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Abstract

There are a range of interventions and programmes to address the on-going issue of Māori homelessness. This thesis explores a gardening project hosted by a Ngāti Whātua marae (communal complex used for everyday Māori life) in Auckland for homeless Māori men. The garden project facilitates a sense of belonging, dignity, purpose, meaning and connectedness with other Māori people. It provides insights into how culturally-patterned relationships are centrally important to resolving the overrepresentation of indigenous peoples’ in homelessness populations. I employ the use of semi-structured interviews, reflective journaling, and photography as techniques to record and document the daily interactions in the marae gardens. Participants came from three distinct groups, which include: homeless Māori men, the Auckland City Mission, and Ngāti Whātua o Orakei. A total of eight participants were formally interviewed, along with another six who engaged in casual conversations, in this research, with ages ranged from 30 to 70 years of age. Key findings from this research relate to the construction and preservation of Māori identity while in a state of homelessness, the functioning of marae as spaces of care that foster the wellbeing of Māori, and the role of food in the reproduction of Māori cultural values in everyday life. The broader significance of my work is to use indigenous concepts to build an understanding of the activities, needs and relationships of homeless Māori men that they can recognise themselves from.
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Preface

Between October 2012 and April 2013, I spent two days a week in the Auckland City Mission (ACM) garden at Orakei marae, Takaparawhau, hosted by Ngāti Whātua (local iwi / tribe who have been maintaining these tribal lands for centuries). During this time, I came to know the people there through the everyday activity of gardening. At first, my fieldwork primarily consisted of digging holes, clearing weeds, and planting vegetables. This was all part of the bonding process that allowed me to familiarise myself with the people there and for the people of the marae to know who I was. I also had to recognise that particular marae as a significant historical site. During the 1970's, Takaparawhau (also known as Bastion Point) was the site of mass Māori protest where the last of Ngāti Whātua’s land was occupied under threat of government confiscation. As a people who understand the feeling of being homeless, the gardening project shows how Ngāti Whātua manaaki (to care for others) people facing street homelessness so that they may share in a sense of place and belonging that is central to the marae.

The marae gardening project has its early beginnings in the ACM’s desire to maintain an on-going and meaningful relationship with Ngāti Whātua. The ACM is a social service organisation located in central Auckland and their mission is to serve people who have been marginalised through states of poverty, ill health, addiction and/or trauma. Through community planting days held at the marae, a number of homeless people (referred to as Streeties) became heavily involved with the marae through the ACM, as the ACM have a strong presence on the streets of Auckland, particularly with the homeless. The Streeties expressed a strong desire to make these planting days a more regular event. Developed by the ACM, Ngāti Whātua, and the Streeties themselves, there is now a space at the marae for the Streeties to escape street life for a while, and engage in everyday gardening and other cultural practices on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

My thesis contributes to the larger “Aue ha! Māori men’s relational health” project, which addresses a crucial gap in research around the everyday lives and positive relationships of Māori men. The broader project explores supportive relationships and positive social interactions among
three diverse groups of Māori men: those engaged in traditional practices in their home settings (Ngati Maniapoto Kaumātua / respected male elder); those who have migrated to an urban centre and who work to maintain links back home (Tūhoe ki Waikato); and those who are experiencing street homelessness (Pani me te rawakore). My thesis directly contributes to the third objective, Pani me te rawakore: Street homelessness.

My research is born out of a need to addressed gaps in the literature in both Māori men’s health and Māori homelessness. I place particular emphasis on three areas: 1) identity as an emplaced, relational, on-going process that is dynamic and fluid within a world constantly at change. As homelessness is a direct threat to the self, and the self is anchored to places and cultural traditions, the marae becomes more than just a place to be situated within; it is a place where Māori identity and sense of self can be preserved. 2) I consider place as an important aspect of health and homelessness that is created and traversed by social actors that can either create spaces of care, or perpetuate spaces of despair. In the context of the marae gardens, I conceptualise this space as a space of care that aids in the preservation of health and well-being for the homeless Māori men who take part. 3) Most importantly, because my research is set within the context of indigenous / Māori psychology, my approach is informed by traditional Māori knowledge, concepts, values and philosophies. This is done as a way of bringing Māori knowledge to the forefront within the discipline of psychology that is dominated by Western assumptions and cultural norms that reflect a legacy of colonialism.

