed under question one. A total of 38 groups responded to the five questions.

The coding reports were analysed individually and the responses by different groups were compared. After considerable attempts to simplify the analysis process I realised that drawing the main themes from the contents was similar to the analysis performed in the case study and community study. Analysing this information meant that the main themes drawn from the data would represent an overall view rather than individual responses from groups.

There were five main codes in each document. The codes were Relationship with Government for question one, Barriers to the relationship with government for question two, Working Solutions towards a better relationship with government for question three, Treaty Issues for question four, and Social Service and Voluntary Work Issues for question five. These codes were developed from the contents of the report. The decision to use these codes was made on the assumption that the information was an attempt to describe the answers to the questions. For example in question one, What would a relationship between

government and your organisation/sector look like? It was appropriate to create a code Relationship with Government. There were other codes such as Resource Issues, Māori Volunteers-Need for Support, Voluntary Work and Multi Cultural amounting to 36 codes in total. However, not all the codes were in each document and only the five main codes were in every document.

#### **8.4 Responses**

Figuring out a way to display the responses involved rigorous trials. To keep the process manageable I opted to follow the same methods used in the case study and cross section study. This meant using the five questions as sub headings followed by responses of the groups. The common responses were compiled under one name. For example responses such as need communication, two-way communication, government need to talk with the voluntary sector were condensed to communication. The responses are given as bulleted points. Each time a response discussed Māori voluntary work or the developments in Māori communities the contents were included. The overall aim of this process was to provide sufficient data so that the voices from the wider community were reflected in the contents.

1. What would a good relationship between the government and your organisation sector look like?

V-1 had six groups that provided information. One group identified themselves as Māori and another group identified themselves as Pacific Islanders. The rest of the groups identified themselves by numbers from one to four. Three out of six answered the question. One out of three who did not answer the question wrote the following, “there is no relationship with Government apart from the relationship with funding agent ‘second hand’” (Māori Group, 4/10/00). The following are comments from the groups that answered the question:

- “balance of power, equal relationship/negotiate, being listened to, open and direct communication, co-ordination, awareness and sensitivity” (Group Five, 4/10/00).

V-2 represents one group. This group did not respond directly to the question and stated the following: “need [a] holistic approach. If you go into a family and see other needs you can’t say I’m just contracted to do this bit of work. ... More and more we see that we need to do things holistically. People need life skills, alcohol and drug counselling, budgetary advice, could benefit from art and leisure not just social service in isolation” (12/10/00).

V-3 represents one group. A summation of the answers were that it:

Requires good line of communication ... continuity from successive Governments and the worth and contribution of voluntary / community organisations needs to be recognised and valued, ... Government needs to listen, consult and respond to the community, ... There needs to be more continuity of Government policy (19/10/00).

V-4 represents one group. The responses were placed under two headings Government Policies and Basic Principles. The first bullet point represents the main findings for government policies and the second represents main findings for basic principles:

- “Monitoring and evaluation, provision for a social impact report and long term effect, genuine consultation and recognition for different viewpoints, ...
- Partnership based, respect and valuing each other” (19/10/00).

V-5 represents one group. They discussed a positive relationship:

- “Security of funding, adequate funding, and advance notice when changing funding, trust, respect, honesty, and recognition for service provision,
- Two-way communication, open and honest between all players (Local Governments, Central Governments, community, service providers) and a transparent process, public good, the community identify the needs” (30/10/00).

V-6 represents one group. They provided a range of ideas to suggest what a good relationship would look like:

- “A recognition that ‘need’ is the most important factor. A respect of the knowledge and partnerships that exist within the sector, ...
- Policies being developed with ‘grass roots’ influence from an early stage and throughout the process, ... adequate levels of funding with consistency of criteria” (31/10/00).

V-7 represents one group. Their comments were:

- “Easy flow of communication paid for by government, ...
- Ongoing involvement in policy making would be maintained throughout the process, regular forums to allow the community to talk to people who can influence policy, a reduced number of stages between grass roots and policy makers ... and security of Government funding, beyond the year-by-year funding rounds” (1/11/00).

V-8 represents one group. The following are some comments made by the group:

- “An equity attitude, partnership not big brother, regular communication and forums to discuss issues, consultation on the consultation process that is genuine, realistic understanding of community needs, ... trust and respect not the professionals versus the do-gooders attitude,
- Understanding the complementary nature of government and community, stable and clear criteria for contracting and funding, matching community needs and funding levels, meaningful evaluation, transparency and honesty in contracting” (8/11/00).

V-9 represents three groups. The groups were identified as Sports and Arts, Pacific People, and Environment, and answered the questions. The overall comments were:

- “Government provide subscriptions for families in Sports and Art groups, sufficient resources for networking, community development, and long term contracts, decisions are made locally/regionally, funding appropriately from bottom up rather than top down,
- Communication, listen to what works well, more control given back to the public, educating the public and monitoring the roles, reimbursement of actual costs (such as travel, and paper) by government to voluntary sector for commitment to policy development, consultation with interested parties including a transparent process to restore the integrity of politicians” (7/11/00).

V-10 represents one group. The overall comments were:

- “Consultation between government and agencies such as Citizen’s Advice Bureau, consistency in funding for services,
- Collect meaningful statistics that are useful for the service being delivered” (9/11/00).

V-11 represents three group. The overall comments were:

- “3 year contracts with respect and acknowledgement, consistency in message and contact person, communication and listening to the community,
- Government agencies need to collaborate with community and provide appropriate funding” (10/11/00).

V-12 represents three groups. The overall comments were:

- “Based on mutual trust and developing goodwill relationships, grass roots liaison people working with advisory and community groups,
- Need training, support, education, and balanced relationships, inform the people, input into policy, locate statutory people within the community” (16/11/00).

V-13 represents one group. The overall comments were:

- “Understanding the Closing of the Gaps programme and government explaining what it means,
- Given an opportunity to comment on the brief for Health Funding Authority” (20/11/00).

V-14 represents one group. They commented “partnership. An ideal relationship would be Treaty like, with complete trust in each other’s vision, instead there is an ‘us and them’ attitude. You soon realise that the Government is the boss not a partner” (28/11/ 2000, 2).

V-15 represents five groups. Four out of five answered the question and the overall comments were:

- “Accountability, holistic, and development driven from the community upwards, recognition from government that they have devolved responsibility for social services to the community, freedom, ability, partnership, and time to challenge government policies, real relationships not just consultation,
- Sufficient funding for Māori, parallel organisations, and development, allow for autonomy and diversity, reduce the competitive environment, develop a shared understanding analysis of cause for community dysfunction” (28/11/00).

V-16 represents eight groups. The overall comments were:

- “Training, encouraging, supporting and understanding the voluntary worker, honour the Treaty of Waitangi, face to face contact with funding organisations and government departments, ...
- Consistency in policy and personnel, building trust, loyalty, and local support” (26/10/00).

The majority of responses did not answer this question directly. Instead the responses discussed the problems organisations encounter with government and briefly identified what a good relationship between government and their organisations would look like. From the overall responses a good relationship between the government and organisations in the voluntary sector of society would consist of:

- A two-way communication system between government and organisations that is transparent,
- A balance of power whereby government and organisations work together when forming policies and systems that will be implemented in the community,
- A process whereby formal recognition is given by government to organisations by way of resources and financial support,
- A Treaty of Waitangi education process funded by government to be implemented by the individual organisations.

2. What are the existing barriers to such a relationship?

V-1 overall comments were:

- “institutional and attitudinal racism, lack of action on outcomes of consultation and no feedback, insufficient resources to carry out services and community expected to fulfil these roles and services, unbalanced funding allocation and insecure funding, ongoing restructuring by government agencies makes it difficult and frustrating to communicate with correct person,
- No real communication between government and community sector, Article 1 of the Treaty, lack of control over the resources, not being listened to at grass roots level, tax regulations and Government Services Tax (GST) limits” (4/10/00).

V-2 overall comments were:

- “Parliament, Members of Parliament, and government departments inaccessible and hard to get through, frustration around the Catch 22 of government reviews which are governed by policy in which people have no input, lack of communication about such policies as ‘Closing the Gaps’,
- Assumptions that different cultures, age groups, and populations are the same, Regional economic initiatives are seen as having the potential to develop civic responsibility, a lot of community/voluntary time is spent chasing round trying to help people” (12/10/00).

V-3 comments were:

- “Non recognition by those in authority of the value of the volunteer worker and the importance of their work, high expectations by funding agencies regarding the levels of professionalism volunteers will have,
- Existing mindsets and Privacy Act, lack of flexibility and constant changes in funding criteria” (19/10/00).

V-4 comments were:

- “Short term funding makes it difficult for planning and employment security,
- Government obligations are often put on to community groups without adequate funding” (19/10/00) meaning government devolved responsibility so that community groups were providing social support with insufficient funding.

V-5 comments were:

- “Communities have to live within their resources or be funded to bring in experts,
- Higher education is not available on the Coromandel Peninsula, people move out of this area to go onto correspondence, basic needs [are] not provided”



(30/10/00) meaning government do not provide higher education in the Coromandel and students leave.

V-6 comments were:

- “The Paper War and lack of funding, continual changing of funding criteria and accountability requirements, the level and cost of accountability, increased administration costs are not reflected in current funding levels, population based funding, needs are increasing and resources decreasing, competition between community agencies for funding,
- Complexity of funding applications, non-inclusion of GST on salary grants, short term nature of the funding cycle, misconception about who qualifies for government funding, the ever increasing demands placed on volunteers for the skills and qualifications required of them by the government” (31/10/00)

V-7 comments were:

- “The multiple sources and ever changing criteria for funding from government, insecurity of funding, long term planning not possible, sector is focussed on surviving today,
- The lack of acknowledgement, funding for administration, technology, training, and information, diminishing ability of people to volunteer due to their economic circumstances” (1/11/00).

V-8 comments were:

- “Impact of government restructuring on community organisations, trust, the government hold all the cards and not interested in voluntary organisations,
- Inconsistency between regions, every agency has a new boundary for example Skill NZ and WINZ, government recognise that community organisations are vision, value, and mission driven rather than funding driven” (8/11/00).

V-9 comments were:

- “Lack of adequate funding to purchase professional skills like accountants, funding applications, funding criteria, needs hands-on assistance, groups are multi-functional and criteria not flexible enough, government agencies are slow to disburse dollars, ...
- Lack of value, recognition of voluntary and community sector, using us to plug gaps without money to follow, we’re seen as a cheap option” (7/11/00).

V-10 comments were:

- “Government delivers services in ‘silos’ but people’s needs go across the boundaries, mass of reporting material needed, sometimes doing five different reports for government funding all in different formats, ...
- Government departments don’t communicate enough, the terms of contracts are too short, government consultation not seen as genuine” (9/11/00).

V-11 comments were:

- “Consistency in contract formats and requirements, recognition of volunteer time, lack of appropriate resources and expectations unrealistic, ...
- Current funding system very compartmentalised, insecurity of funding for collaborative initiatives, undervaluing of volunteers and voluntary organisations” (10/11/00).

V-12 comments were:

- “There is no time for developing relationships, not enough commitment at top level, lack of incentives, rigidity of policy, no one size fits all, diversity needs to be recognised, time needed to fill in funding forms, no co-ordination of projects in government departments (right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing), ...

- Communication bureaucracy, translating ideas not just words, concepts, and context, new people getting contracts and long term migrants none” (16/11/00).

V-13 comments were:

- “Contracting, the approval process is one way, delay in payments, sometimes three or four months later, government are not listening to the people, ...
- Yearly expected to achieve twenty percent more outcomes with same funding and meet contracts” (20/11/00).

V-14 comments were:

- “Government departments’ approach to local communities tend to be to ride rough shod over local efforts and knowledge, constantly changing government personnel, you are very lucky to get the same person, ...
- Even though there is a government policy to close the gaps many government departments are not reflecting that” (28/11/00).

V-15 comments were:

- “Recognition of mana and tapu of Māori women, developing shared analysis of causes of community dysfunction, ...
- Recognising the variety of roles we take, developing trust between community groups” (28/11/00).

V-16 had seven out of eight groups that responded to this question. The overall comments were:

- Withdrawal of government services and allocation of funding, policies that serve government not people, insufficient resources and accountability for small amounts, ...

- links between social and economic intertwined, national and regional control, local government give poor support” (26/10/11).

The existing barriers for a relationship between the government and voluntary organisations identified in this part of my thesis were diverse. From the overall responses existing barriers suggested in the responses were:

- Poor communication networks between government and organisations,
- Funding applications were technical and designed in a fashion that was not ‘user friendly’ for organisations,
- Government policies being created without the assistance of organisations at the ‘grass roots’ level, ...
- Decrease in funding distributed to organisations by government and constant government restructuring of departments left organisation in a state of uncertainty.

### 3. How could those barriers be removed?

V-1 comments were:

- “Better partnerships between central and local government for planning and funding of services, long term funding horizons, consultation on broad basis and cultural awareness, acts of disempowerment must stop, ...
- Māori need to be served by Māori, regular conferences for volunteer agencies, get away from market policies and practices, fund infrastructure training and supervision” (4/10/00).

V-2 comments were:

- “Need processes that are transparent and honest, ...
- Need an evaluation of the process required from community organisations” (12/10/00).

V-3 comments were:

- “Ombudsmen for community issues, re-education of government employees in ‘people skills’, having recognition, status, and opinions valued, ...
- being able to advocate for the sector, having an open door policy” (19/10/00).

V-4 comments were:

- “Genuine consultation, negotiation before policies are formed, ...
- Realistic consideration of needs, long term planning, cross party with inter-departmental” (19/10/00).

V-5 comments were:

- “Sharing resources, mentoring communication, ...
- Measure own performance, peer review, and self-governance” (30/10/00).

V-6 comments were:

- “Using community networks including churches, educating bureaucrats, young people straight from education, all theory with no experience, ...
- ensuring policy addresses an identified need in a specific area/location, ensuring consistency of adequate funding, reasonable criteria, and accountability” (31/10/00).

V-7 comments were:

- “Bringing the decision makers to the West Coast for quality time on a regular basis, provision of ongoing funding for proven services, two-way communication, ...
- More flexibility in funding criteria and recognition by remuneration of community knowledge, providing a regional ombudsman or commissioner to provide a neutral forum for advice and problem solving” (1/11/00).

V-8 comments were:

- “Strengthening relationships within the community sector, regular networking, sharing resources and information, acknowledging differences and staff diversity, formulating collective strategies, sharing success and links between community and business, ...
- reject competitive funding models in favour of collectives, use umbrella groups such as NZ Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations, more contact with local government community development, a council of social services, ongoing volunteer training” (8/11/00).

V-9 comments were for two out of three groups:

- “Advice readily available, non-government based advisors, Pacific Islander advisors in government agencies, on site appraisals, funding determined by needs of community for capacity building, adequate funding, long term, simplified and flexible, ...
- Pacific Islanders represented in policy committees and statutory bodies, co-operation between groups, reimbursement of commitment from voluntary sector of actual costs” (7/11/00).

V-10 comments were:

- “Need administration support in order to run efficiently, ...
- Need funding and more training is needed” (9/11/00).

V-11 comments were for two out of three groups are:

- “Community devolve responsibility with dollars, simplify contracts and share power, more transparency in government funding, flexible contracts and a collective resource pool for administration, ...

- Important to have a clear government/management role, long term planning and contracts, balance between what government sees as important and what will work, all reporting should be relevant to agency work” (10/12/00).

V-12 comments were:

- “Empower local governments to be more flexible and proactive, be aware that ‘not one size fits all’ allow and encourage openness, government departments develop a community face, ...
- Regular meetings, contact list, clarity of levels, and authority, accessibility to Ministers, more representation on community boards and statutory levels” (16/11/00).

V-13 comment was:

- “Community groups that provide cost effective services should get tenders” (20/11/00).

V-14 comments were:

- “Government remove barriers, accountability and better evaluation system,
- valuing existing initiatives and training, applying the REAP scheme” (28/11/00).

V-15 main comments for four out of five groups were for organisations to:

- “Write for Signpost and Social Perspectives, invite key people from government and local government to meetings, build a collective vision, and a picture of the community, invitation for Crown to meet on the *marae*, ...
- [Strengthen] Community Organisation Grant Scheme (COGS) locally, respect who we are, co-operation, collaboration, and co-ordination, empower and support community initiatives” 28/11/00).

V-16 comments for seven out of eight groups were:

- “Māori want the ability to deal with our own issues, partnership creation of policy relating to funding, government call for a review between community and local government, include another body separate from government and local government to get people active, planning meetings to suit a wider audience of volunteers, ...
- Funding basic administration costs, training, equipment, and travel, respect local networks and knowledge and acknowledge spirituality, recruiting government staff. ... removal of contract concept toward a relationship with memo of understanding, empowering local communities, acknowledge local needs, uniqueness, and diversity by devolving into local government” (26/10/00).

The responses provided many ways to remove barriers and the overall suggestions for removing barriers required:

- A better partnership between government (local and national) and voluntary organisations,
  - More resources, funding, and support from government to organisations,
  - Making processes between government and organisations transparent,
  - Including voluntary organisation in policy decisions and adopting the Treaty of Waitangi in policies.
4. How does the Treaty of Waitangi affect relationships that you have in your sector?

V-1 comments for four out of six groups were:

- “Treaty of Waitangi is positive for our service, ...
- Staff take Treaty principles seriously, Article I is the issue not Article III” (4/10/00)



V-2 did not answer this question.

V-3 comments were:

- “Being so sure that we may offend leads us to substitute other cultures ahead of the needs of Māori, ...
- No time for training in cultural awareness and many varied issues within different *iwi*” (19/10/00).

V-4 did not answer this question.

V-5 did not answer this question.

V-6 comments were:

- “Awareness of Treaty developing gradually, ...
- Because of our cultural ignorance the issue has become divisive” (31/10/00).

V-7 comments are quoted in 8.5.2.

V-8 comments were:

- “The government needs to role model honouring the Treaty at all levels, need for ongoing Treaty training, ...
- Reflect partnership principles in practice not just in principle, the Crown/Māori relationship is primarily a Crown responsibility not a community organisation” (8/11/00).

V-9 comments for two out of three groups were:

- “Crown and Māori relationship impact on Pacific Islanders, Crown and Māori need to address their partnership issues, some pay lip service, some embrace biculturalism, and the *tangata whenua*, ...

- More relevant when it responds to community needs, recognise significance of the Treaty but have problems identifying appropriate *iwi*” (7/11/00).

V-10 did not answer this question.

V-11 comments for two out of three groups are:

- “The Treaty of Waitangi is the basis for any relationship with the Crown, the Māori version of the Treaty is what the government should work with, ...
- *Rangatiratanga* is not partnership but an equal balance of power, recognise principles and responsibilities of the Treaty”(10/11/00).

V-12 comments were:

- “People know very little about the Treaty, Treaty needs to be implemented from beginning to the end, Treaty of Waitangi is a bond that should be respected, honoured, and understood, foundation of NZ society, ...
- Ignorance of Treaty and relationship with *tangata whenua* needs to be build and strengthened, Pacific people view the Treaty as a sacred ‘covenant’ between two peoples” (16/11/00).

V-13 comments were:

- “The Treaty issues in some government departments have been minimised or forgotten about, ...
- Need to monitor performance on Treaty issues, the Treaty is priority” (20/11/00).

V-14 comment was:

- “The removal of the Treaty clauses from impending legislation means the Treaty is defunct” (28/11/00).

V-15 comments for two out of five groups were:

- “Consolidate the Treaty of Waitangi, acknowledge the Treaty and history, ...
- Treaty education, real relationship, and consultation” (28/11/00).

V-16 comments for six out of eight groups were:

- “Founding document acknowledged, educate people about the Treaty of Waitangi, Treaty of Waitangi should be applied in the work of organisations, choices and shared partnerships, differences to be negotiated, need for better knowledge and understanding, ...
- Risk of tokenism and undue panic, powers to be are white and this community has not dealt with these issues, lack and resistance by local government, *tikanga* versus *kawanatanga*” (26/11/00).

Thirteen out of 38 groups did not answer the question on the Treaty of Waitangi. Of the groups that answered the responses showed that:

- Many organisations were not educated on the Treaty of Waitangi,
- The Treaty of Waitangi was perceived as an issue between the Crown and Māori rather than the wider community,
- Māori organisations desired a partnership with the Crown,
- The Treaty of Waitangi was perceived as the founding document of New Zealand however, not implemented in the voluntary sector or in policies.

5. On a broad front, what are the issues you wish to raise?

V-1 comments are quoted in 8.5.3.

V-2 comments were:

- “Want the ability to deliver services to Māori by Māori, worry that Closing the Gaps is divisive and fear backlash, don’t like 0800 numbers and prefer to

work face to face with people, demand and costs have increased but funding has not, ...

- Feel submissions go into a hole, obscene obsession with the market driven economy model, social services seem to focus on problems not well being and the funding does not reflect that, gap between rich and poor widening” (12/10/00).

V-3 comments were:

- “Inability to advocate, for example biting the hand that feeds you, ...
- Geographic disparity of policies is not suitable for all regions, Government should listen to community needs and act on them” (19/10/00).

V-4 comments are quoted in the theme section of the chapter.

V-5 comments were:

- “High expectations of sector, high caseload, lack of staff, and funding, having to deal with aggressive clients because of lack of money or health problems,
- lack of personal phones because they are too expensive, key tasks are prevention of crisis and development of clients” (30/10/00).

V-6 comments were:

- “The recognition that for some people volunteering is a means to gain skills for paid employment, personal safety of staff paid and unpaid, issues of a community organisation running a cake stall to raise funds so that it can pay the costs of meeting OSH compliance, ...
- Volunteer committees are employers and a number of associated responsibilities, duplicity of services being provided” (31/10/00).

V-7 comments were:

- “What would government do if the community/voluntary sector walked away tomorrow? Volunteer burnout, the person wanting to volunteer for two hours a week have expectations of a higher level placed on them, ...
- The feeling of being ‘trapped’ as a volunteer and can’t walk away because who will fill the gap? Village knowledge has been lost to corporate requirements” (1/11/00).

V-8 comments were:

- “Accepting government funding and retaining independence especially around social justice issues, ...
- The need for funding to promote social change, security of funding for wages, people can’t afford to be volunteers” (8/11/00).

V-9 comments for two out of three groups were:

- “Filling accountability request is time consuming, some targets seem to preclude a quality service, ...
- Mistrust of our ability/honesty to run the organisation, sources of funding are not well known” (7/11/00).

V-10 comments were:

- “The low level of funding in itself causes insecurity, services are increasing steadily but funding stays the same, have a master/slave relationship with the Department of Courts and Justice, government literature is too hard to read and understand, ...
- Requests for proposals were long laborious processes, tension between government funding objectives and the organisation’s mission in life, don’t like the centralisation of policy writing, vulnerability round applying for funding, some services find it harder to get volunteers than others” (9/11/00).

V-11 comments are quoted in 8.5.4.

V-12 comments for two out of three groups were:

- “Māori wardens have a lack of funding, ...
- Plain and simple language needed when asking questions, within the Non Government Organisations (NGO) there are marginalized NGO groups” (16/11/00).

V-13 comments were:

- “Tired of consultants coming to asks questions, high fees, they put their report together and nothing is given back, ...
- Contracts don’t allow for some of the protocols such as social talk which is necessary before the specific service” (20/11/00).

V-14 comments were:

- “The market model is highly inefficient, funding applications are time consuming, unless there is some better government actions the number of Māori in prisons or sick will improve, ...
- We don’t want a top down model imposed, contracts are unequal, we are the ‘clients’ they are the boss, the community has lost the ability to facilitate” (28/11/00).

V-15 only comment for one out of five groups was “*aroha*, trust, respect and swap seats” (28/11/00).

V-16 comments for seven out of eight groups were:

- “Acknowledge our various *hapū*, *iwi*, and try to build unity across *iwi*, greater collaboration across voluntary sector and build trust, loss of focus on what your *kaupapa* is and becomes dollar focussed, should be a forum between

voluntary *iwi* sector with government on an annual basis, allow services to develop in communities, level playing field, sharing power, out with hierarchy, make voluntary work attractive and involve young people, competition for funding loses the community spirit, resource volunteers for example WINZ adding value to volunteer, develop a National Charter, ...

- Principles and code of ethics, integration of government departments to avoid duplication and waste of tax payer money, GST on government grants taxed, volunteers help people to value their lives if provided with basic funding, harder to get voluntary help in sports, youth for example because of all the paper work, culture of social ethos diminishing, helping/volunteering more individualistic, costs for volunteering rising, for example petrol for travelling, honour the Treaty of Waitangi” (26/10/00).

The final comments reinforced the need for:

- a transparent process between government and the voluntary sector
- government to recognise voluntary organisations formally with resources and funding,
- government to include the voluntary sector in policy making decisions,
- education on the Treaty of Waitangi.

## **8.5 Main Themes**

The findings highlight the main issues relevant to Māori and structural impediments. There were five themes: The Treaty of Waitangi – Sovereignty (8.5.1), Relationship with Government (8.5.2), Policies, Barriers, and Funding Problems (8.5.3), Working Conditions and Workload (8.5.4), and Recognition, Value, and Consultation (8.5.5).

### **8.5.1 The Treaty of Waitangi – Sovereignty**

Evidence showed that many communities, voluntary organisations, and government agencies have not addressed the issue of the Treaty of Waitangi in regard to voluntary work. The importance of the Treaty of Waitangi was raised but the implementation of the Treaty in charters, constitutions, and policy making has not been endorsed. Some groups feared the Treaty of Waitangi and refrained

from acknowledging it as significant to New Zealand. The groups identified a need to address issues surrounding the Treaty and acknowledged that:

The treaty creates its own barriers. There is a growing awareness of protocols but this is not generally making a lot of difference. There is a perception that being focussed on Māori is a requirement of funding. There is a knowledge gap on how to relate Māori on a day-to-day basis. The treaty is either given ‘lip service’ or put in the ‘too hard basket’. The Treaty affects all our relationships, for example recognising the local *iwi*, some organisations haven’t made any effort to accommodate the Treaty apart from mention it in their statement of intent (V7/11/00).

A quarter of the groups did not respond to questions on the Treaty of Waitangi. The groups identified as Māori responded and other groups highlighted their uncertainty of the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi would mean for them. Some groups assumed the Treaty of Waitangi was an issue between government and Māori which did not affect them. Also, there was “no commitment by the Crown as a treaty partner to educate new migrants and refugees on their treaty obligation, funding contracts do not include costs related to Treaty training and supervision” (V1, 4/10/00)

### **8.5.2 Relationship with Government**

The evidence stipulated that Māori desired an equal partnership with the Crown. A partnership involved government working with Māori over policies for Māori social services and negotiating with Māori on the structures for this type of service. Power of control was to be balanced and the:

Recognition and basis of any relationship should be *tangata whenua*, *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* and no ‘Māori’ generalised. ‘Urban Māori’ are refugees of colonisation. There needs to be an urgent rebuilding of Māori infrastructure based on *whakapapa* which allows Māori to express themselves and take ownership for one’s own destiny. This needs to be acknowledged at a strategic level. Important to have access to information about Government services and products. In a knowledge based economy,



Māori are at risk due to low education levels and lack of resources (V11, 10/11/00, 1-2).

There was strong evidence to argue that government have a poor communication network with voluntary organisations. The communication was considered to be disproportional where government dictated to voluntary organisations and there was no forum to discuss issues. The groups called for a two-way process where government agencies communicate directly with voluntary organisations at a community level before any decisions are made over the voluntary sector. A “two-way communication, [was] recognising and understanding the differences in cultural backgrounds, belief, the value of voluntary organisations, address the value and status of a voluntary worker and relationship between volunteers and paid workers” (V16, 26/10/00). In addition, the Māori members in the group, Te Korowai Hauora o Hauraki felt:

There was no direct relationship between the Māori Social Service and the local service providers; there is no direct influence/input of the ‘Close-the-Gaps Policy’ in the area; there is only a good and efficient direct link with the Māori Health Service Provider (V5, 30/10/00, 4).

Evidence showed that voluntary organisations carried the social responsibilities of government. Tension in the communities was growing because government monitored and pressured voluntary organisations to perform a role with inadequate funds. The groups expressed:

Volunteers [were] addressing problems that government agencies should be responsible for [because of] devolution to [the] community. [Government] expect professional service, and community groups compete for funding, [and] communication. The market model does not work in the community sector, [because] services are isolated because of competition (V9, 7/11/00).

### 8.5.3 Policies, Barriers, and Funding Problems

The groups stressed anger that policies were created centrally without input from the community or voluntary sector. Only a few organisations knew of policies that affected them and some contributed to research or attended a policy meeting held by government agencies. Many of these organisations were not given feedback or informed about the outcomes. The groups demanded that government include them when making policies that affected their organisation. The groups wanted to increase the:

Awareness of who/what services we provide [and] recognition of [the] important role of what community groups offer and impact of policy, ... [a] more realistic timeframe for consultation to develop policy, acknowledgement of diversity and providing services not done or covered by government (V1, Group Three, 4/10/00).

The groups argued that the current “system encourages fragmentation and competition rather than co-operation, accountability and policy demands, policies are limiting, restricting community/volunteer development, and discourages potential community and voluntary involvement” (V1, 4/10/00). The restructuring of government departments and processes caused major problems because government departments that changed constantly brought different processes that required voluntary organisations to adjust with little support.

Funding was a main concern for all voluntary organisations. Groups expressed their disappointment with changing rules, application requirements, and processes to access funds. The barriers encountered when applying for funding anger applicants when the return of money is minimal. Evidence suggested that Māori organisations were not funded the same as mainstream organisations because “Funding [allocated for] mainstream [organisations is]  $\frac{3}{4}$  and Māori specific funding [allocated for organisations is]  $\frac{1}{4}$  ... We service mainstream as well. Māori are taken advantage / exploitation because of who we are! *Whakapapa!* Born with responsibility” (V16, 26/10/00, 1-2).

Evidence showed that non-European groups challenged the notion of volunteering. It was perceived that Europeans could afford to volunteer whereas non-Europeans could not. It was argued that unpaid work for the church reflected voluntary activity unlike unpaid social services, thus:

Trust [was] a core issue. Volunteering is a Pakeha construct. The difference between Palagi [European] and Pacific Island volunteers is Palagi can afford to volunteer. Pacific Island volunteering is a source of income. Voluntary is free for example involving the church, voluntary is not free for example involvement in a social service provision. WINZ pay low for elderly voluntary work, volunteer groups cost dollars to run, need more philanthropy and volunteering, social services delivered by Māori for Māori not *tauwi* organisations with Māori units in them ” (V1, 4/10/00)

In addition, it highlighted government agencies abused beneficiaries by setting up structures whereby beneficiaries felt they had to work unpaid to receive a benefit.

#### **8.5.4 Working Conditions and Workload**

From the evidence, a reality surfaced that volunteers encountered oppression on a daily basis. Insufficient funding, minimal resources, coupled with the lack of human resources meant the workplace was stressful and unattractive. To exacerbate matters government did not give “enough recognition for the voluntary sector. Inequalities of funding geographically, social and community work is undervalued and there is an expectation of low wages and long hours, services are set up for failure due to lack of skills, resources, infrastructure, and volunteers” (V4/19/10/00). This feeling of being undervalued meant:

Māori organisations [had to] face commercial, cultural, and social realities. Māori motivation to do unpaid work in the past [had] been exploited. In some cases, Māori Wardens are recognised under legislation and given statutory powers but not adequate resources to fulfil these, Māoridom needs to express itself to achieve its own identity, support structures for training (V11, 10/11/00).

The groups called for government to “recognise the overload of work and provide feedback. Provide realistic resources and meaningful reporting, get roles clear by proper negotiation, and where services are devolved provide the right resources, recognise the limits of voluntary services” (V16, 26/10/00).

Evidence confirmed voluntary organisations struggled to operate in the community. Every group identified problems providing services with insufficient resources. Many groups argued that when government devolved policies so that the responsibility to look after social issues became the local community’s, it caused major problems for those providing social services. A service that was once admirable transformed into a daily drudgery, and for Māori organisations it increased a:

Lack of communication, value, recognition, and understanding *tangata whenua* status. [The] goal posts keep moving and [we are] unable to move ahead, power distribution, bureaucracy, stigmatisation, and ignorance of what it is like at the grass roots. ... Volunteers used to be icing on the cake now providing the bread (V16, 6/10/11).

### **8.5.5 Recognition, Value, and Consultation**

Groups that provided voluntary services claimed they were not recognised by government for contributing to the development of New Zealand society. Any recognition given by government was viewed to be tokenism. Insufficient funding for social service provision, exclusion of voluntary organisations at policy-making level, and poor communication networks were examples where government failed to recognise the significance and the value of voluntary organisations. The groups demanded a:

Genuine [commitment and] volunteer[s] being valued not taken for granted as an expectation of the community, more resources and money. Policy development should be considered on impact at ground level. Government agencies working more efficiently, accessible, and available, [and a] better understanding of capacity building by government. Devolve

power and control of resources, push more money through COGS to create a better funding system (V1, 4/10/00).

In doing so, groups believed it “empowers community organisations to move forward and act together for the collective good, recognising and assigning roles in social change” (V15, 28/11/00).

It emerged with the evidence that Māori voluntary organisations believed they were not treated the same as non- Māori. The experience Māori organisations had in working with Māori communities was overlooked or challenged. It showed that “sometimes there is competition from government providers about issues which should be dealt with by Māori, such as with young children who should be dealt with by *iwi/hapū*” (V14, 28/11/00, 1). There was also a “lack of a national database for Māori and Pacific Voluntary Associations, work is undervalued and people devalued” (V12, 16/11/00). Māori felt government were “not recognising the skill base and Māori skills or Māori worldview, cultural amnesia that evolved from different communities and historical factors” (V1, 4/10/00). The Māori organisations demanded government “support *iwi mana* and control over all things Māori, review aspirations of the Pua Te Ata Tu report (a social policy report commissioned by government), acknowledge *tikanga* based autonomous processes independent of current models” (V1, 4/10/00). Māori [needed] to speak for themselves and have their own *hui*, ... *Mana whenua*, autonomy, self determination and a direct relationship for Māori to government” (V12, 16/11/00).

## 8.6 Concluding Comments

This chapter brought forward strong views from those community groups and voluntary organisations that were part of a cross section study. It affirmed the reality that voluntary work had transformed from a philanthropic activity to an unpaid social service. The chapter highlighted that policies of devolution favoured government departments. In doing so, it showed community and voluntary organisations shouldering the responsibility for government.

The chapter discussed what voluntary work has meant to Māori. For Māori, voluntary work has been exploited, unrecognised, and the people have felt abused.

The failure for many groups and government to incorporate the Treaty of Waitangi in policies or daily routines signalled the disrespect and lack of commitment to acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document for New Zealand.

Major problems in the voluntary sector of society were raised in the chapter. The most common were; government sat as authority over unpaid volunteers and monitored organisations as employees. The workplace for voluntary organisations was oppressive. Structures and policies set by government for voluntary organisations were problematic and designed for government agencies.

In the next chapter the case study, community study, and cross section study are discussed.

## **Chapter Nine: Combining the Studies with Conclusions**

*“He peka kai, he peka tāonga.”*

*“Some food and property, these are what a man needs”*

*(Brougham, Reed, & Kāretu, 1999, 158).*

### **9.0 Introduction**

From the case study, community study, and cross section study emerged stories to describe the relationship between government, Māori, and voluntary work. The case study focussed on gathering the stories and experiences from the Māori volunteers in an organisation managed by Māori. It described a brief encounter in the daily lives of volunteers and their work. The community study provided a wider description of the work Māori encounter in the field of voluntary activity. The cross section study introduced a national perspective of volunteering for mainstream.

This chapter combines these stories. The sections are Consistent Themes (9.1), Differences in Studies (9.2), Personal Reflections on the Studies, (9.3), and Concluding Comments (9.4).

### **9.1 Consistent Themes**

The separate studies produced similar themes that voluntary organisations encounter. The following paragraphs identify themes which were consistent in each study.

#### **9.1.1 Working Conditions, Resource Problems, and Funding Problems**

The studies implied that voluntary organisations were struggling to access sufficient resources to deliver a voluntary service. It was common for voluntary organisations to stretch existing resources to ensure a social service would be delivered. The resource problems were broad ranging from insufficient human resources to inadequate office equipment.

A voluntary organisation that operated with insufficient resources was subjected to further problems. The studies confirmed a relationship between an increased

workload for individuals in voluntary organisations and resource problems. This relationship was evident in each study when participants identified the workload would diminish if more money or people could be made available to them.

Voluntary organisations experienced an increase in hours of work each week for the volunteers. The studies suggest that a volunteer worked, on average, twenty hours a week and indicated a connection to the number of hours worked and community problems. One voluntary organisation providing a 24-hour telephone service showed that the hours one volunteer worked weekly exceeded forty and therefore voluntary work was fast becoming an unpaid job.

Funding problems were identified in the studies as being directly linked to the ability of an organisation to fill out application forms to access financial support. Each study identified the problems with accessing funding from government or community agencies. The application forms for funding were described as technical and tedious. The studies described the process to access funding met with a constant changing of rules and application requirements. The barriers encountered when applying for funding angered applicants when the return of money was minimal.

### **9.1.2 Recognition, Value, and Consultation**

The studies highlighted the lack of recognition a voluntary worker in an organisation received for the social services that were delivered. The recognition individuals sought was internal from the organisation one worked in and external, from government or local communities. The participants identified resources and funding as indicators to measure the recognition received for voluntary work. In an internal situation volunteers felt that an increased workload without any type of compensation signalled the lack of recognition for work done. In an external situation voluntary organisations discussed the lack of inclusion at policy level and insufficient funding as indicators to identify how voluntary work was not given the deserved recognition.



### **9.1.3 Change in Expectations**

The environment a voluntary organisation worked in was changing as indicated by the studies. Voluntary organisations were expected to operate as a small business from a charitable perspective meaning that they should administer the affairs in accordance with government and funding agencies for free. There appeared to be a shift in autonomy where voluntary organisations receiving government funding were no longer in control of decisions being made. Instead, the studies suggested the voluntary organisations complied with government rules and regulations under protest.

It was unclear throughout the studies as to the direction a voluntary organisation should be taking in regard to future developments. The organisation in the case study was confined to administering social services and insufficient funding and resources prevented further development. Respondents in the community study hoped for a brighter future for voluntary organisations and expected community groups in partnership with government to suggest a way forward. The cross section study expected the future for voluntary organisations to be dismal unless government acknowledged voluntary activity by including representatives from voluntary associations at the decision making level.

Voluntary organisations managed by Māori in the three studies believed that government expected to fund Māori lower than mainstream organisations. The participants in the studies felt the Māori concept of *aroha* was being interpreted as working for nothing and a definition of voluntary work from a cultural perspective. Māori participants in the study raised concerns that this interpretation leaned towards exploitation whereby Māori voluntary organisations were expected by government and the local communities to continue unpaid social services. Māori voluntary organisations wanted this expectation from government and the local communities to change so that voluntary work delivered for the government came with sufficient resources or wages.