I being this work with an exploration of the existing literature on colonisation, Māori homelessness, the construction of identity, and the role of communal gardens to contextualise and provide background to the importance of my research (chapter one). From there, I move on to describe the ways in which the research team and I conducted this research, making a particular point about the significance of the site of my research as a socio-cultural place that has endured through colonial practices (chapter two). Chapter three presents the key findings and analysis of my research. My analysis draws upon casual conversations, formal interviews, personal
reflections and photographs that the research team and I produced from our time spent in the marae gardens. Key findings are then discussed in chapter four where I explore the broader significance of this research and present concluding remarks to provide some closure to this thesis.
Chapter One: Introduction

Through processes of colonisation and economic exclusion, many Māori have experienced displacement and homelessness. Familial and community bonds and relationships have been disrupted as a result of structural upheavals. The present research explores the gardening practices of a group of homeless Māori on an urban marae. This focus provides a means of shedding new light on the reproduction of healthy relationships and ways of 'being' Māori through the emplaced day-to-day practices that gardening on the marae provides. As a socio-cultural space, the marae represents a familiar space for these men on many levels. It is a space in which past lives once embedded in traditional Māori communities are 're-membered' by homeless men displaced from their communities of origin.

This chapter presents a review of the literature that sets the scene for the research. I begin by exploring the impacts of colonisation on dislocating Māori from traditional homelands and cultured ways of being, and the production of psychological knowledge as a cultural and political act set within a historical context. I then examine the notion of homelessness, conceptualised as a complex socio-economic phenomena and a key determinant of health. I then present a critical review of philosophical and social science theories of identity. The final sections examine the role and benefits of community garden projects, and provides an overview of traditional Māori gardening practices.

Colonisation and epistemological violence

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, New Zealand underwent dramatic change with the increase settlement of European settlers to these shores. At first, social relations between Māori and Pākehā (non-Māori) were positive, as trade between both Māori and Pākehā were mutually beneficial (Belich, 1988). In 1840, Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) was signed as an agreement between a collection of Māori chiefs and the Crown. This agreement held that Māori maintain their rangatiratanga (sovereignty) over all of their lands, resources, and taonga (anything to have great value within the Māori world), and the Crown given the position of kāwanatanga.
Over time, this agreement became viewed in the eyes of the Crown as a ‘simple nullity’ that opened the door to the illegal acquisition of Māori land and resources. Crown and European commercial enterprises began to exploit the natural resources of the country, setting up permanent settlements, and spreading the new religious faith of Christianity (Orange, 1987). Massive amounts of land were acquired by the growing settler society by means of purchase and illegal confiscation (Consedine, 2007). New Zealand was viewed as a new, undeveloped land that colonisers believed they were entitled to occupy and capitalise upon (Nikora, 2007).

Figure 1 depicts the loss of Māori land between the years of 1860 and 1939.


During the 1860’s, Māori were still in control of most of their land, see figure 1, 1860. With the passing of legislation, such as the New Zealand Settlement Bill and Suppression of Rebellion Bill, millions of acres of Māori land were confiscated as a form of punishment for Māori resistance, both physical and political resistance, to absolute Crown rule (Orange, 1987; Sinclair, 1992a).
The resistance of Māori to colonial rule sought to maintain the rangatiratanga (sovereignty) Māori were assured would be protected under Te Tiriti (Orange, 1987). Lands that were purchased from Māori by the Crown by way of pre-emption saw Māori land being bought at a fraction of its real value that was then sold to private owners at a great profit (Sinclair, 1992b). Over time, these colonial practices of acquiring land continued, which turned Māori from majority landholders, into small, scattered communities (see 1939 in figure 1).