### **9.1.4 Social Obligation**

All studies indicated that voluntary organisations remained in the field of social service delivery because they felt socially obliged to make New Zealand a better

society. The case study, community study, and groups representing Māori organisations related social obligations to an activity that was common in Māori culture. Māori *tikanga*, *whakapapa*, *whānau*, *kawa*, and *aroha* were strong values exercised in the case study and community study. These values were present in organisations that identified themselves as Māori groups through responses in the cross section study. A common thread to all studies was the service an organisation provided signalled its commitment to the government and community. The studies tended to link social obligation to social responsibility that was replacing government responsibility to administer and deliver social programmes.

The desire for a ‘grass roots’ approach to develop voluntary organisations was highlighted in the studies. The studies showed that voluntary organisations wanted development to begin from the grass roots (in the community) level with representatives working beside government and local authorities. The descriptions for grass roots development were varied and included policies, consultation, research, and decision-making. The centralised fashion where government dictated from main centres such as Wellington was detested and a face-to-face approach was summoned followed by action.

### **9.1.5 Relationship with Government**

Consultation between voluntary organisations and government was inadequate. The volunteers in the case study did not meet with government officials to discuss voluntary work. The participants in the community study rarely met with government officials and in the cross section study participants were angered that a two-way consultation process was non-existent. The volunteers in voluntary organisations were irritated and annoyed that government adopted policies, changed structures, and increased the expectations for voluntary services without consulting their communities. Instead of taking steps to liberate themselves using techniques identified from Freire such as threatening the dominant position of the rulers (see section 2.4), in this instance government, by protesting and refusing to deliver voluntary social services, they continued to work in oppressive conditions. The studies showed voluntary organisations as ‘chasers’ (contacting government agencies) and the government agencies the ‘avoiders’ (avoiding consultation).

Transparency and honesty were values the studies identified that would build a strong relationship with the government. Currently, the studies indicated that government departments and officials were considered false and dishonest. This stemmed from the poor communication networks, the constant pressure placed on voluntary organisations to adjust to government requirements without consultation, and the absence of feedback.

The studies showed a hegemonic relationship operated in the local communities whereby the government represented the master and the voluntary organisations the slaves as noted by V10 (9/11/00). The government made the rules and the voluntary organisations followed them. Any attempt from the voluntary organisations to alter the rules was subject to being marginalized or incur a loss of funding. The criteria of funding and rules were set in policies designed by the government. The participants in the studies described government, local bodies, and business agencies I have labelled as 'politically ignorant'. This ignorance assumed that voluntary organisations lacked expert skills and required professionals to teach them. Since the voluntary organisations were subject to outside dictatorship, the voluntary work was no longer attractive and there was concern that membership numbers were decreasing.

## **9.2 Differences in the Studies**

While the studies produced consistent themes such as funding and resource problems there were slight differences. The differences were found in the questions participants were asked and the nature of volunteering the organisations entered. The differences are discussed in the following paragraphs.

### **9.2.1 Cultural Differences**

The case study and community study highlighted specific cultural processes used in the delivery of social services. The processes were Māori orientated and an example was to begin programmes with a *karakia*. The descriptions of cultural differences given in the cross section study were reflected in the organisations' makeup rather than specific approaches to social services. The cross section study

discussed the culture of different organisations such as the arts or conservation groups whereas the case study and community study focussed on Māori culture.

### **9.2.2 The Treaty of Waitangi**

The overall responses to the Treaty of Waitangi in the community and cross section study showed that the government refrained from treating Māori as partners. In the delivery of social services the Māori voluntary organisations desired government to include them in the construction of social policies or any issues governing Māori people as a right.

In the community study all participants questioned on the Treaty of Waitangi were aware of its contents and the significance to Māori. The cross section study identified a lack of education on the Treaty of Waitangi in mainstream organisations and the majority failed to include treaty policies in the workplace. The cross section study highlighted that non-Māori organisations preferred to avoid engaging in any treaty discussions or considered the treaty to be an issue that Māori and government should deal with.

### **9.2.3 Māori Voluntary Work**

The case study and community study described a Māori voluntary organisation as having a *kaupapa* that was Māori and serviced predominantly Māori clients. Helping people in the community through the use of voluntary services was considered the essence to development for Māori because of the insufficient finances and resources. The studies indicated that Māori service providers delivered an appropriate service to Māori clients because it was secured in cultural customs.

The future for a Māori voluntary organisation relied heavily on the people. The participants in the case study and community study believed voluntary organisations would always be around because they represented *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* organisations. However, the future for this type of activity described by participants was bleak unless the organisations could capture sufficient resources to operate or funding to pay for wages.

The case study and community study description of the average Māori volunteer was a person over forty-five years of age and receiving a type of Work and Income NZ benefit. This person possessed a range of skills and was experienced in community work; above all this person was Māori. A Māori volunteer was expected to have knowledge of Māori customs and prepared for unpaid work.

### **9.3 Personal Reflections**

The three studies tested personal assumptions. In the case study I assumed voluntary work was having a negative impact on Māori voluntary organisations. My experience in the case study showed that voluntary work was oppressive and there was seldom anything positive to celebrate and the volunteers felt tired from working long hours for nothing. The environment had not changed in the community study, rather the way in which the volunteers perceived work was different. The community study indicated that voluntary work was positive and I began to question why the two studies had different perspectives.

When considering the gender of the volunteers I obtained some interesting information. The participants in the case study were male and the drive to find paid employment was crucial so they could support their families. These participants felt oppressed for working long hours unpaid and desired some type of compensation. The participants in the community study were predominantly female who considered voluntary work to be an extension of their own duties such as nurturing, caring for people, and bringing up their families. Although voluntary work was performed under duress, it was perceived as a typical duty for them. The male participant in the community study provided positive feedback on volunteering because he was retired and commented that without a pension he could not volunteer and would have to work. When comparing the responses from males and females, I discovered that unpaid duty was more acceptable for a female. The reasons behind the responses I felt were that the attitudes of the volunteers were a response to the society they lived in whereby the role of a male was to provide an income for the family and unpaid work was seen as not fulfilling that duty in comparison to a female's role where unpaid work was perceived as normal.

Another issue that surfaced in the research was the history of the organisations. The Māori participants clearly identified the importance of *whakapapa* (genealogy). Many volunteers joined the organisation because their family members and relatives joined before them. In addition, there was always a sense of a communal relationship that existed between Māori and voluntary work.

A voice I seldom heard or read in documents was that of the younger volunteer, the volunteer aged between 16 and 30 years. I often encountered volunteers aged from 30 years onwards with the majority over the age 40 years. I realised that the struggle voluntary organisations endured in this society, along with the social obligation to volunteer, was no longer attractive as a role model for the future. A trend I observed was those who participated in voluntary activity were an older generation and the younger generation were not coming forward to replace them. Society today pushed a market economy that was rooted in globalisation, individualisation, and capitalism that left suffering in the social sector of society. Consequently, the younger generation were learning to adopt a user-pays approach to work, therefore they were deterred from volunteering because it was an unpaid activity and the conditions were oppressive. Government, voluntary organisations, and individual communities need to think about developing methods to make voluntary work attractive so that the younger generation can provide the social services required for the future.

#### **9.4 Personal Reflections on Theories and Consistent Themes**

The government held a dominant position in society in comparison to voluntary organisations that could be described as an unpaid working class. When viewing the relationship between government and voluntary organisations from the standpoint of critical theory, I suggest that government supported processes that retained their dominant position by:

Firstly, failing to create a two-way consultation that left voluntary organisations unable to educate themselves on government practices and reasoning for decisions made. The case study highlighted that volunteers feel there is no direct relationship between them and government (see section 6.3.5). Instead, they see their role as one of compliance to changes administered by government. The

cross section study (section 8.4) clearly identified the absence of a two-way consultation process.

Secondly, creating structures to restrict support to voluntary organisations from government so that voluntary organisations remained dependent on them. The barriers government imposed on voluntary organisations were identified in the cross section study (see section 8.4 question 2). The voluntary organisations stated “short term funding makes it difficult for planning and employment security, government obligations are often put on to community groups without adequate funding” (V4, 19/10/00). Since funding was restricted, this in turn restricted an organisation’s ability to move away from government dependency.

Thirdly, dictating rules and regulations, and using education, coercion, and force to ensure government objectives were met. In doing so, it alienated the voluntary community from government (V2, 12/10/00). This process applied by government secured their position of authority over voluntary organisations.

Fourthly, continuing to perpetuate a belief that voluntary work was a communal responsibility, thereby diverting the responsibility away from government (see section 5.3.4). It also encourages a hegemonic belief that voluntary work is a role of the community that should be provided free of charge. As a consequence, voluntary organisations are under-resourced and under-funded.

The structures government instruct voluntary organisations to follow are a process Foucault refers to as ‘power relations’ (section 2.4.2). Foucault describes a society where men use power through structures to govern over others to maintain their elite position of hierarchy. These structures set up a class structure and individualise people and divide groups.

Although the environment volunteers worked in was not attractive, people continued to provide a social service in oppressive conditions. Using the concept of hegemony I argue that the social construction of New Zealand society was made up of inequalities where those voluntary organisations educated in completing application forms and government processes were in a better position.

This position had standards and different levels for voluntary organisations so that professional organisations were ranked high and most likely to gain government support. New Zealand society as a whole came to accept that the different levels of voluntary organisation determined access to support and oppressive working conditions were a normal part of volunteering.

Māori voluntary organisations were at a cultural intersection trying to maintain voluntary practices of *aroha* in a society that positioned them at the bottom. In addition, government refrained from allowing Māori to take their rightful position as treaty partner to govern New Zealand. This inaction from government showed mainstream voluntary organisations that the treaty was unimportant and provided a way out for them to address treaty issues. Māori voluntary organisations were struggling to get government and New Zealand to acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi. The struggles were extended to include finding appropriate Māori terms and practices that represented voluntary work in a way that would not be exploited but represented the culture of communalism and social responsibility. This struggle was conducted with insufficient resources and little recognition.

## **9.5 Concluding Comments**

This chapter compared the studies affirming that voluntary work was an unpaid economy that helped to maintain political and social order in New Zealand. It reinforced the notion that communities and governing bodies relied on the contribution from voluntary social workers to take care of social needs in health, education, housing, employment, crime, family breakdowns, elderly, and a range of social problems. The needs of the community were expected to be met with insufficient resources, long working hours, and no paid wages.

The chapter confirms that government used voluntary workers to provide voluntary social services. This service is perceived as taken for granted and exploited. The working environment for volunteers has become oppressive. Policy reforms and social structures impeded the development of voluntary organisations and were designed with little consultation from community organisations. Government maintained authority over voluntary organisations through the use of political power in controlling policy development and forcing



the organisations to follow them by restricting access to resources. Through a process of power government influenced and steered development in voluntary organisations so that the ruling ideas in a given period were that of the ruling class, a form of hegemony. In doing so, a system was created over time whereby Māori voluntary organisations became an underclass working in oppressive environments.

The studies signalled that voluntary workers must be acknowledged for their work and supported. Unfortunately, the lack of internal policies in voluntary organisations suggested that management forgot to acknowledge the voluntary workers because it placed the needs of communities before the workers. The funding applications were not user-friendly and concerns raised by voluntary organisations were that the applications were getting more difficult every year. It was argued that the monitoring processes from government increased and the criteria set for funding suited the government more than voluntary organisations.

The chapter proceeded to support the view that Māori voluntary organisations were marginalized. The Treaty of Waitangi was absent in the majority of mainstream organisations and Māori were not acknowledged as treaty partners. Māori voluntary organisations encountered similar negative experiences as mainstream organisations, however, their contribution towards voluntary work was perceived differently from mainstream because it was regarded as part of the Māori culture that should be provided for free. This perception created a barrier to accessing resources and gaining similar recognition as non-Māori voluntary organisations.

The next chapter combines theory and research to discuss overcoming the barriers to development for voluntary organisations.

## Chapter Ten: Developing Methods to Overcome Barriers

*“He kai nā tangata, he kai tiitongitongi;*

*He kai nā tōnā ringa, tino kai, tino mākona noa.”*

*“You can only nibble at another’s food; but with food that you have cultivated Yourself, you can satisfy your appetite” (Brougham, Reed, & Kāretu, 1999, 128).*

### 10.0 Introduction

I began this thesis with a story of my own experience as a young Māori woman growing up first among my people of the East Coast of Aoteroa/New Zealand. I continue my story now as an academic interested to understand my frustration at the poverty of my people. In this thesis I explored the disruption of *whānau* and the associated support for the wellbeing this represented, our urban relocations and the adaptation of Māori ideas and ideals for togetherness under foreign and often hostile conditions. My work is set in that historical context, from my particular vantage point. My intellectual interest was stimulated by my father’s motivation to work long and hard for the restoration of his people – motivated by *aroha*. From there, I have been concerned to investigate and support the contemporary work underway to restore the *mana* of the people back home. My focus has been on the work conducted in the voluntary sector over the various historical epochs I have described with a view to making some comment in this chapter about the contemporary expectation of and for Māori under what is being articulated as “The Third Way” by the current Labour Government.

My theoretical lens in this thesis has drawn on aspects of the European critical theorists and post-modernists who are concerned with the workings of power, hegemony, colonisation, and oppression. Their work, together with the work of Māori philosophers and thinkers, informs my methodological interests in the emerging commitments to *Kaupapa* Māori researchers – researchers seeking empowerment and transformation for and by Māori people through the research process itself. While in my own empirical work I did not adhere to all the tenets of the emerging *kaupapa* Māori methods, I found that I had almost ‘naturally’ complied with a number of its assumptions – assumptions that come out of that

which is still powerful in me; that which is Māori, that which drives me to participate in the restoration of justice and wellbeing for *te iwi* Māori.

In the previous chapters, I identified ways in which, during the different historical epochs since contact with Europeans, a variety of approaches in social policy and the delivery of social services replaced *manaakitanga* and *aroha*. Each promised to underpin the wellbeing of Māori people and their communities in the changing directives of the nation's political and economic directions. Yet – in each era, Māori became increasingly alienated – an alienation evident in the social, health, penal, economic, and educational statistics that continue to stand in society today, in Aotearoa/NZ. This historical development embedded oppressive conditions in Māori communities.

Much of the later part of this thesis was concerned to identify barriers that affect the delivery of social services for Māori voluntary organisations. In this chapter I re-visit these barriers and suggest some ways to overcome problems in the community that Māori voluntary organisations experience; that take account of the issues that have arisen from our history; that speak into the aspirations associated with a Treaty based future, and that seek a rightful place for Māori as the directors of their future.

The chapter is divided into five sections, Barriers (10.1), Capacity Building – For *Tino Rangatiratanga* (10.2), Development Theories (10.3), Recommendations (10.4), and Concluding Comments (10.5).

## **10.1 Barriers**

There are four barriers discussed in this section: Transformation of the Relationships with Government (10.1.1), Oppression through the Re-Definition of 'Aroha' as Voluntary Activity (10.1.2), A New Approach to Policy Development (10.1.3), and Insufficient Resources as a Continual Handicap for the Restoration and Invigoration of Te Ao Māori (10.1.4).

### 10.1.1 Transformation of the Relationships with Government

In each of the historical epochs I have described in the previous chapters, Māori have been required to change their relationship with the state. While many of these changes were imposed, others were sought by Māori with the intent to take active responsibility for a place of contribution, wellbeing and justice for *te iwi* Māori in that particular epoch. The resistance to the decimation of Māori spirituality, the commitment to fight Britain's battles in Europe, the formation of the Māori Women's Welfare League and the current efforts of many Māori and non-Māori to establish variously held notions of Treaty based or bi-culturally directed future, are just some examples this thesis alludes to.

The struggle to insist that the relationship between the state and Māori is based as a relationship between two sovereign entities (1835 Declaration of Independence and 1840 Treaty of Waitangi) has been continuous ever since the formation of a British based parliamentary system. In my view, *tinu rangatiratanga* in the Treaty is about Māori voluntary organisations being in control of their resources and decisions in the community. Government must accept Māori as treaty partners. Working with community groups, Māori and Pakeha, using the consciousness raising techniques associated with Freire and *Kaupapa* Māori research methods are ways this possibility may be enhanced. Without this work, very little can be done at the grass roots level because governments continue to dictate the processes set in place to define and address social problems and maintain control over resources and decisions. 'Quality standards' have a defining say in what will be considered as appropriate Māori protocol to be established in the community groups government chooses to fund.

*Tino rangatiratanga* cannot be exercised in Māori communities without government's active participation in the formation of a Treaty based approach to managing this country and sharing control for its direction. Māori alone cannot transform the social problems in Māori communities by using the Treaty of Waitangi to its maximum potential. It is a 'partnership' or 'relationship' issue. We share this land – we must share its stewardship. This needs a new relationship with the partner that has assumed control and whose management has not served Māori well.

In Chapters Four and Eight, I note that in 2001, the International Year of the Volunteer, government committed itself to work on strengthening a relationship with the community and voluntary sector. That year government worked on strengthening the relationship. The incentive to strengthen this relationship was driven and structured by government. It failed to include the community and voluntary sector in the construction of the framework to gather information on how to conduct a process to measure this relationship. Government acted as a separate entity to the community and voluntary sector in New Zealand society and conducted processes controlled by its agencies. The community and voluntary sector were treated as mere respondents to research conducted and monitored by government. The community sector resisted overtures to consider themselves as ready to commit to a partnership with the state in its ambitious new approach to social wellbeing articulated as 'The Third Way' (described in section 5.4.1). While government documentation and declaration in almost all aspects of political and social policy promulgate messages to and about Māori wellbeing and Treaty-based responsibilities, the results of research indicate not only a rather limited notion of partnership with the community sector, but with regard to Māori shows that developing:

Effective working relationships between government and *Iwi/Māori*, community and voluntary organisations requires both immediate steps and substantial commitment over time – a 'journey' in which the partners work together to develop trust and understanding through shared experience. The Working Party acknowledged the pressure from many in government and in the community for visible and specific action right now. This initial review has, however, demonstrated the need for ongoing development of particular streams of work to enable stronger relationships to emerge and flourish (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001, 128).

Despite government's efforts to build a relationship with the voluntary sector and Māori there was little change to the policies governing social services delivered by Māori voluntary organisations. Presently, Māori voluntary organisations do not

have a fruitful relationship with government nor any apparent robust processes to represent them in the construction of such a relationship.

### **10.1.2 Oppression through the Re-Definition of ‘Aroha’ as ‘Voluntary Activity’**

New Zealand society remains locked in the idea that the concept of voluntary activity is an act of freewill, a condition of hegemony. The insistence of this definition for Māori communities is yet another substantiation of the imposition of Western hegemony eating at the fabric of *Te Ao Māori*. The problem my studies show is that people come to believe, for example, that it is acceptable for voluntary organisations to provide a service with inadequate resourcing and resourcing dependent on compliance with government directives. Because the activity is perceived as one of freewill, those who are unhappy with the circumstances are considered free to walk away. I argue therefore, that the establishing of such ideas ‘as normal’ adds to the form of oppression. Māori people in my research continue to work in under-resourced and over strained conditions because they feel they cannot walk away from their social obligations to society. This concept of responsibility appears to be encouraged by government and funding agencies and has the effect of deterring voluntary organisations from protesting for more funding and resources, and insisting on a *Te Tino Rangatiratanga* based *kaupapa*. This is the extent to which hegemony is established.

Gramsci and Freire (discussed in sections 2.3 and 2.4) share a belief that hegemony is never total and the seeds of dissent are always present. Within each of the historical epochs described earlier in this thesis, Māori retained an idea of *Te Ao Māori* and resisted those processes that sought to undermine it. Today, attempts to transform the structures of voluntary organisations into corporate agencies which request government and funding agencies to allocate resources and financial support on a user-pay basis are met with resistance. However, this resistance itself is a further drain on energy and resources and much compensatory work is done for ‘*aroha*’. Government and funding agencies appear to prefer voluntary organisations to deliver social services with unpaid workers as they provide a form of labour that is highly motivated, not costly in economic terms,

can be managed 'at a distance' (as referred to in discussions regarding the work of Foucault in section 2.4.2) through the accountability criteria established in the contracts:

In an era where governments are seeking to reduce expenditure on human services, community-based programmes provide an excellent way for this to occur, and represent a form of 'services on the cheap'. This is particularly true of the move from institutional care to community care for dependent people, where the high costs of institutional care can be reduced, but it is also true of other 'community-based' options, in that they tend to rely more on the use of volunteers, and on staff who are paid lower wages than those in the public sector. While such cost-cutting is a frequent result of moving to community-based services, it has a tendency to become the *de facto* justification for such a move. In addition, for a government intent on cost-cutting, it is often easier to reduce funding for community-based programmes than funding for an equivalent service provided by the state (Ife, 1995, 12).

The relationship of Māori with the state, may be argued to be even more difficult than the crisis articulated through the Report of the Working Party discussed in Chapters Four and Eight of this thesis. Some analysts believe that the new right policies were a way for government to shed responsibility (see section 5.3.4). The New Right policies opened the doorway for government to devolve social policies in a manner where government, whose role was to take care of and protect the welfare of citizens, handed that role over to communities. Since a large section in the communities was composed of voluntary organisations, taking care of citizens became their responsibility. The New Right policies created individualism and a business orientated environment whereby voluntary organisations requiring government support had to compete for funding from the government as purchaser to provide services to the community. The process to access funding and support created difficulties as indicated in the responses by community organisations (see section 8.4).

For Maori organisations, the relationship with the state is more difficult because co-opting values such as *aroha* to represent the voluntary work causes problems in an environment where organisations are under-resourced and under-funded. One example of the problems occurring for Māori voluntary organisations is when they challenge government funding agencies to provide adequate support and are declined because the activity is perceived as *aroha*. *Aroha* referred to in this context means working for love (unconditionally) to provide support for *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* and sacrificing the need for adequate resources and finances to ensure a social service is provided free of charge (see examples of *aroha* in sections 6.3.2, 7.2.1). According to Arotakenga (2000), Māori providers are prone to abuse precisely because governments appear to perceive the work Māori volunteers do as *aroha*. The value of *aroha* in this context is referred to as free labour. This corruption of its meaning, when taken up by those who agree, supports the state in this way, and perpetuates the notion that compensation is unnecessary. For example:

Providers stated that government agencies recognised Māori providers as a source of advice on Māori issues and often wanted to access this for free. The implication for Māori providers was that time and resources were being spent with no compensation. When Māori providers invoiced or charged in these situations, they were told that they didn't meet the approval standards of the agencies. They complained about how they were expected to work for '*aroha*'. These types of demands impinge on their capability to deliver quality programmes and services (p. 17).

Indeed, in many Māori communities the idea of voluntary work is frequently mingled with Māori values such as *aroha*. However, in the co-option of Māori values, especially when used to harness the efforts of Māori in the construction of an ever more compliant segment of the population that appears to accept poverty and struggle as a normal way of being, we are observing the conditions of hegemony of class and race in this country.



### 10.1.3 A New Approach to Policy Development

Poata-Smith (1996) introduces another way in which, through generalised social policies, Māori communities are disenfranchised. This occurs through the assumption that all Māori communities are basically identical to each other and can be treated in a similar manner. Poata-Smith argued that:

Māori are too frequently discussed by cultural nationalists as if forming one homogenous entity, its members possessing exactly the same experiences of oppression and exactly the same political aspirations. However, this ignores the fact that there exists a dynamic range of aspirations and political strategies within so-called 'Māoridom'. Moreover, these aspirations often conflict with one another and are not divorced from the influence of wider social and economic environment (p. 109).

This imposition has a tendency to misrepresent the voices of individual communities in a way that suppresses their voices and value. In my studies I found this to be a common attitude emanating from policy directives, for example, participants from *Te Rōpu Awhi* were being directed by government to disclose the type of *tikanga* they applied in their delivery of social services. The disclosure of this information was then analysed by government and an increase of support to the organisation was dependent on whether the organisation met the criteria of *tikanga* as defined by government.

Policy development for Māori continues to be the role of the government. Māori are excluded from decisions over Māori policies that impact on the community. This exclusion creates problems because the government produces policies without an input from the grass roots and expects the policies to be implemented in Māori communities. Policies are problematic for Māori when they are irrelevant and do not reflect the community initiatives or social problems. Pressure is placed on Māori service providers to implement these policies whether or not they are useful because:

Māori providers play a middle role between the government and Māori communities. In working with Māori communities, they are very aware of the particular needs of their communities. They are usually also accountable to the local Māori community, either informally, through their work in the community, or formally, through governance structures. Māori providers therefore often have a much better view of what is needed than policy makers in central government. However, they continue to be frustrated with the lack of attention by government to their views and knowledge and the lack of consultation with Māori communities (Arotakenga, 2000, 25).

The policy structures, themselves, for delivering social services are also a barrier that needs to be transformed. Modern social policies need to be implemented if the partnership ideals of both the Treaty of Waitangi and 'The Third Way' are to be manifest. It may be that in choosing to pursue an economic system where there have been insufficient paid jobs for Māori in the market or public sector, some of this work should be paid at a 'fair' market rate. At the very least, it becomes essential to acknowledge unpaid work and voluntary activity. This would require processes to breakdown the stereotypes that voluntary work or unpaid work is of less value than formal or paid work. Building on the work of Freire (section 2.4) for many Māori, this would entail a process of consciousness raising to generate an awareness of the part they have been allocated in an economy that has relegated them to the periphery, and to assert a new direction from that point. From many Pakeha policy makers, organisations, and volunteers this would require a review of their own part in the maintenance of Western hegemony.

#### **10.1.4 Insufficient Resources as a Continual Handicap for the Restoration and Invigoration of *Te Ao Māori***

According to Lissner (1977), the general view of funding in mainstream, voluntary agencies (or organisations) derives from four different types of income: government, business, other non-governmental organizations, and the general public. The amount or type of resources provided by these four contributors "differ widely in character and in volume" (p. 87). Resources are essential in a voluntary organisation because they shape the services the organisations would

deliver to a community. Without the provision of resources in some kind the voluntary organisations struggle to exist or simply fold. A barrier voluntary organisations encounter is securing sufficient resources to operate and to ensure that the source of funding does not corrupt their purposes through the accountability and output criteria that come with the money.

Government continues to insufficiently resource Māori organisations and provide assimilationist or unachievable outcomes and accountability measures (as discussed in 5.3.4). There is an expectation from government agencies for Māori people to provide voluntary services at a low price. This is a global problem for indigenous people:

Government under-funding is a common concern for indigenous peoples who provide programmes and services to their communities. A recent report by the United States General Accounting Organisation (GAO, August, 1999) highlighted a shortfall in funding for all American Indian tribes with government contracts. Tribes manage federal social services through self-determination contracts and receive contract support costs to cover costs of contract management and administration from the Federal Government. Allowable contract support costs include direct costs for tribal support services such as accounting, direct contract support costs and start-up costs (Arotakenga, 2000, 32).

The concept of *whānau*, so central to my opening story, was discussed by Durie (2001) in section 5.2.2. According to Durie (2001) “the capacity to care, *manaakitia*, is a critical role for *whānau*. Unless a *whānau* can care for the young and the old, for those who are sick or disabled, and for those who are temporarily out of pocket” (p. 220), he argued the fundamental purpose of the *whānau* is lost. In policy-speak, *whānau* appears to be treated as another concept to be co-opted from its meaning embedded in the context of *Te Ao Māori* to a convenient concept to carry new kinds of responsibility in a new context. *Whānau* is to be described as a way of forming voluntary organisations that should provide care to family members who have insufficient resources to take care of their ‘family’. Ironically, it is often the economic difficulties that place Māori in the need for social services

– social services they are increasingly expected to provide through (their own) community (resource) organisations. It is their *aroha* given from already limited resources that then prevents individuals from taking an active part on the more lucrative job-market:

Being concerned for *whānau* members does itself require resources, and the stark reality for many *whānau* is that an absence of material and social resources counts against caring for others. Nor is there always sufficient geographical closeness to exercise the caring function. Belonging to an active *whānau* means being willing to sacrifice personal independence when there is a need for assistance. Contribution in kind may be especially expected of members who are not able to assist in a financial way, and not infrequently that imposes costs that are difficult to measure but are perhaps higher than a monetary contribution (p. 200).

Durie states a “particular concern for many *whānau* is the difficulty in convincing authorities that it makes sense to use *whānau* members to provide disability support and pay them at the same rate as an external care giver would warrant” (p. 200). In doing so, Durie raises the issue of rate-of-pay for *whānau* who are experienced in care-giving and not acknowledged by authorities for the value of their work.

Financial underpinning and workers are not the only resources needed to establish a healthy community or a robust community organisation. Wise or astute leadership is a key resource for any community or organisation.

Poata-Smith (1996) argues that when the state targets key leaders it does so to bring the leaders in line with government way of thinking. This process results in the leaders adopting characteristics from the state that separate them from the community. Poata-Smith argued that in addition to the Treaty of Waitangi policies:

Labour also undertook a process of co-opting key individuals in the Māori protest movement. The involvement of a Māori elite within the structures

of the state forced many Māori leaders to straddle the uneasy gulf between pushing the Māori struggle forward and maintaining the existing state of affairs. The prestige and wealth that went with such privileged positions in the settlement process meant that Māori leaders became increasingly removed from the concerns and vitality of the flax roots Māori struggle (p. 109).

This political strategy to target Māori leaders strengthened government and weakened the community. It created a range of barriers in Māori communities such as loss of leadership and mistrust of government and leaders.

*'Aroha'* and *'Manaaki te Whānau'* are immensely cooptible concepts for any kind of leadership. These concepts, used strategically 'pull on the heartstrings' of the people. Often, government identified leaders, and sometimes leaders arising from a community need, are pressured to provide a service that is deemed culturally appropriate (and acceptable to the state/funder), often unpaid with a scarcity of resources that make it unlikely that the task will be achieved. In this case, good leaders step aside because the task is too enormous and the collaboration is fruitless or counter-productive. Those who do not resist this situation are left to manage the voluntary organisations, are overworked, positioned in more than one organisation, and struggling to cope with the demands that come with the role. It is here that some strategic capacity building from a critical perspective, perhaps using Freirian principles or *kaupapa* Māori researchers will return better outcomes for Māori in the long term.

## **10.2 Capacity Building – For *Tino Rangatiratanga***

It is imperative to find ways to overcome barriers so that the contribution from Māori voluntary organisations in search of well-being is recognised. If the contributions from Māori voluntary organisations in the proposed 'Third Way' context are to enhance the living standards in the local communities, there must be an authentic and holistic approach to strengthen the Māori service provider. This will take not only adequate financial support and more appropriate policies from government based on a robust commitment to the manifestation of self

determination safe guarded by the Treaty of Waitangi. The result of the efforts of the state and the community sectors of the past have been inadequate:

Fundamental to Māori criticism of the social services has been the rejection by many Māori activists and by Māori involved in the delivery and provision of social services to Māori of the assumptions of professional expertise. These assumptions formed an increasing component of the development of social services in 1960s and 1970s. The over-representation of Māori in juvenile institutions, in prisons, and in mental hospitals was seen to be the result of the failure of state services. ... The obvious response by Māori to these failures was to demand that Māori be given the resources and opportunities to provide for their own. The state had failed, it was argued, and Māori involvement could only improve the quality of services and outcomes for Māori (Cheyne et al., 2000, pp. 193-194).

This is a call to embed and support the tenets of *Tino Rangatiratanga* in any development work to be done with *Te Iwi Māori*. While ‘capacity building’ is a favoured concept in the emerging social policy context (described in 2.5.3) in this section I suggest four ways to build the capacity of Māori voluntary organisations in the pursuit of *Tino Rangatiratanga*. I begin with the Treaty of Waitangi – Implementing a Partnership Relationship with Government (10.2.1) followed by Consciousness Raising and Resource Development (10.2.2), Policy Inclusion (10.2.3), Organisational and *Tino Rangatiratanga* Development (10.2.4).

### **10.2.1 Treaty of Waitangi – Implementing a Partnership Relationship with Government**

The Treaty of Waitangi must be included in social policies. Walker’s (1990) discussion on the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi calls for government to honour the partnership made with Māori. Honouring the Treaty would include “eliminating the gaps that exist between educational, personal, social, economic and cultural well-being of Māori people and the general population” (p. 286). A way identified by Walker to eliminate the gaps would be:

Promoting economic development and self sufficiency for Māori people; dealing quickly and justly with grievances under the Treaty of Waitangi; allocating resources to Māori language and culture to enable the development of a unique New Zealand identity; promoting Māori participation in decision-making in the machinery of government [is] encouraging Māori participation in the political process (p. 286).

The Treaty of Waitangi provides the formal documentation for the government to share control with Māori when deciding over social policies that affect Māori in the community. In doing so, the government shares the responsibility over social problems with Māori and collectively produces social programmes in the community to make a significant difference. A way forward is for Māori to mirror successful organisations and for government to trust these organisations. Durie's (1994) discussions on Māori services provide examples of successful Māori providers:

Such as Te Pua Ora, a mental health initiative in Auckland that integrates traditional Māori practices with a Western clinical model, have been associated with a client focus and innovation. They have identified specific barriers to good health in their communities and have found ways around them. Being client focussed they have recognised the power of working in a culturally appropriate Māori framework where Māori values are practised and the power of community mobilisation and involvement is recognised (p. 229).

It has been suggested that Māori voluntary organisations need to form partnerships. A partnership approach, according to Williamson (2000), is a way to operate with minimal resources thus:

A partnership approach to local development has considerable appeal to governments struggling with the problem of scarce resources. It means that policy initiatives can target areas of acknowledged disadvantage and can adopt 'Worst First Policies'. Governments have a rationale which enable them to reduce the levels of help received by less disadvantaged

areas. Furthermore, by involving voluntary organisations and community associations in the planning and delivery of the programmes, policy-makers can reduce costs, avoid working with costly unionised labour, and the projects and programmes can often attract the support of volunteers at little, or low, cost (pp. 22-23).

However, if Māori voluntary organisations follow this partnership approach suggested by Williamson, it would increase oppression. Instead, a true partnership approach would involve government making decisions with Māori as a partner, not as a purchaser deciding what is fair and equitable that enables Māori voluntary organisations to provide a social service.

Torjman's (2000) discussion on voluntary work in Canada highlights social problems that result in government withdrawing support to social programmes and leads to an increase in voluntary activity. Social programmes, according to her, arise from an unstable labour market, changes in family structures and increase in an ageing population:

While the pressures on social programmes have grown, their foundation has been seriously shaken in recent years by major funding cuts and structural changes (Battle and Torjman, 1996). With cutbacks to publicly supported social programmes, governments have looked increasingly to the voluntary sector to 'pick up the slack.' This expectation is unrealistic. The voluntary sector can never replace a strong public sector. The 'communitisation' of responsibility for problems such as unemployment, poverty and family violence is not the answer we are seeking (p. 9).

A way forward she also suggests is for the voluntary sector to form partnerships with government in developing public policy 'on the ground'. However, while of course it is prudent to do as much as we can with as little pressure on resources, the call to such efficiency, when dependent on the free work of an already over-stretched community requires caution. In Aotearoa/New Zealand the concept of partnership is discussed by Robinson (1996) as a way to resolve tensions



“between the market, government and community and drawing them into mutually supportive relationships”:

In a true partnership, the ‘partners’ do not simply cooperate on a project as separate entities. They join together to form a new type of organisation in which all parties participate in identifying the needs and developing the solutions. In this situation there is potential for the resources of the business community to combine with the community knowledge of voluntary agencies, and the financial and legislative resources of government to create new structures that are able to operate effectively outside their sectoral boundaries (p. 3).

What is needed then, is to ensure that the parties to the proposed partnerships will ensure that success is success for all.

### **10.2.2 Consciousness Raising and Resource Development**

Raising the consciousness of voluntary organisations can be accomplished at the national and local level. A national form of consciousness raising would address changing legislation. A local form of consciousness raising would suggest ways to change the thinking of voluntary organisations in communities. The following paragraphs provide ways to raise the consciousness of individuals in New Zealand society and suggest that when the consciousness of individuals is raised the collective society as a whole can change.

Raising the consciousness of Parliament is a method towards raising the consciousness of people in New Zealand society. A way to raise the consciousness in Parliament is to identify the Acts that are relevant to the voluntary sector of society. Currently, the 1973 Voluntary Employment Protection Act is irrelevant and outdated. The Act concentrates on the voluntary activity of New Zealand citizens in the army and fails to acknowledge the social service delivery areas where volunteers need protection in legislation. Volunteers in New Zealand have survived over the years without any changes to the 1973 Voluntary Employment Protection Act and this needs to change so that the Act reflects the field of voluntary work today.

Developing the human resources in a voluntary organisation is the key to success. Ski Australia (1991) on staff training and development state “it is not uncommon for community-based organisations, especially where there is a heavy reliance on unpaid, volunteer staff, to ignore issues of staff development and training” (p. 30). The decision to provide resources for human development is not easily made. “The facts remains, however, that successful organisations (whether commercial or community-based) tend to put a fair amount of time and effort into training and developing their people” (p. 30). But, in the context of this thesis, such training and capacity building cannot be a text book solution drawn (often) from principles of business management. The organisation and management of Māori community organisations needs to be rethought to ensure that the people who work in them understand the conditions of oppression described in this thesis and are committed to redress these conditions and their outcomes.

Good principles are essential. Stewart-Weeks (1991) stated an organisation needed a system that is clear and provides rewards and sanctions. The rewards must “relate directly to achieving the results which matter to the things the organisation is trying to achieve” (p. 15). An organisation offering such rewards must offer a type of recognition:

In other words, when you have decided to offer rewards – whether they are financial, in kind or whatever they might be – make sure people only get them, and the recognition which goes with them, when they have achieved a result the organisation needed and had identified. That way, people will begin to learn that rewards actually mean something – that they have to be earned, but that when they are earned, the rewards will be forthcoming (p. 15).

Rewards and sanctions are common for the establishment of any social order. Sanctions, in the context of community organisations is a sensitive issue. Stewart-Weeks (1991) argues that “poor performance or consistent failure to achieve the results the organisation’s needs [have] to be appropriately sanctioned. This is part

of human resource management which is always tougher in non-profit organisations” (p. 15).

In Māori voluntary organisations there is a tendency for workers to constantly dip into their pockets to provide a service. These organisations run on a ‘smell of an oily rag’ and are predominantly poor. Somehow, the struggle to survive seems to gain a sense of pride and the notion to work without getting wealthy becomes the normal perception. This notion can be a form of oppression. Durie (1996) encourages *whānau* to resist believing that there is some virtue in living in poverty thus:

The fact that many *whānau* experience hardship on a day-to-day basis should not be a reason for normalising the experience as if it were some sort of noble existence. Now, should wealth be viewed as if it were the prerogative of some groups but not others? There is every reason for *whānau* to expect to be wealthy. The second ground for advocating wealth creation is that *whānau* receive insufficient benefits from their resources – cultural resources such as language, physical resources such as land, and social resources such as people (p. 204).

This resistance to believing ‘virtue in poverty’ as discussed by Durie I consider to be a method of consciousness raising. Wealthy *whānau*, according to Durie, are Māori who are able to obtain maximum benefit from their possessions. Māori enjoy the “heritage of language and custom; reap profits from land, fisheries, and investments in the wider economy; and enjoy the gains from their own work, the efforts of the collective *whānau*, and the work of their forebears” (pp. 204-205). I add, Māori voluntary organisations should pursue ways to provide rewards and sanctions for their volunteers. In saying so, I encourage volunteers (like the participant referred to in 6.6) to refrain from feeling guilty for accepting rewards for the voluntary work that is done because it opens the door to abuse.

Consciousness raising can be a simple process like improving ways to value the people who volunteer and are essential to the growth and development of any organisation. Valuing people can be achieved in many ways. Millar (2000)

discusses ways to motivate volunteers who are not being paid to work and makes suggestions on how to retain volunteers by:

*Extrinsic rewards* – those rewards that come from outside of the individual such as money, chocolate fish or bonuses – are notoriously poor at getting anything other than temporary compliance. Put simply, extrinsic rewards only work for a while, and then their effect wears off. It is the *intrinsic rewards* that are important, those rewards come from within. Making work interesting, allowing people to have autonomy (such as making their own decisions), and developing individual strengths allow people to reward themselves with feelings of satisfaction and achievement, and a sense that they have made a difference (p. 99).

Durie's (2001) discussions on collective responsibility identify the values Māori place on these words. Collective responsibility is described as an activity that is entangled in activities of philanthropy coupled with reciprocity. Wealth is not seen as individualistic but spread amongst the *whānau* because:

The capacity to share, *tohatohatia*, depends on the generosity and sense of collective responsibility. It represents a redistribution of wealth among family members and the promotion of a spirit of selflessness; it also reduces the emphasis on personal possessions at the expense of the group. Sharing is not a one-way process. Reciprocity is the expectation and allowances for *whānau* demands must form part of the household budget. For many *whānau*, sharing means that no one becomes rich. For others, it means an inability to effectively meet cultural expectations. At the same time, however, the *whānau* is sometimes able to act as a buffer in times of hardship. Māori parents are more inclined to provide financial support to children after they have left home and do not necessarily expect the money to be tagged for a particular purpose to be returned (pp. 200-201).

Another way to raise the consciousness of people in society is to draw on the work of Freire within the consciousness raising of *whānau* about itself, its past and its future. I suggest that consciousness raising for Māori should be collective

and extend to the *hapū*, and *iwi*. It would involve informing members about the breaches and promises of the Treaty of Waitangi and the co-option of Māori effort in many projects that may not lead to wellbeing and the huge waste of resources associated with this. Training and participation with organisational activities from fund raising and compliance with less than useful outcomes might be challenged by *whānau* members heightening their understanding of the social policies that affect their community and the ways in which they may act to ensure a better outcome for their future. Their first political act may be to refuse to accept money or provide services that are not Treaty directed.

### 10.2.3 Policy Inclusion

Although consecutive governments claimed the desire to close the gap of disparity between Māori and non-Māori they failed to resource the voluntary sector sufficiently. Part of honouring the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi would include working with Māori to design social policies.

Māori voluntary organisations and volunteers in general need policies that protect them as employees. These policies need to be drafted by government and individual organisations that reflect protection in the workplace. Even though volunteers are unpaid, this should by no means suggest that they are not entitled to protection of a safe working environment because they provide a service to the community. Government and representatives from voluntary organisations must draft a mainstream policy for volunteers in the workplace.

Bearing in mind my concern for *Te Ao Māori*, social policies for Māori voluntary organisations must include Māori values and processes not easily recognised by the Western mind. Among the more controversial processes Māori might want to consider as part of their social capital is the *karakia*. *Karakia*, as discussed by Durie (1996) creates an environment of social healing but its use requires wise leadership:

Out of context, prayer or incantation can appear forced or contrived or excessively linked to religious dogma. But within Māori circles, as an integral part of *tikanga* Māori, it is the norm, even when there is no

particular religious affiliation. *Karakia* may range from a brief observation before the assessment process commences to an elaborate ceremony conducted as part of a healing process (p. 234).

The practising of Māori values in the workplace separates a Māori voluntary organisation from a mainstream organisation. It is essential Māori voluntary organisations design policies that reflect the workplace and are not confined to using only mainstream policies. However, Māori must not be limited to action through these types of organisations.

It is important for government to include Māori in Treasury. Māori are the Treaty partners in New Zealand and command the right to be included at the top level of decision making especially in issues concerning social, political, and economic aspects of New Zealand society. The Treasury (2001) is a powerful organisation in the framing of economic policy.

In order for an inclusive economy to be effective in New Zealand it must place Māori at the table in policy decisions. Māori voluntary organisations need to adopt policies that protect their voluntary workers and reflect the culture of the people in the organisations. This protection must include an input from government.

#### **10.2.4 Organisational and Tino Rangatiratanga Development**

A Treaty based future for Māori voluntary organisations involves a combination of good leadership, good management practices, and a partnership with the government. It requires implementing treaty based initiatives in the *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*. The *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*, are made-up of organised groups and the following paragraphs provide suggestions to develop organised voluntary groups.

Murphy and Thomas's (2000) discussions on philanthropic behaviour suggest voluntary associations can develop into corporate institutions. They argue that literature shows a shift away from traditional models of volunteering towards a

business model. Voluntary organisations are seen to develop relationships with the community and businesses:

An examination of the overseas literature on corporate citizenship reveals that the level of corporate interest in forming partnerships to address social problems in their community is moving beyond traditional corporate philanthropy. .... the most radical departure from corporate volunteering whereby business organisations encourage and support the involvement of their staff in the community. Recent surveys have revealed that in the US, 92% of large companies support employee volunteering, and in the UK, a third of large companies have formal employee volunteer programmes (p. 33).

‘Organisational development’ is a way to transform traditional roles of volunteering towards a business model.

Kaplan (1996) described organisational development as consisting of three phases. “Typically, the developing organisation moves through the phases of dependence, independence and interdependence” (p.23):

- 1) Dependence phase is a newly formed organisation run by one or more charismatic leaders. The organisation operates like a family unit, personally and informally.
- 2) Independence phase is when the organisation enters a standardised process of structure and procedures. The organisation operates on a formal basis moving away from personal relationships between individual members in the organisation. Repetitive behaviour within formal structures produces an unconscious organisation. The organisation has developed repetitive activities and struggles to become conscious.
- 3) Interdependence phase is when an organisation achieves organisational consciousness. It is the ability for the organisation to act decisively amidst uncertainty, and continue to seek the balance between polarities (p. 25).

Kaplan related these phases to the theories of consciousness. He considered the “state of dependence is the state of unconscious acceptance and natural conformity” (p. 26). Adding to this, he contends that the “stage of independence is essential in awakening consciousness, but is not enough to maintain it” (p. 27).

Interdependence, as defined by Kaplan, referred to the organisation’s “capacity to make decisions with maximum awareness. It is the ability to act decisively within the realm of uncertainty and contradiction” (p. 29). The significance of these phases is that they describe how an organisation moves from a phase of unconsciousness to consciousness.

Gramsci and Freire supported organisational consciousness, to organised groups. I propose several layers of consciousness raising must occur. Māori must continue to examine the conditions of their alienation and work towards resistance. Non-Māori must learn to understand that in their contribution to the weakening of Māori, they weaken themselves. Moreover, just as oppressive regimes are established and maintained in ‘formality’ so can the transformation be more formalised – in policy, in organisational format, in the training associated with capacity building, in systems of rewards and sanctions.

Hall (1991) states that there is a tendency in “voluntary organisations for processes to be less structured. It is seen to be less onerous, more friendly, more participatory and more likely to contribute to the ‘esprit de corp’ of the organisation. I do not subscribe to this view” (p. 4). Hall adds:

Structure is critical and does not pre-empt an informal style. Our experience is, organisations without clear lines of responsibility and accountability, without clearly defined roles, without established job specifications, without specific procedures, breed confusion, frustration, ineffectiveness and often dissension. Such organisations are able to be led left, right and centre, across the spectrum via either the executive or paid management. Whilst there are weaknesses in the corporate model as used by the commercial sector, we don’t believe structured processes is one of them (p. 4).



A consciousness raising question to be addressed by Māori, the state and the voluntary sector more generally might be – just what would transformative structures and processes look like if they are to serve the ends of Māori wellbeing?

Burnes (1992) says that much of the literature on management practices derived from organisational development. He contends that it was defined as a system wide application of behavioural science knowledge that reinforced strategies for the organisation by a planned development. This plan included enhancing the effectiveness of the organisation by improving the structures and processes.

The community strengthens the resource base by strengthening individual organisations. Organisational development (OD) according to Burke (1994) involves theory and practice: what one says it is and how one does it. “OD is a consideration in general of how work is done, what the people who carry out the work believe and feel about their efficiency and effectiveness, rather than a specific, concrete, step-by-step linear procedure for accomplishing something” (p. 1). More importantly, OD is about human resource development, the people. Burke’s discussions on case studies identified problems with linear procedures for accomplishing tasks. When groups rely on specific tasks to be met and a system breaks down, the groups begin to ‘blame’ each other and conflict arises that affects productivity. Managers can spend a lot of time resolving conflict (p. 4). A conflict resolution method proposed by Burke is to use a standard OD intergroup problem-solving format, whereby the groups meet to discuss problems, clarify the differences, and as a group create a procedure to solve the problem.

*Tino rangatiratanga* involves sovereignty and implies that Māori have the ability to combine theory and practice. Māori work in a world based on practical application and it is this practical experience that allows for Burke’s notions of organisational development to help achieve *tino rangatiratanga*. Burke’s notions encourage human resource development in organisations and in Māori voluntary organisations human resources are the core to how it functions. By taking on

board Burke's notions Māori organisations can strengthen the volunteers within the organisation.

Millar (2000) argues that people “are the key to a successful organisation, and staff who are valued and respected will provide the organisation with a strong competitive advantage” (p. 3). To this he adds, “people will be more satisfied with their work and with themselves, particularly if they believe that the organisation is treating them as fully functioning human beings who have unlimited potential” (p. 3).

In the quest for *tinu rangatiratanga* within *Te Ao Māori* I suggest Māori voluntary organisations can achieve sovereignty by taking control over their processes of development. First and foremost, this development must consist of valuing the people and to resist supporting situations that create an oppressive environment for the *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*. A process that values people involves creating an environment of participation within the organisation between workers, volunteers, and management. This process requires collaboration and mutual respect of each other's position. A way to achieve collaboration and mutual respect is to create a contractual agreement or memorandum of understanding whereby everyone participates in its construction and the rules of operation for the organisation are clear, transparent and within the capabilities of those who work in there. Another way forward to accomplish such development would be to review what was discussed in sections 2.10.1, 2.10.2, and 2.10.3 and build the capacity of the Māori voluntary organisations. For Māori, one of the greatest challenges in this quest for *tinu rangatiratanga* is to say, ‘No, this organisation cannot deliver the programme because we do not have sufficient resources’. Individual Māori voluntary organisations must decide for themselves what programmes and processes are appropriate for their delivery of social services. By taking such action they implement practices of sovereignty and, go one step further to lobby government or the local Member of Parliament to accept these practices, reinforces the development of *tinu rangatiratanga*.

### 10.3 Development Theories

This section describes the theories of development I have produced from this thesis in four parts. The first part describes *Tino Rangatiratanga* (10.3.1), followed by Characteristics of a Māori Organisation (10.3.2). Part three looks at Enhancing Working Conditions (10.3.3) and then *Kaupapa* Māori Approach to Research (10.3.4).

#### 10.3.1 *Tino Rangatiratanga*

*Tino rangatiratanga* for Māori voluntary organisations involves their recognition that this activity is of Pakeha origin. They need to take control of the knowledge to describe what voluntary work means to them. Without taking a position to establish the origin of the Māori contribution to voluntary work or the relationship Māori have to such activity, the meaning and understanding of such work remains unclear. By establishing an origin and describing the process of how voluntary work evolves in different Māori communities throughout history, a clearer understanding of this relationship emerges. From this process Māori take control of the knowledge that will grow from this understanding.

Māori voluntary organisations must lobby government to include the Treaty of Waitangi in social policy. The Treaty of Waitangi allows Māori to work with government over social policies and restores their right as sovereign rulers. It is the social policies that have the greatest impact on Māori voluntary organisations because social policies determine the funding criteria, the amount administered to organisations, and the availability of resources.

Māori voluntary organisations must have the capacity to resist working in an oppressive environment. In doing so, they exercise their status of *tino rangatiratanga*. For too long, government and communities have relied on Māori *aroha* to provide ongoing social services for government without sufficient resources. Māori have taken this role on as their social obligation to New Zealand society. They need to build their understanding of and resistance to the hegemonic impact of such re-definition. Times have changed and Māori *tamariki*, *rangatahi*, *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* need to reassess the contribution they give to

the community to see whether the reciprocity is a positive or negative development for the community as a whole.

I find in Māori communities that volunteers are silenced by government and those placed higher in the organisation when they raise their voices to complain about working conditions and are told to complain is not to be Māori. This behaviour, silencing volunteers, has perpetuated hegemony that voluntary work and oppression are part of being a lower class voluntary worker for a Māori person and perpetuates the notion that it is done freely without reciprocity. Government has played a major part in fashioning minds of volunteers to expect little or nothing for their work efforts by constructing policies that restrict support for volunteers with stringent criteria. Government policies and voluntary organisations are related because voluntary organisations are required to fulfil certain obligations as directed by government in the community. Since these obligations are structured in government policies, the voluntary organisations becomes dependent on government for direction. *Tino rangatiratanga* is including the Treaty of Waitangi in government policies and raising the class position of Māori and Māori controlling the direction they take for the future of their communities.

### **10.3.2 Characteristics of a Māori Voluntary Organisation**

A Māori voluntary organisation must first achieve *tino rangatiratanga*, then formalise itself according to mainstream law. My reasons for suggesting an organisation be formalised are:

- 1) The majority of Māori voluntary organisations are reliant on government funding and without formal recognition are placed in a position to struggle for funding.
- 2) Formal processes will change ad hoc management systems into something that is practical making the overall process transparent and attractive to people in the community.

To resist the potential strengthening of colonising and disempowering hegemony which has peripheralised Māori in all aspects of life in this country, Māori

voluntary organisations must follow *kaupapa* Māori. The constitution of the organisations must include a section on the Treaty of Waitangi and its relevance in the organisations, and some aspect of *tikanga* Māori. The practices of Māori culture need to be exercised daily and be created by the people in the organisation. Māori voluntary organisations must consist of a predominantly Māori membership and management.

Māori voluntary organisations need to include policies on voluntary work. It is no longer acceptable to expect voluntary workers to work without knowing where they fit in the organisations. Too often the charter of the organisation fails to implement a section on the roles and responsibilities of volunteers. Therefore, policies need to develop with the volunteers and reflect the organisation's and volunteer's objectives.

### **10.3.3 Enhancing Working Conditions**

Māori voluntary organisations operate in oppressive conditions. The organisations work long hours with insufficient resources to deliver a social service for the community. The satisfaction of clientele lifts the tension but overall it's a struggle to survive. The minimal reciprocity received from groups, *whānau*, and government relieves some of the burden volunteers in the organisation carry.

Autonomy in the workplace seems to be at the discretion of the managers. I have found that the character of the manager determines whether the volunteers share power in making decisions in the organisation. Managers who treat volunteers with respect create a better workplace environment, those who do not position volunteers at the bottom of the organisation and abuse them. The managers considered autonomy to be directed from government and show this by following government rules and regulations. A reason voluntary organisations are subservient to government is pinpointed at funding because failure to comply with the rules or regulations tends to result in a loss of financial support given from government.

The community drives the amount of social services provided by Māori voluntary organisations. Each time social problems soar voluntary organisations react in a life-saving mode so that their services and people become expendable in the quest to solve social problems. When this happens autonomy is conceded to the community and clientele that need help. The role of a Māori voluntary organisation is diverse and success of the organisations determines how the role is perceived by the wider community. The ability for a Māori voluntary organisation to deliver a grand service with minimal resources is considered by the community to be a good role model. I object to this consideration, it creates a false sense of security and perpetuates a belief that to be 'poor is to be honourable'. To me, there is no honour in an organisation that is overworked, under funded, with stressed out workers that is controlled by government.

#### **10.3.4 A *Kaupapa* Māori Approach to Research**

The *kaupapa* and social obligations maintain Māori participation in voluntary organisations. Māori culture applied in voluntary organisations separates a Māori organisation from a non-Māori organisation. The application of *whakawhānaungatanga* and rituals of sharing one's *whakapapa* are part of the service with a predominant Māori membership. However, without research the knowledge of this *kaupapa* or the relationship Māori have to voluntary work remains undocumented.

A *kaupapa* Māori approach to such research is essential. Without conducting a type of research based on a Māori framework a researcher would struggle to gain confidence from participants and conduct a transparent process. This process requires the combination of *Kaupapa* Māori Research and Social Research theories to strengthen the research approach and provide types of analysis for validity. Most importantly a researcher must have knowledge and experience in the community and a dynamic personality so that the approach is not confined to rigid processes and can be modified in an instant. In saying so, there need to be clear guidelines and principles to follow.

*Whakawhānaungatanga*, *whakapapa*, *kanohi kitea*, *kaupapa*, and *aroha* must direct the research. *Whakawhānaungatanga* is described as the process the

researcher and participant encounter when discussing the research. It involves sharing information and getting to know each other. My use of the term *whakawhanaungatanga*, differs from the use of the term by Bishop (discussed earlier in section 3.2.1). Bishop's notion of *whakawhanaungatanga* involves collaborative research whereby the participants and researcher work together on the process and methodology and form *whānau*-type relationships. Bishop's theories are similar to mainstream approaches conducted by Pearson, Tierney, Tucker, Gallagher, and Crismore (1988) and Pearson, Taylor, Peterson, Rodriguez (2002). Pearson et. al (1988; 2002) discuss research in education that involves forming a collaborative relationship between teachers and researchers so that research conducted upon the students is done with agreement from teachers and researchers. However, my approach was slightly different. Participants were more interested in telling the stories of their lives and forming friendly relationships with me than in critiquing or theorising about the process and methodology used in the research. Most felt that they did not have enough resources for the tasks they were already undertaking.

The *whakawhanaungatanga* research process as I have defined it is paramount and rigorous and allows the participant the opportunity to see inside the person and determine whether they should participate in the research. *Whakapapa* allows the participant to make a connection to the researcher. *Kanohi kitea* is crucial. It requires the researcher to show their face to the participant and meet them. I do not endorse social research conducted from outside the field where participants and researchers do not meet. *Aroha* commands the researcher to be respectful towards the participants. After all, it is predominantly the researcher who seeks the knowledge of the participant rather than vice versa, therefore one must be appreciative for the assistance a participant gives. Respect means going through the stages of *whakawhanaungatanga*, *whakapapa*, and *kanohi kitea* before getting to the research questions. Researchers must expect this process may take from one hour to two days depending on the participant. It is presumptuous and unethical to rush this process and if it is unsuitable for the researcher then I suggest refrain from calling the approach a *kaupapa* Māori approach.

## **10.4 Recommendations**

This section provides recommendations for the development of Māori voluntary organisations. It consists of five parts: Individual, Organisational, and Government Contributions (10.4.1), National Māori Voluntary Association (10.4.2), Consciousness Raising (10.4.3), Support Research (10.4.4) and ends with Concluding Comments (10.5).

### **10.4.1 Individual, Organisational, and Government Contributions**

If each voluntary organisation contributed positively to support voluntary work then collectively, with the support of many, the environment would become attractive. If each voluntary organisation supported the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi, the founding document of New Zealand, in the workplace then collectively, New Zealand society will become educated on treaty issues. Support and action are needed to move the stereotypes and mindset of people to stop using and abusing volunteers, and to stop avoiding issues raised from advocates for recognition of the Treaty. It is imperative that each individual that works in the voluntary sector, employs volunteers, writes about volunteers, and teaches voluntary activity to develop policies for volunteers that include the Treaty. It is essential that people who use the services of volunteers sit down with them and together create policies on the usage of voluntary service in the organisation.

Each voluntary organisation can take steps towards implementing better working conditions with workers such as implementing transparent processes whereby the volunteer and the organisation understand each other's role. Creating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is a way to establish a transparent process and placing the Treaty in this MOU strengthens the partnership between the Crown and Māori. The organisation should provide policies regarding the roles and responsibilities of the organisation and volunteers. I reinforce the importance for the organisation to provide a type of reciprocity to the volunteer. Most important, the organisation must implement systems needed to monitor the workload of volunteers so that it does not exceed the average of 20 hours as suggested in this thesis and create oppressive environments at the place of work.



In the MOU the *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*, policies can be designed so that they include *tikanga* Māori.

#### **10.4.2 National Māori Voluntary Association**

New Zealand society needs to form a National Māori Voluntary Association. This association can represent all types of voluntary activity, Māori groupings, pan-tribal organisations, *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi*. Māori voluntary organisations are in a better position to be included in social policies impacting on Māori communities if they are represented by a national organisation. Government needs to support the development of a national body to represent Māori volunteerism and provide funding as part of its responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi, and to strengthen the third sector of ‘civil society’.

If individual *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* worked together and designed a national policy for Māori voluntary organisations it could be used as a guideline for organisations in Māori communities. Without a national policy that has the mandate of many Māori groups government will continue to dictate policies to Māori organisations that deliver social programmes. Without the support of many Māori organisations the national policy or national body would fail to represent a strong Māori voice.

#### **10.4.3 Consciousness Raising**

New Zealand society must consider implementing some consciousness raising techniques such as:

- Capacity building initiatives that are developed from the community level,
- Implementing the Treaty of Waitangi policies in voluntary organisations,
- Lobbying government to change the 1973 Voluntary Employment Protection Act,
- Resisting voluntary work when there are insufficient services to deliver a government programme.

If the voluntary organisations are unhappy with the current contract application forms they should take steps to change the situation. I suggest lobby the local Member of Parliament or form groups to petition to government.

Arotakenga (2000) says “one of the key areas where government agencies can make improvements for Māori providers is in creating consistency in the contracting processes of the various funding agencies, with the aim of reducing compliance costs” (p. 41). For a large section of western society, voluntary work is seen as a pastime activity one participates in as part of their duty as good citizens. However there are voluntary organisations such as Women’s Refuge whose voluntary services are not a leisurely activity. People join mainstream organisations such as Women’s Refuge because they were/are victims of abuse and have an insight to the problems women encounter and can provide informed advice or a genuine concern to assist women. Although it is important to investigate the environment for these types of mainstream organisations, this thesis can only acknowledge the need for research because the focus here is on the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. For Māori people, it is an unpaid job that must be done and in the social service area a priority and social obligation:

Māori providers have an important role to play in Māori development. They are well placed to deliver appropriate and effective services to *iwi*, *hapū*, *whānau* and Māori communities. Māori provider development also contributes to building the capacity of *iwi*, *hapū*, *whānau* and Māori communities (Arotakenga, 2000, 7).

#### **10.4.4 Support Research**

One of the saddest realities encountered in this research was the lack of support and promotion to research the voluntary sector of society. Although the Year of the Volunteer recognised voluntary work on a global level it highlighted the lack of recognition global communities give to this concept and those who take part in this type of work. When societies and communities supported research in the voluntary sector they targeted mainstream Western organisations and left indigenous organisations on the periphery. Research that was conducted on Māori voluntary organisations was often a response to a government directive. Research in Māori volunteerism must be conducted regularly so that changes in the environment can be monitored and addressed. But it must be done with an

alertness of purpose; an alertness I believe is provided in the proposed methods of *kaupapa* Māori research.

Māori participation in voluntary work requires further research – research that is not designed to inform a colonising state or the wider less than conscientious society of the aspirations of Māori. This type of research runs the risk of co-option. What is needed is research that inspires Māori to take up their position as the Māori provider to a Treaty well established as valid and significant.

Concepts, once life – enhancing, have become entangled with processes of oppression. Notions of kinship obligations and *aroha* are no longer confined to direct *whakapapa* links because Māori organisations today may be pan-tribal (representative of more than one tribe). Research in Māori voluntary organisations must incorporate a *kaupapa* Māori approach that recognises the consequences of this entanglement and a future that is one both Māori and Pakeha can be proud to call ‘just’.

### **10.5 Concluding Comments**

This thesis outlined the theories and concepts that underpinned my discussions on Māori voluntary organisations. I came to view that critical theory when used to critique modern, colonised society, exposed the social injustices that impacted on the lower working classes and those who live in the lower socio-economic communities. I highlighted the analysis of social structures with issues drawn from critical theorists, Gramsci, Freire, Foucault, and development theorists. In this way, I examined the notion that industrialisation produced a working class, an oppressed group. A process of hegemony was implemented to keep this group oppressed and retain them in a subordinate position. In the case of Māori in the process of colonisation, class and race have been a complex mix.

Relating critical theory, hegemony, oppression, and development theories to Māori the thesis showed how New Zealand society was created from colonisation and industrialisation. The social structures that stemmed from colonisation were designed to serve the state and were established on values from Britain using force, coercion, and education. The state stripped Māori of their resources and

treated them as an underclass. By creating structural barriers the state produced Māori subalterns to perform lower paid and unpaid work in the poor communities in New Zealand. Māori resisted colonisation and pursued the notion of sovereignty. Through a process of development Māori survived colonisation and retained some cultural values and resources using consciousness raising and other survival techniques.

From this examination the thesis purported that the theoretical frameworks explained the transformation that was achieved through the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. The discussions presented arguments through which the emergence of oppression in New Zealand positioned Māori as poor and living in poor communities. By locating the discussion in this framework the thesis analysed the relationship between theories, concepts, and voluntary work in Māori communities.

The establishment of Māori voluntary organisations was initially a response to developments arising in New Zealand. Much of the environment Māori voluntary organisations operated under were subjected to external policies and Māori communities dealt with social problems arising internally at the community level. This thesis acknowledged the work of voluntary organisations that commit to the strengthening of local communities. Yet it may be argued that in many ways volunteers were coopted from traditional structures of *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* to represent a contemporary form of Western voluntary organisation.

I build on the work of Paulo Freire, and the later social constructivists to posit that the world we have is not the world that we need rest in. Techniques of consciousness raising and action, whether they be incorporated in the resistance of institutional life, with its processes and formalities provide an opportunity for oppressed groups and their supporters to transform lives of oppression to the liberation promised in democracy and the very essence of human-being.

Māori voluntary organisations struggle to deliver voluntary programmes in mainstream society under mainstream structures. As I pointed out in Chapter 2, Freire argues that programmes must be ‘grounded in real life experiences’ in a

holistic fashion that caters for social, political and economic development in communities (Ife, 1995, 95). This approach would require a step away from European structures of formality, rules, and bureaucratic systems and a return to traditional constructs of kinship and whānau that incorporate a cultural dimension.

Administering programmes that are constructed from life experiences by the people living in the communities who are oppressed and disadvantaged is a way forward out of oppression. It gives back to the community people control to direct development. When the people are given control they are able to use their knowledge to empower themselves, for example providing appropriate programmes based on experience.

It is the complexity of cooption that is critical, the manner in which voluntary organisations' transformations have exposed the lack of resilience, and the limited capacity to withstand external expectations, with consequent internal tensions and conflicts. It is through the work of capacity building and institutional reformation, a reformation built squarely of the principles of *Te Tino Rangatiratanga*, that I believe another transformation is possible. However, the premise that Māori voluntary organisations are open to adaptation and change as a process of *tino rangatiratanga* is a myth if such organisations are totally reliant on government funding and decision making is out of their hands. The transformation from ad hoc informal organisations to formal organisations as a modification to suit government as a condition of receiving funding has become a normal process. Transformation is met with problems as voluntary organisations comply with stringent requirements imposed by government funding departments. However, if government acknowledge Māori as Treaty partners and together share power and resources this process can change.

The thesis supported a triangulation of methods to study organisations involved with using the services of Māori volunteers in order to gain an understanding of the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. The three studies in the thesis: case study, community study, and cross section study, highlighted internal and external factors that impact on the relationship between Māori and voluntary work in organisations. The developments that occurred in these organisations

eventuated while adapting and changing according to political, social, and economic circumstances. The change or lack of change had implications for the building of capacity in Māori voluntary organisations as they evolve and transform from *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* structures to a business orientated organisation.

The Treaty of Waitangi is omitted from policies in the community and voluntary sector. The thesis advocates for the Treaty of Waitangi to be included in social policies to put right historical injustices that have been done to Māori. In doing so, the inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in social policy will set a precedent for those in the local communities who deliver voluntary social services to follow the same path by including the Treaty in constitutions and organisational policies.

It is suggested in the thesis that barriers in the voluntary sector are created and can be removed by people. Over the years government, local communities, voluntary organisations, and Māori organisations have developed independently instead of collectively. To bring together the communities and government requires a sharing of power and dialogue. That is just the beginning. Government needs to devolve power and let communities at the grass roots control the delivery of social services because the grass roots community is equipped to understand local problems. Government and local communities must include Māori providers when making decisions to provide a service for Māori clients.

The process of accessing support from government must improve. Currently the structures in place are troublesome for voluntary organisations and are made for policy makers rather than community groups. A way forward is to include people from the grass roots community to participate in the structuring of funding applications and processes so that the process is transparent and inclusive. By including the Treaty in social policies Māori can come forward to sit at the decision-making table.

The thesis states that inclusion is the key to retaining voluntary participation. Inclusion involves acknowledgement and sufficient resources for voluntary organisations. It is no longer feasible to expect communities to provide social

services with inadequate resources. I stress that it is a social responsibility for society to provide a type of reciprocity or reward for the volunteers in communities and ensure voluntary organisations place the needs of the volunteers before the clients. The rewards and reciprocity must be negotiated between the organisation and volunteer(s) in a way that the process is transparent with mutual respect given to each. Human resource development must not be perceived as a reward because it is the role of the organisation to provide a service for the unpaid workers. Value must be placed on the voluntary workers because they are the social capital that keeps New Zealand operating. New Zealand society has to overcome the barriers that keep volunteers and government apart. Volunteers are dependent on government for some types of resources and government are dependent on volunteers to work for free. The current legislation has to change to reflect the environment voluntary organisations work in.

The purpose of the thesis was to merge together theory and practice to gather an understanding of the relationship between Māori and voluntary work. In addition, the research was a personal journey to describe the work *whānau*, *hapū*, and *iwi* exercise daily. For me, it identified that the activity was Pakeha in origin and values taken from Māori culture were co-opted by Pakeha to represent the relationship Māori have to voluntary work. I assumed in the beginning that government was to blame for any oppressive conditions a Māori voluntary organisation operated in. With the assumptions, I entered the research biased and ready to expose the injustice government placed upon and within the environment of Māori voluntary activity. Applying a process of theory and practice I felt I was equipped to validate my assumptions.

The thesis confirmed for me that voluntary work is Pakeha in origin and oppression is a two-way street. It suggested two types of oppression. The first is the oppression of the mind in allowing one to accept that there is no way to change and feeling hopeless and burdened with taking care of the social problems in the community. The second is an oppressive workplace where one works twenty or more hours a week with minimal resources or no reciprocity. The thesis purported that work in an oppressive environment is a condition Māori have had to accept and a concession to hegemony. I argue this mindset has to change.

Development theories, based on liberation rather than assimilation are a way out of oppression and action completes the cycle. This thesis has displayed alternative processes to overcome barriers that impede development for Māori voluntary organisations. An important development process was to endorse consciousness raising. It encouraged the adoption of grass roots practices and endorses implementing the Treaty of Waitangi in a quest for *tinō rangatiratanga* and control over resources and control over decisions. It supports a partnership between government and Māori voluntary organisations. It promotes the establishment of a national organisation to represent and advocate on behalf of Māori voluntary organisations.

In conclusion, the aim of this thesis was to demystify the relationship between voluntary work and Māori communities by bringing forward the voices of the volunteers. It utilised a combination of theory and practice in literature and experiences to interpret what voluntary work meant to Māori. Overall, it focussed on recognising those workers who are not acknowledged for keeping the foundation of New Zealand society stable by providing unpaid services to enhance many communities. This thesis concludes with a *whakataurangi* "*he aha te mea nui o te Ao? He tangata, he tangata*". What is the most important thing in life? It is people, it is people. Value the volunteers and voluntary organisations by not taking their work for granted!



## Glossary

Aroha: love, respect, and sympathy.

Aroha ki te tangata: the love, respect, and sympathy for another person(s)

Aroha ki teetahi ki teetahi: help this person and that person.

Ataarangi: a method of learning the Māori language in groups.

Awhi: assist, help, and support.

Hangi: a Māori feast that is cooked in the ground.

Hapū: the sub tribe or a group of families.

Hariru: an action performed after visitors are welcomed on the *marae*. It involves the home people and visitors entering into an action of friendliness by shaking hands, pressing noses or kissing.

Hokonga: to exchange, barter, buy or sell.

Iho: is referred to as the umbilical cord or centre of a person.

Iwi: the tribe that is made up of many groups of families from a specific tribal area with similar genealogy connections.

Kaituao: a voluntary work for the army.

Kanohi Kitea (Kanohi-ki-te-kanohi): the action of meeting with a person ‘face to face’.

Karakia: a ritual of prayer.

Karanga: to call out to a person(s).

Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata: do not trample over the spirit, prestige, essence of another person.

Kaua e Mahaki: do not flaunt your knowledge.

Kauhanganui: is the open space through a house.

Kaupapa: is a plan. Used in this thesis as an objective that unites people together or a reason for doing something.

Kaumātua: a respected elderly person.

Kawa: the protocols or systems used on a *marae*.

Kawanatanga: the term used to represent the government.

Kia ora: a friendly greeting of hello.

Kia tupato: to be careful.

Kina: a sea urchin.

Kīngitanga: organised body of Māori tribes formed in the late 1800s.

Koha: gift.

Kōhanga *Reo* (Te *Kōhanga Reo*): kindergartens that teach Māori language and customs.

Kōhanga Whānau: a gathering of family groups.

Kororareka: voluntary military army called the Kororareka Association formed in 1834.

Korero: to speak or engage in discussions.

Kotahitanga: the action of unity and a political movement.

Kuia: an elderly women.

Kupapa: Māori loyalist who fought with European against Māori.

Kura *Kaupapa* Māori: a primary and intermediate school that teaches the curriculum in the Māori language.

Mahaki: to be humble and meek.

Maioha: to great affectionately, to welcome.

Mana: means prestige. A person who is respectful of others, intellectual, and acknowledged by to uphold prestige.

Mana whenua: Ownership and control over the land.

Manaaki(tia): to care for others.

Manaakitanga: taking care of others.

Manaaki ki te tangata: taking care of or helping the people.

Manaaki te whānau: taking care of families.

Manuhiri: a visitor (s).

Marae: to exercise hospitality, the open space in from of a meeting house. It was referred to in this thesis as the buildings on land that is owned or used by Māori people to exercise Māori customs.

Matauranga: knowledge, education.

Mihi: to greet people.

Mokopuna: grandchild or grandchildren.

Ngākau: the heart of a person, the seat of affections, feelings, or mind.

Ngākau Pāpaku: humility.

Nga tikanga Māori: to exercise Māori customs.

Noa: to be common.

Pakeha: a person of predominantly European descent.

Pipi: shellfish.

Pito: the navel.

Poha: a concept used by a writer to describe voluntary work. A concept used by Māori to express the action of breaking something open.

Pohiri: to welcome someone or a group.

Pono: having integrity.

Puha: a edible plant.

Putea: money.

Rangatahi: adolescent or teenagers.

Rangatira: a chief.

Rangatiratanga: to exercise chiefly powers and authority.

Reo: the Māori language.

Ropu: a group of people.

Rūnanga: a council of people.

Taha Māori:

Takahia: trample.

Tamariki: children.

Tangata Katoa: all the people.

Tangata Whenua: People of the land.

Tāonga: treasures that are tangible and intangible.

Tapu: holy and sacred.

Tauiwi: European.

Tauutu (tauutuutu): reciprocity.

Teetahi: a definitive pronoun.

Te Ao Māori: the Māori world.

Te Iwi Māori: the Māori tribes.

Te Kōhanga Reo: means the same as Kōhanga Reo.

Te Reo Māori: the Māori language.

Te Rōpu Awhi: The Helpful Organisation and the name of the organisation in the Case Study.

Te Tino Rangatiratanga o te iwi: the sovereignty of the tribe.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi: The foundation document of New Zealand Society signed by Britain and Māori chiefs.

Te Whakata Hou: a Māori research model translated to be ‘The New Model’

Te Whenua Rangatira: a declaration of authority over Māori land.

Tika: what is appropriate, fair, and just.

Tikanga: custom.

Tinana: body.

Tino Rangatiratanga: exclusive rights and sovereignty over Māori possessions.

Titiro: look.

Tohatoha: distribute.

Tohunga: a person of expertise.

Tuao: a voluntary soldier.

Tukutuku: referred to as a Māori design.

Tupuna: ancestors or grandparents.

Turangawaewae: a place to stand.

Wairua: the spirit.

Wananga: university, a meeting of higher learning.

Whakakoha: humbleness.

Whakapapa: genealogy and used to link Māori to tribes, families, land, customs,  
and the sea.

Whakarongo: listen.

Whakatauki: proverb.

Whakawhānaungatanga: engage in a process of sharing information.

Whānau: a family or collection of families related to each other.

Whānau Whānui: wider community.

Whare wananga: university.

### References

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., & Turner, B.S. (1994). *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Penguin Books.
- Agger, B. (1979). *Western Marxism: an introduction. Classical and contemporary sources*. Santa Monica, California, USA: Goodyear Publishing Co.
- Allison, B., O'Sullivan, T., Owen, A., Rice, J., Rothwell, A., & Saunders, C. (1996). *Research skills for students*. London, England: Kogan Page Limited.
- Arotakenga, A. (2000). *Māori providers' views of government funding. Key issues from literature and interviews. Monitoring and evaluation branch*. Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development.
- Australia, S. (1991). Human resource management policies and procedures. In Hillary Commission (Ed.), *Managing organisations. A conference on the relationship between paid and voluntary staff*. Wellington, NZ: Hillary Commission.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Banton, M., & Sills, D.L. (1968). Voluntary associations. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (pp. 357-362). New York, USA: Macmillan Company and the Free Press.
- Barker, P. (1993). *Michel Foucault. Subversions of the subject*. Herfordshire, GB: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Barnett, T. (1996). *Aroha Poha Tikanga: Volunteering in Aotearoa/NZ. Produced for the Community Employment Group of the Department of Labour*. Christchurch, NZ: The group.
- Barret, D. (1999). A Health Promotion Project for Tamariki Māori - Māori Women's Welfare League. In D. Robinson (Ed.), *Social capital in action*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Benjamin, M., Capie, A., & Nossin, M. (1998). *Measuring the quality of community services*. Wellington, NZ: Standards and Monitoring Services

Trust.

- Bevan-Brown, J. (1998). "Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research Development Conference" In Te Pu Manawa (Eds.), *Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference*, Palmerston North, NZ: Te Putahi-a-Toi School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Bishop, R. (1991). *Ko te whakawhanaungatanga tikanga rua*. Unpublished MA thesis. Otago, NZ: University of Otago.
- Bishop, R. (1997). Māori people's concerns about research into their lives. *History of Education Review*, 26.1(1), 25-41.
- Bishop, R. (1998a). Examples of culturally specific research practices; a response to Tillman and Lopez. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(3), 419-434.
- Bishop, R. (1998b). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11 (2), 199-219.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999a). *Culture counts. Changing power relations in education*. Dunedin, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999b). Researching in Māori contexts: an interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 20 (2).
- Blackburn, S. (1994). *The Oxford Dictionary of philosophy*. Oxford, New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Bloom, M., Fischer, J., & Orme, J. G. (1994). *Evaluating practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional*. (Second ed). Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boler, M. (1999). Posing feminist queries to Freire. In Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, politics and pedagogy. Reflection from Aotearoa – New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Bouma, G. (1993). *The research process*. Melbourne, Aus: Oxford University Press.
- Brougham, A. E., Reed, A. W., & Karetu, T. (1999). *The Reed book of Māori proverbs* Auckland, NZ: Reed Books.
- Burke, W. (1994). *Organization Development. A Process of Learning and Changing. Second Edition*. Massachusetts, USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

- Burnes, B. (1992). *Managing Change. A strategic approach to organisational development and renewal*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Capeling-Alakija, S. (2000). *United Nations volunteers. Remarks by Sharon Capeling-Alakija UNV Executive Coordinator. Opening ceremony of the International year of volunteers at the United Nations*. Available: <http://www.unv.org/events/lyr2001/sca2811.htm> [18 July 2001].
- Cheyne, C., O'Brien M., & Belgrave M. (2000). *Social Policy in Aotearoa New Zealand. A critical introduction. Second Edition*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, J. (2000). Speech to the Community & Voluntary Sector Working Party and the Gisborne community. Speech presented at the Lawson Field Theatre on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> October 2000 in Gisborne, New Zealand, at 9.30 am. In G. C. W. Party (Ed.). Gisborne, New Zealand: Gisborne District Council.
- Clayton, J. C. (1990a). *Defence not defiance: the shaping of New Zealand volunteer force. Unpublished thesis*. Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato.
- Clayton, J. C. (1990b). *The New Zealand Army. A history from the 1840's to the 1990's*. Christchurch, NZ: NZ Army.
- Coney, Sandra. (1997). *Into the fire: writings on women, politics and New Zealand in the era of New Right*. North Shore City, N.Z.: Tandem Press.
- Cox, L. (1993). *Kotahitanga. The Search for Māori Political Unity*. London: Zed Books.
- Crampton, P., Woodward, A., & Dowell, A. (2001). The role of the Third Sector in providing primary care services - Theoretical and policy issues. In Ministry of Social Development (Ed.), *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand. Te Puna Whakaaro. Issue Seventeen. December 2001*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Development.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. California, USA: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Cunningham, C. (1998). "A framework for addressing Māori knowledge in research, science and technology". In Te Pu Manawa (Eds.), *Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference*, Palmerston North, NZ: Te Putahi-a-Toi School of Māori Studies, Massey University.

- Cunningham, P. (1993). *Let's get real: A critical look at the practice of adult education*. Journal of Adult Education. Available: <http://nlu.edu/ace/Resources/Documents/Cunningham.html> [22 July 2001].
- Dalziel, P. (1999). 'Third Way' economics: What might this mean in New Zealand? In J. Stilglitz (Ed.), *The new politics a Third Way for New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Printing Company Ltd.
- Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (1999). *Social Science Research in New Zealand, many paths to understanding*. Auckland, NZ: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories. Foucault's methods and historical Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Department of Industry and Commerce. (1967). *The Māori in the New Zealand economy*. Wellington, NZ: Department of Industries and Commerce.
- Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis, a user friendly guide for social scientists*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Donovan, D. (1993). *The economic impacts of community development: A literature review*. Wellington, NZ: Policy Research.
- Durie, A. (1998). *Me tipu ake te pono: Māori research, ethically and development*. Paper presented at the Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference 7-9 July,
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora. Māori health development*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press. Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Durie, M., Ratima, M., Allan, G., Gillies, A., Waldon, J., Morrison, P., & Kingi, T. (1995). *Men For Change Living Without Violence*. Palmerston North: Massey University Department of Maori Studies.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga. The politics of Māori self determination*. Auckland, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiora. Māori health development. Second edition*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora. The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Earp, G.B. (1844). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Statement of Mr George Butler Earp, 11-18 June, 1844, IUP Vol.



XIII, pp. 91-158.

- Eichbaum, C. (1999). The politics and economics of the Third Way. In J. Stilglitz (Ed.), *The new politics of a Third Way for New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ.
- Faubion, J. (1998). *Michel Foucault. Aesthetics, method, and epistemology*. London: Penguin Books
- Feldman, M. (1995). *Strategies for interpreting qualitative data*. USA: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Field, P. A., & Morse, J. M. (1985). *Qualitative approaches to nursing research*. Edinburgh: Chapman & Hall.
- Fillingham, L. A. (1993). *Foucault for beginners*. New York, USA: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc.
- Findsen, B. (1999). Friere and adult education. Principles and practices. In Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, politics and pedagogy. Reflections from Aotearoa - New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Firth, R. (1959). *Economics of the New Zealand Māori*. Reprinted 1973. Wellington, NZ: Government Printer.
- Flatt, J. (1838). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Statement of Mr John Flatt, 3 April, 1838, No. 1, IUP Vol. XXI, pp. 32-48.
- Florence, M. (1998). Foucault. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault aesthetics essential works of Foucault 1954 - 1984*. England: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982a). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus, and Rabinow, P. (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982b). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Martin, L.H. Available: <http://www.thefoucauldian.co.uk/techne.htm> [14 February 2000].
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, USA: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1976). *Education for the practice of freedom*. London: Writers and

Readers Publishing Cooperative.

- Gallin, D. (2000). *Civil society - A contested territory civil in Euro-WEA Seminar on Workers' Education and Civil Society, Budapest, 16-17 June, 2000*. The Global Labour Institute. Available: [http://www.global-labour.org/civil\\_society\\_a\\_contested\\_territory.htm](http://www.global-labour.org/civil_society_a_contested_territory.htm) [22 July 2001].
- Gardiner, W. (1992). A colonial economy rice. In Rice (Ed.), *The Oxford history of New Zealand*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. (2000). *Canterbury Volunteer Center. The value of volunteering*. Available: [http://www.cvc.org.nz/paper\\_valueofvolunteering.htm](http://www.cvc.org.nz/paper_valueofvolunteering.htm) [9 July 2001].
- Geddes and Grosset Limited. (1996). *The Concise English Dictionary*. Victoria, Aus: Geddes and Grosset Limited.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way. The renewal of social democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *The Third Way and its critics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *The Global Third Way debate*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory & resistance in education. A pedagogy for the opposition*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1994). *Between borders, pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Gisborne District Council. (2000). *Gisborne 2000. First to see the light*. Available: <http://www.gisborne2000.org.nz> [24 January 2001].
- Glaser, B.G. (1978). *Advances in the methodology of Grounded Theory*. California, USA: The Sociology Press.
- Glass, R. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher*, 30 (2), 15-25.
- Glensor, P., & Wood, M. (1991). Declaration of Independence. In New Zealand Institute of Valuers (Ed.), *Issues pertaining to the valuation of Māori Land*. Palmerston, NZ: Massey University.
- Hall, G. L. (1991). Current issues in the development of organisations. In Hillary Commission. (Ed.), *Managing organisations. A conference on the*

- relationship between paid and voluntary staff.* Wellington, NZ: Hillary Commission.
- Henare, M. (1991). *Human labour as a commodity - a Māori ethical response.* Paper presented at the proceedings of the Labour, Employment and Work in New Zealand, Wellington, NZ.
- Henare, M. (1995). *Differing perceptions of New Zealand history and sovereignty.* Paper presented at the Seminar: The Treaty of Waitangi and its relevance to contemporary New Zealand politics and society, Department of Political Science, University of Canterbury, 30 October 1995. Wellington, NZ: School of Māori Studies, Victoria University.
- Henare, M. (1997). “Nga tikanga me ngā ritenga o te ao Māori. Standards and foundations of Māori society”, *The April Report, Future Directions*, Volume III, Part One, Associated papers, Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy. Wellington, NZ: Government Printer, pp. 193-210.
- Hillary Commission. (1991). *Managing organisations. A conference on the Relationship between Paid and Voluntary Staff.* Wellington, NZ: Hillary Commission.
- Hindess, B. (1996). *Discourses of Power: from Hobbs to Foucault.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hinds, S. (1838). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Statement of Reverend Samuel Hinds, 3 April, 1838, No. 1, IUP Vol. XXI, pp. 124-146.
- Hoare, Q., & Smith, G.N. (1971). *Antonio Gramsci 1891-1937. Selections from the prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hyden, G. (1980). *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania. Underdevelopment and an uncaptured peasantry.* London: Heinemann.
- Ife, I. (1995). *Community Development. Creating community alternatives, vision, analysis, and practice.* Australia: Addison Wesley.
- Jackson, M. (1998). “Research and colonisation of Māori knowledge”, In Te Pu Manawa (Eds.), *Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference*, Palmerston North, NZ: Te Putahi-a-Toi School of Maori Studies, Massey University.
- James, B. (1977). *The Māori Women's Welfare League: from social movement to*

- voluntary association*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Waikato University, Hamilton.
- Janke, H., & Taiapa, J. (1999). Māori Research. In Davidson and Tolich (Eds.), *Social Science Research in New Zealand, many paths to understanding*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Janmohamed, A. R. (1994). Some implications of Paulo's Friere's border pedagogy. In MacLaren and Giroux (Eds.), *Between borders, pedagogy and the politics of Cultural Studies*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Jenkins, R., & Martin, P. (2001). Tidal waves of change: Divine work with Paulo Freire. In Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, politics and pedagogy. Reflections from Aotearoa - New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Jones, K. (1995). *People and participation in rural areas, a community development approach. A report on relationships between local governments and communities in the United States, United Kingdom and Ireland*. Bay of Plenty, NZ: Western Bay of Plenty District Council.
- Jones, M. (1997). *Reforming New Zealand welfare. International perspectives*. Queensland, Aus: The Centre for Independence Studies Limited.
- Kaplan, A. (1996). *The development practitioner's handbook*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kawharu, H. (1977). *Māori Land Tenure. Studies of a changing institution*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Keelan, J., & Moon, P. (1998). *A review of development theories*. Auckland, NZ: Te Ara Poutama, Faculty of Māori Development, Auckland Institute of Technology.
- Kellner, D. (2001). *Boundaries and borderlines: Reflections on Jean Baudrillard and Critical Theory*. Available: <http://www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/kell2.htm> [11 July 2001].
- Kelsey, J. (1990). *A question of honour? Labour and the Treaty*. Wellington, NZ: Allen & Unwin New Zealand.
- Kelsey, J. (1993). *Rolling back the state. Privatisation of power in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Bridget Williams Book Limited.
- Kelsey, J., & O'Brien, M. (1995). *Setting the record straight. Social Development*

*in Aotearoa/New Zealand. A response to the New Zealand Government's Paper to the Social Development Summit, Copenhagen, March 1995.*

- Khinduka, S. (1987). Community development: Potentials and limitations. In Cox (Ed.), *Strategies of Community Organization: Macro Practice*. Itasca, ILL: P. E. Peacock.
- King, D. S. (1987). *The New Right. Politics, markets and citizenship*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Kunowski, M. (1988). *The first hundred years, Social Welfare in NZ from 1891*. Auckland, NZ: Heinenmann Education.
- Labrum, B. (2000). Persistent needs and expanding desires: Pakeha families and State Welfare in the years of prosperity. In Dalley and Labrum (Eds.), *Fragments. New Zealand social & cultural history*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Laclau, E., & Chantal, M. (1985). *Hegemony & socialist strategy towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Levine, H. (2001). Can a voluntary organisation be a treaty partner? The case of Te Whānau o Waipareira Trust. In Ministry of Social Policy (Ed.), *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand. Te Puna Whakaaro. Issue seventeen. December 2001*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Policy.
- Levine, H., & Henare, M. (1994). Mana Māori Motuhake. Māori self determination. *Pacific Viewpoint*, 35(2), 193-210.
- Lissner, J. (1977). *The politics of altruism. A study of the political behaviour of voluntary development agencies*. Geneva, Switzerland: Lutheran World Federation.
- Loomis, T. (1998). Capacity building course: Key definitions. In class lecture notes, session 2, 11 March 1988, Hamilton, NZ: Development Studies, School of Māori & Pacific Development, University of Waikato.
- Loomis, T. (2000a). *The political economy of indigenous peoples and development*. Hamilton, NZ: Waikato University.
- Loomis, T. (2000b). *Government's role in Māori development. Charting a new direction?* Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato.
- Love, N. (1994). The Hui Taumata and the decade of Māori development in perspective. *Kia Pūmau Tomu*. Proceedings of the Hui Whakapumau:

- Māori Development Conference, 10-11 August 1994. Palmerston North, NZ.
- Lyman, S. M. (1997). *Postmodernism and a sociology of the absurd. And other essays on the "Nouvelle Vague" in American Social Science*. Arkansas, USA: The University of Arkansas Press.
- Mackey, J. (1999). *The Labour government and voluntary social service organisations. A proposed agreement*. Gisborne, NZ: East Coast Electorate Office.
- MacLeod, F. (1992). *Motivating and managing today's volunteers. How to build and lead a terrific team*. Canada: International Self-Counsel Press Limited.
- Makins, M. (1992). *Collins English Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Collins Publishers.
- Marshall, G. (1998). *A dictionary of sociology*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Marsden, M., & Henare, T. A. (1992). *Kaitiakitanga. A definitive introduction to the holistic worldview of the Māori. Hand out for MM3B – Te Wānanga o Raukawa Bachelor of Mataūranga*. Otaki, NZ: Te Wānanga o Raukawa.
- Mayo, P. (1999). *Gramsci, Freire and adult education. Possibilities for transformative action*. London: Zed Books.
- McHugh, P. G. (1983). *Māori Land Laws of New Zealand*. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Native Law Centre.
- McKinlay, P. (1999). *Public ownership and the community*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Mead, L. T. (1996). *Ngā aho tekakahu mātauranga: The multiple layers of struggle by Māori in Education*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University.
- Metge, J. (1995). *New Growth from Old. The Whānau in the Modern World*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Mikaere, A. (2000). *Māori and Self-Determination in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato.
- Miles, M. B., & Hubberman, M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. USA: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Millar, S. (2000). *Managing Human Resources in New Zealand. Second Edition*. Auckland, NZ: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.

- Ministry of Social Policy. (1987). *A fair and just society: a guide to the terms of reference of the Royal Commission of Social Policy*. Wellington, NZ: NZ Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Ministry of Social Policy. (2000). *Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party*. Ministry of Social Policy. Available: [http://www.msp.govt.nz/comms/CommAndVolSecWG\\_mem.htm](http://www.msp.govt.nz/comms/CommAndVolSecWG_mem.htm) [1 December 2001].
- Ministry of Social Policy. (2001a). *2001 Social Report. Te purongo oranga tangata 2001*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Social Policy.
- Ministry of Social Policy. (2001b). *Communities and Government. Potential for partnership. Summary Report of the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party. April 2001*. Wellington, NZ: The Ministry of Social Policy.
- Montefiore, J. B. (1838). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Statement of Mr J. B. Montefiore Esq, 3 April, 1838, No. 1, IUP Vol. XXI, pp. 12-32.
- Morse, J. (1994). Dialogue: more on theory. Emerging from the data: the cognitive processes of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In J. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. California, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mulgan, R. (1989). *Māori pakeha and democracy*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, J., & Thomas, B. (2000). Partnerships between business and the community. In D. Robinson (Ed.), *Partnership - From theory to practice*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University Wellington.
- Nabalarua, E. (2001). Creating community-based systems of good governance at grassroots level: A case of organisational strengthening and capacity building among indigenous women in Tailevu Province, Fiji. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 2(February), 50-66.
- National Committee on Marae Subsidies. (1974). *Report of Committee on Marae subsidies to Honourable Matiu Rata*. Wellington, NZ: Government Printer.
- New Zealand Government. (1854). *Statutes of New Zealand, 1854, No.6, The Waste Lands Act*. Section 1, pp.10-11.
- Ngata, H. M. (1993). *English-Māori Dictionary*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of

## Education.

- North Shore Council. (1995). *Community Development. What is it?* Auckland, NZ: North Shore Council of Community and Social Services Inc.
- NZ Committee on *Marae* Subsidies. (1974). *Report of Committee on Maraе subsidies to Honourable Matiu Rata*. Wellington, NZ: Government Printer.
- NZ Federation of Voluntary Organisations and Voluntary Welfare Agencies Training Board. (1987). *Report of a seminar on biculturalism and voluntary agencies held on 10 April 1987 for policy makers*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Organisations.
- NZ Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1987). *A fair and just society: a guide to the terms of reference of the Royal Commission of Social Policy*. Wellington, NZ: NZ Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, NZ: Allen & Unwin, Port Nicholson Press with assistance from the Historical Publications Branch Department of Internal Affairs.
- Paradise Press Inc. (1997). *New Webster Dictionary and Roget's Thesaurus. Abridged Edition. Two books in one*. Florida, USA: Paradise Press Inc.
- Parata, H. (1995). Māori sovereignty. The Māori perspective. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Māori sovereignty. The Māori perspective*. Auckland, NZ.: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Parata, H. (1996). *Treaty implications for Crown information, collection, dissemination and ownership*. Paper presented at the Māori users of Statistics Conference 20-21 November 1996, Hamilton, NZ.
- Patterson, J. (2000). *People of the land. A Pacific philosophy*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. California, USA: Newbury Park, Sage Publications.
- Pearson, P., Tierney, R., Gallagher, M., & Crismore, A. (1988). The Metcalf Project: A teacher-researcher collaboration. In S. Samuel and P. Pearson (Eds.), *Changing school reading programs. Principles and case studies*. Newark, USA: International Reading Association.
- Pearson, P., Taylor, B., Peterson, D., & Rodriguez, M. (2002). *The CIERA School Change Project: Supporting schools as they implement home-grown*



- reading reform*. Michigan, USA: Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, University of Michigan – Ann Arbor.
- Peters, M. (1999). Freire and postmodernism. In Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, Politics and Pedagogy. Reflections from Aotearoa - New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Pihama, L. (1993). *Tungia te ururua, Kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke: A critical analysis of parents as first teachers*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Poata-Smith, E. (1996). The evolution of contemporary protest. In P. Spoonley, Pearson, D., & Macpherson, C. (Ed.), *Ngā patai. Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Printing Company Ltd.
- Poulin, B., & Tahī, B. (1991). *A Study of Community Services and Development for Ruatahuna*. Hamilton, NZ: Management Development Centre, University of Waikato.
- Poulsen, M. F., & Johnston, R. J. (1973). Patterns of Māori migration. In R. J. Johnston (Ed.), *Urbanisation in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Reed Education Division of A. H. & A. W. Reed Ltd.
- Preston, P. W. (1996). *Development theory. An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Project Waitangi. (1989). *The Treaty of Waitangi: questions and answers: a resource kit for Pakeha*. Wellington, NZ: Project Waitangi.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work. Civic traditions in Modern Italy*. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Ray, L. (1993). *Rethinking critical theory. Emancipation in the age of global social movements*. London: Sage Publications Limited.
- Riley, M. (1990). *Māori sayings and proverbs*. Paraparaumu, NZ: Viking Sevenses N.Z. Ltd.
- Rist, G. (1997). *The history of development from Western origins to global faith*. London: Zed Books.
- Ritchie, J. (1977). *One nation or two. Māori and Pakeha in contemporary New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Price Milburn and Company Limited.
- Ritchie, J. (1984). *Working in the Māori world*. Unpublished paper. Hamilton,

- NZ: Centre for Māori Studies and Research.
- Ritchie, J. (1985). *Wāhi, a case study: social and economic development in a New Zealand Māori community*. Hamilton, NZ: Centre for Māori Studies and Research.
- Ritchie, J. (1992). *A report to the Waipa District Council*. Hamilton, NZ: Centre for Māori Studies and Research.
- Ritchie, J., & Nuttall, P. (1995). *Māori participation in the Resource Management Act. An Analysis of provisions made for Māori participation in regional statements and district plans produced under the Resource Management Act 1991*. Hamilton, NZ: Centre for Māori Studies and Research and the Tainui Trust Board.
- Rivera, F., & Erlich, R. (1998). *Community organizing in a diverse society. Third Edition*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, D., and Williams, T. (2001). Social capital and voluntary activity: Giving and sharing in Māori and non-Māori society. In Ministry of Social Policy. (Ed.), *Social policy journal of New Zealand. Te Puna whakaaro. Issue seventeen, December 2001*. Wellington, NZ.
- Robinson, W. (1996). *Promoting polyarchy. Globalization US intervention and hegemony*. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Rosengarten, F. (2001). *Sociology at Hewett. An introduction to Gramsci's life and thought*. Available: [http://www. Hewett.norfolk.schuk/curric/soc/Gramsci/gramsci.htm](http://www.Hewett.norfolk.schuk/curric/soc/Gramsci/gramsci.htm). [9 May 2001].
- Rowland, R. T. (1973). Māoris and Pacific Islanders in Auckland. In R. J. Johnston (Ed.), *Urbanisation in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Reed Education.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (1997). *Research methods for social work. Third Edition. USA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company*.
- Ryan, T. (1994). *PM Ryan's Dictionary of Modern Māori*. Auckland, NZ: Heinemann.
- Ryan, T. (1996). Use of Tribal Registers. In L. Cook (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Māori users of statistics conference*. Hamilton, NZ: Statistics New Zealand. Te Tari Tatau.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Vintage Books.

- Salmond, A. (1975). *Hui*. Wellington, NZ: Reed Books.
- Savage, J. (1807). *Some Account of New Zealand*. Otago, NZ: Hocken Library in 1966 University of Otago.
- School of Māori and Pacific Development. (1998). *Students Handbook*. Hamilton, NZ: Development Studies Department, Waikato University.
- Selby, R. (1996). *Māori and the Social Services. An annotated bibliography*. Palmerston North, NZ: Massey University.
- Sharp, A., & McHugh, P. (2001). *Histories power and loss. Uses of the past - A New Zealand commentary*. Wellington, NZ: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sheehan, M. (1989). *Māori and Pakeha race relations 1912 – 1980*. Auckland, NZ: MacMillan New Zealand.
- Shirley, I. (1979). *Planning for Community*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Simpson, P. (1993). Commentary on David Robinson's paper. In G. Hawke, & Robinson, D (Ed.), *Performance without profit: the voluntary welfare sector in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Ski Australia. (1991). Human resource management policies and procedures. In H. commission (Ed.), *Managing organisations. A conference on the relationship between paid and voluntary staff*. Wellington, NZ: Hillary Commission.
- Smart, B. (1983). *Foucault, Marxism and critique*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.
- Smith, G. (1990). *Research issues related to Māori education. Paper presented at NZARE special interest conference*. Auckland, NZ: University of Auckland, RUME.
- Smith, G. (1992). *Tane-nui-a-Rangi's legacy. Paper presented at NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Deaken University, Australia*. Auckland, NZ: University of Auckland, RUME.
- Smith, G. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori: theory and praxis*. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Auckland.
- Smith, G. (1999). Paulo Freire: Lessons in Transformative Praxis. In Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, Politics and Pedagogy. Reflections from Aotearoa -*

- New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Smith, J. D. (1999). *Volunteer research and policy. Volunteering and social development. A background paper for discussion at an Expert Group Meeting. New York, November 29-30, 1999.* Available: [http://www.iyv.org/iyv\\_eng/research/soc\\_dev/soc\\_doc.htm](http://www.iyv.org/iyv_eng/research/soc_dev/soc_doc.htm) [7 May 2001].
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies. Research and indigenous people*. London: Zed Books.
- Smithies, R. (2001). *Volunteering in New Zealand: A data review*. Wellington, NZ: Research Unit, Ministry of Social Policy.
- Spellerberg, A. (2001). *Framework for the measurement of social capital in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Statistics New Zealand, Te Tari Tatau.
- Spoonley, P. (1996). Mahi Awatea? The racialisation of work in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, Pearson, D., & Macpherson, C. (Ed.), *Ngā Patai. Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press Ltd.
- Statistics New Zealand. (1998). *1996 Census of Population and Dwellings*. Wellington, NZ: Statistics New Zealand.
- Statistics New Zealand. (1998). *A guide to a good survey design*. Wellington, NZ: Statistics New Zealand.
- Steven, R. (1989). Land and white settler colonialism: The case of Aotearoa. In Novitz and Willmott (Eds.), *Cultural identity in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: GP Books.
- Stewart. (1999). *Business applications of repertory grid. Chapter 6. Analysis of grid data*. Available: <http://www.enquirewithin.co.nz/busChap6.htm#Manual> [9 May 1999].
- Stewart-Weeks, M. (1991). To appoint or not to appoint: the people decisions. In H. Commission (Ed.), *Managing organisations. A conference on the relationship between paid and voluntary staff*. Wellington, NZ: Hillary Commission.
- Stokes, E. (1978). *Ngā Tumanako National Conferences of Māori Committees, Turangawaewae marae 18-20 August 1978*. Hamilton, NZ: Centre for Māori Studies and Research.
- Stokes, E. (1985). *Māori research and development. A discussion paper by*

- Evelyn Stokes, University of Waikato, for the Social Sciences Committee of the National Research Advisory Council.* (Māori Research and Development). Wellington, NZ: National Research Advisory Council.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientist.* Cambridge: Press Syndicate for the University of Cambridge.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice.* London: SAGE Publications; Thousand Oaks.
- Strinati, D. (1995). *An introduction to theories of Popular Culture.* London: Routledge.
- Tamihere, J. (1995). Māori sovereignty. The Māori perspective. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Māori Sovereignty. The Māori Perspective.* Auckland, NZ: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Tauroa, H., & Tauroa, P. (1993). *Marae.* Auckland, NZ: Reed.
- Taylor, J. (1992). *Rethinking the theory of organizational communication: How to read an organization.* New Jersey, USA: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *He tikanga whakaaro: research ethics in the Māori community, a discussion paper.* Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Māori Affairs.
- Te Momo, O. (2000). Notes taken researching *Te Rōpu Awhi.*
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (1996). *Ministry of Māori Development. Post election brief October 1996.* Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (1998). *Progress towards closing social and economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori.* Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (1999). *A Review of the Māori communities Act.* Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2000). *Māori in the New Zealand economy. Second Edition.* Wellington, NZ: Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Rōpu Awhi. (2000). *Notes from Te Rōpu Awhi correspondence.* Gisborne, NZ: Te Rōpu Awhi.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. (1996). *Te Matatiki, contemporary Māori words.* Māori Language Commission. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research analysis: analysis types and software tools.* New York, USA: Falmer.

- The Māori Perspective Advisory Committee. (1986). *Puao-Te-Atatu. (Day Break). The report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare.* Wellington, NZ: Ministerial Advisory Committee.
- The Treasury. (2001). *Towards an inclusive economy. July 2001.* Wellington, NZ: The Treasury.
- Thompson, B. (1996). *Community organisations grants scheme 1994/95, monitoring applications for COGS grants.* Wellington, NZ: Policy Research, Department of Internal Affairs.
- Thomson. (1998). *A world without Welfare, New Zealand Colonial experiment.* Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Thorns, D., & Sedgwick, C. (1997). *Understanding Aotearoa/New Zealand: Historical statistics.* Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press Limited.
- Todaro, M. (1997). *Economic development, sixth edition.* US: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Torjman, S. (2000). Partnership: building block for a caring society. In D. Robinson (Ed.), *Partnerships - from theory to practice.* Wellington: NZ: Institute of Social Policy, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Torres, C. A. (1992). *The Church, society, and hegemony.* Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1997). *General guidelines for Capacity Building Assessment and development to support the development and implementation of National Programme Frameworks.* United Nations Development Programme. Available: <http://magnet.undp.org/cdrb/GENGUID.htm> [1 November 1997].
- Viceministry of Indigenous Affairs and First Peoples (VAIPO). (2000). *VAIPO Polic, Bolivia.* Available: <http://www.rds.org.bo/mcpio/vaipo/vaipoinfow2eng.htm> [9 August 2001].
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whaiwhai tonu matou. Struggle without end.* Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books.
- Walker, R. (1996). *Ngā Pepa a Ranginui. The Walker Papers.* Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books.
- Walsh, P. (1994). *Trade unions, work & society. The centenary of the arbitration*

*system*. Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press Ltd.

- Walters, W. (1995). Māori sovereignty. The Māori perspective. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Māori Sovereignty. The Māori Perspective*. Auckland, NZ: Hodder Moa Beckett Publishers Limited.
- Ward, A. (1997). Righting the wrongs. *Sunday Star Times*. 11 May.
- Watkins, J. (1838). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Statement of Mr John Watkins, 3 April, 1838, No. 1; IUP Vol. XXI, pp. 12-32.
- Webster, S. (1998). *Patrons of Māori culture. Power, theory and ideology in the Māori Renaissance*. Dunedin, NZ: Otago University Print.
- Weitzman, E., & Miles, M. B. (1995). *A Software Sourcebook. Computer programs for qualitative data analysis*. California, USA: Sage Publication Inc.
- Whitmore, G. S. (1864). *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers 1862-1864. Colonies: New Zealand (GBPP)*, Whitmore, 26 April 1864.
- Williams, M. (1992). *A Dictionary of the Māori Language*. Wellington, NZ: Crown Copyright Reserved.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, A. (2000). New Models of governance in Ireland: the European Union and the involvement of the voluntary and community sector in multi-level development partnerships in 1990s. In D. Robinson (Ed.), *Partnership - From Practice to Theory*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Wilson, C. (2001). *The changing face of social service volunteering: A literature review*. Wellington, NZ: Research Unit, Knowledge Management Group, Ministry of Social Development.
- Witten-Hannah, S. (1999). Social capital, community initiatives and local government. In D. Robinson (Ed.), *Social Capital*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: description, analysis, and interpretation*. California, USA: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Woods, M. (1998). *Volunteers: a guide for volunteers and their organisations*. Christchurch, NZ: Hazard Press.

- World Bank. (1992). *World development report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Uncat 250.
- Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Between states and markets. The voluntary sector in comparative perspective*. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Yates, J. (1978). *Profile of the community: a survey of the Orakei, Mission Bay Kohimarama Suburbs, Auckland*. Auckland, NZ: Orakei-Kohimarama Community Committee.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: design and methods*. California, USA: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.



**Conversation Sheet**

Code of Participant:

Date of Meeting:

Gender: Male Age:

Time of Meeting:

- 1) What brought you to this organisation and why do you volunteer?
- 2) What does words like social, economic and politics mean to you a voluntary worker this organisation?
- 3) What is your role in this organisation? Does your role require you to think about social, political or economic issues?
- 4) What type of skills (or life experience) do you possess?
- 5) What type of training is needed to work in this organisation?
- 6) Do you have access to support for training or increasing your skills? And if you did would you take advantage of training if the opportunity arose?
- 7) What is needed to make the environment you work in better (socially, economically, and politically)?
- 8) Are you on a social welfare benefit that allows you to work voluntary for the organisation?
- 9) How many hours do you volunteer on average a week and are you happy with the amount of hours you volunteer?
- 10) What do you think is a fair number of hours you should volunteer a week?
- 11) What makes you volunteer a high number of hours per week that you would not normally do?
- 12) If you were to volunteer a high number of hours do you think you are entitled to some type of compensation?  
If your answer is yes, then what type of compensation would you like?
- 13) How do you deal with working long hours?
- 14) Do you bring to work any Māori customs and apply it in this organisation (for example open with a karakia before meetings)?  
If you apply Māori customs in this organisation why do you do it? Is it for political or social reasons?
- 15) How does every one work together and keep under control?
- 16) How does the organisation deal with internal conflicts?

- 17) What do you think is needed to strengthen the organisation you work in?
- 18) Have you volunteered for any other organisation? Did that organisation look at social, political and economic issues concerning volunteers?  
What was your voluntary duty in the other organisation?
- 19) How do you define Māori voluntary work?
- 20) What is positive and negative about working as a Māori voluntary worker?
- 21) Are you pressured from outsiders (agencies or other people) about the service you or the organisation provides?
- 22) What kind of support would you like from Māori communities to help you provide a better service?
- 23) What kind of support would you like from the Gisborne community to help you provide a better service?
- 24) What kind of support would you like from the Government to help you provide a better service?
- 25) What kind of support do you or the organisation get from Māori communities?
- 26) What kind of support do you or the organisation get from the Gisborne community?
- 28) What kind of support do you or the organisation get from the Government?
- 28) What kind of support do you or the organisation get from other agencies?
- 29) Do you know of any policies that affect you as a Māori voluntary worker?
- 30) What do you think researchers should research in Māori voluntary organisations?
- 31) How does Māori voluntary work contribute to the development of Māori communities?
- 32) Do you think voluntary work is given the recognition it deserves?  
If your answer is no why? What can be done to give recognition to a Māori voluntary worker?
- 33) What type of future do you see for a voluntary worker?
- 34) Would you like to make any further comments?

## **Research Information Sheet**

### **The University of Waikato**

School of Māori and Pacific Development Human Ethics Committee

General Notes:            Use clear and simple language  
                                  Technical terms should be avoided where possible  
                                  Each participant should retain a copy of the information  
                                  sheet

Who is the researcher (s)?

The researcher is:        Oliver Helena Fiona Te Momo  
                                  Commonly called Fiona Te Momo

Where I can be contacted:

Personal Details

What is the study about?

The study is about Māori voluntary work and how it contributes to the development of Māori communities.

What will the participants have to do and how long will it take?

The participants will be asked to participate in a conversation of questions and answer where the participants will be asked about thirty questions and the researcher will write down the answers. The participation should not take any longer than an hour and a half with a minimum of time to be fifty minutes depending on responses.

What does the researcher expect the major outcomes from the research will be (e.g. publications, dissertations)?

The researcher expects to complete a doctoral thesis.

What will happen to the information collected?

The researcher will process the information and the results will be written in to the researchers doctoral thesis. The names of participants will not be recorded instead a code like W1 for worker one will be recorded in meetings and conversations. When the doctoral thesis is completed the information collected will be destroyed.

What degrees and kinds of confidentiality and anonymity will be required for this research?

The names of participants will not be recorded to protect their anonymity. All information collected during conversation or meetings will **only be viewed by the researcher** and remain strictly confidential.

**Declaration to Participants:**

Individuals will not be identified in any publication/dissemination of the research findings without their explicit consent.

If you take part in the study you have the right to among other things:

- Refuse to answer any question, and to withdraw from the study at any time.
- Ask any further questions about the study that occurs to you during your participation.
- Be given access to a summary of the findings from the study, when it is concluded.

**Researchers Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Participation Consent Form**

**School of Māori and Pacific Development Human Ethics Committee**

Project Title: **Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities.**

Consent Form

I have read the Information Sheet for this study and have had details of the study explained to me. My questions about this study have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I also understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, or to decline to answer any particular questions in the study. I agree to provide information to the researcher under the conditions of confidentiality set out on the information sheet.

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

Participant Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: Each participant must be supplied with a copy of their completed consent forms.

**Interview Schedule/Conversation Sheet**

Code of Participant:

Date of Meeting:

Gender:

Age:

Time of Meeting:

Participant role in organisation:

Type of Organisation:

Type of Legal Structure (e.g. Charitable Trust):

*Iwi* Affiliation (s):

Type of programmes delivered by the organisation:

**A: Māori Voluntary Organisations**

- 1) Why do you work in this organisation?
- 2) How do you recruit volunteers?
- 3) Why do volunteers work in this organisation?
- 4) Are volunteers employed to fulfil services that are not funded by government?
- 5) What are your thoughts on how the government treats volunteers in general?
- 6) What type of working conditions does a volunteer encounter? (For example: Do they work long hours? Do they have to provide their own transport)
- 7) How do you define or describe a Māori voluntary organisation?
- 8) What *kaupapa* should a Māori voluntary organisation follow?
- 9) Does this organisation have a policy about voluntary services?  
If yes what does it contain?
- 10) What kind of relationship does this organisation have with government?
- 11) What type of consultation process exists between this organisation and other agencies such as local government, churches, *iwi* representatives funding agencies?
- 12) Does the government/local council/*iwi* representatives provide funds to this organisation for the services of voluntary workers?

If yes, who provides the funding and what type of funding is provided?

**B: Māori volunteers**

- 13) What words would you use to define and describe the characteristics of a Māori voluntary worker?
- 14) How many Māori volunteer work in this organisation?  
How many are under 45 years of age?  
How many are over 45 years of age?
- 15) What service does a voluntary worker provide?
- 16) How many hours does a volunteer work on average per week?
- 17) How does voluntary work contribute to the organisation?
- 18) Do volunteers volunteer as a stepping stone to paid work?
- 19) What is the turn over rate for volunteers?
- 20) How long do volunteers stay?
- 21) Are there any social, political or economic reasons for having voluntary workers?  
If yes, please comment?

**C: Volunteer Resource Development**

- 22) Do the voluntary workers have access to up skill themselves and support when necessary? If yes please comment?
- 23) Do the volunteer receive any type of compensation for services like petrol vouchers?
- 24) What type of support is necessary to make sure a voluntary worker is able to perform his or her duties?
- 25) How are volunteers monitored?
- 26) What future do you see for Māori voluntary workers?

**D: Closing Comments**

- 27) Does this organisation apply any type of Māori *tikanga*?  
If yes can you describe the *tikanga* that is applied?

- 28) Volunteers have expressed that they are lower than paid workers because they are not paid and Pakeha volunteers received more benefits than a Māori volunteer. What is your response to this expression?
- 29) Does your organisation have any Treaty of Waitangi Policies?  
If your answer is yes could you describe the policies?
- 30) What does the Treaty of Waitangi mean to your organisation?
- 31) Did your organisation access any capacity building funding?  
If your answer is yes could you describe how capacity building fund helped the organisation?
- 32) What are some ways to develop your organisation?
- 33) Do you think volunteers contribute to the community and Māori development?
- 34) Would you like to make any further comments about Māori volunteers?



**Research Information Sheet**

Kia ora Koutou,

My name is Fiona Te Momo and this is an information sheet for participants in my research. I live at (personal details and contact number).

My research study is about Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities. For the past two years I have been interviewing Māori voluntary workers for their perspective on what voluntary work means to them.

The participants in this research are required to answer 30 questions. I write down the answers and the process takes about an hour. I do not record the name of the participant or organisation instead I code each questionnaire. I code them in order such as O1-for organisation one, O2-for organisation two, until I interview ten participants representing an organisation.

I will use this information on the questionnaire in my thesis for a doctorate of philosophy. Only I view the information that is collected. When the thesis marked the information is destroyed. By coding the questionnaire the confidentiality and anonymity is protected.

**Declaration to Participants:**

Individuals will not be identified in any publication/dissemination of the research findings without their explicit consent.

If you take part in the study you have the right to among other things:

- Refuse to answer any particular question, and to withdraw from the study at any time.
- Ask any further questions about the study that occurs to you during your participation.
- Be given access to a summary of the findings from the study when it is concluded.

**Researcher's Name:** .....

**Researcher's Signature:** .....

**Contact details:** .....  
.....

**Date:**    /    /

**Participation Consent Form**

Research Project Title: Māori voluntary work in the development of Māori communities.

1. I have read the Information Sheet for this study and have had details of the study explained to me.
2. My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.
3. I also understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time or decline to answer any particular questions in the study.
4. I agree to provide information to the researcher under the conditions of confidentiality set out on the information sheet.
5. I wish to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

**Informant's Name:** .....

**Informant's Signature:** .....

**Date:** / /

**Researcher's Name:** .....

**Researcher's Signature:**.....

**Contact details:** .....