Colonial practices not only dispossess Māori of land and access to natural resources, but also proved detrimental to the Māori culture, language, identity, economic development, and a unique way of life (Jackson, 1992). Māori were systematically excluded from benefiting from the wealth that was being generated from New Zealand's natural resources. Many Māori were forced to move into paid employment within settler society, away from traditional homelands and cultural supports, which contributed to the state of poverty Māori face today (Cram, 2011). This socio-economic deprivation resulting from colonial practices has been linked with the over-representation of Māori in family violence (Koziol-McLain, Rameka, Giddings, Fyfe, & Gardiner, 2007; Robertson & Oulton, 2008), shifts away from traditional Māori concepts of family (Cooper & Wharewera-Mika, 2011), higher rates of indigenous imprisonment (Webb, 2011), and reduced life expectancy and increased risk of disease (Nikora, Hodgetts, Groot, Stolte, Chamberlain, 2012).

An important question at this point is how does all this relate to an ‘objective’ science such as psychology that is often fixated on the present and naïve to its own role in the perpetuation of colonial practices (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). In addition to the acquisition of land, processes of colonisation are also prominent within the practice of producing knowledge. Because of this, I find it crucial to offer a critique of knowledge as a product of a particular cultural tradition that is then imposed upon Māori, which do not necessarily relate to lived experiences of Māori. By reflecting on the colonial processes that have shaped contemporary New Zealand reveals the dominant discourses used in the production of contemporary knowledge.
Nikora (2007) points out that there is a tendency for countries with lower capacities to produce knowledge, such as New Zealand, to import knowledge from countries that have a greater capacity to produce knowledge, such as the US. This greater capacity to produce knowledge reflects the higher availability of resources particular countries are able to allocate to research. The problem of importing knowledge is recognised by other indigenous researchers worldwide, in that the relevancy of imported knowledge can sometimes be mismatched with indigenous experiences (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). One of the dangers for Māori through the importation of knowledge is the assumption that imported concepts directly relate to the experiences of those who are to have these concepts imposed upon them. In effect, the production of knowledge can serve as a tool of colonisation that continues the tradition of underserving minority groups, such as Māori.

Teo and Febbraro (2003) argue that intuition plays a major role in the production of psychological knowledge, and that every cultural group possess their own particular form of intuition. However, within the field of psychology as they point out, Eurocentric intuitions are positioned as being more superior, relevant, and rigorous than those of other minority / marginalised groups. This can result in the interpretation of empirical data that labels minority groups as being “problematic or inferior” when “equally compelling, alternative interpretations” can be made from the same data set (Teo, 2008, p. 47). Spivak (1988) developed the term epistemic violence to shed light on colonial practices of knowledge production that results in direct or indirect harm to marginalised groups. For example, research into intelligence testing showed that indigenous children, on average, score lower than children of European heritage within Western educational settings (McElwain & Kearney, 1973). Furthermore, with increased contact with Western society, indigenous children's intelligence scores also increased. This seems to suggest that there is no truly objective ‘thing’ being measured, rather, something else all-together. Westerman and Wettinger (1997) argue that most psychological intelligence test are biased against minority groups, and favour dominant group members, as the cultural biases of the dominant group leak into the tests themselves. This form of epistemic violence can
have extremely harmful effects for marginalised groups by ignoring non-Western worldviews (Teo & Febbraro, 2003). In addition, epistemic violence can exclude marginalised groups from accessing higher education, reducing employment prospects to low skilled and low paid jobs, and exclusion from important political decision-making roles. Epistemic violence can be seen as an extension of colonial practices that seeks to maintain control of intellectual and academic spaces for dominant group members.

Epistemic violence is not limited to the production of knowledge, as it concerns issues in ethics and politics (Teo, 2008, 2010). This means that the implication of knowledge within the political arena can result in a form of violence to those who are not represented in the process of producing knowledge. As the production of knowledge is a cultural undertaking, a failure to recognise the underlying cultural assumptions that inform so called ‘objective’ research is what Fairchild (1991) refers to as scientific racism. Psychological knowledge, in light of epistemic violence, can pose a political threat to marginalised groups, such as Māori, as it can be used as a basis to provide political recommendations for policy (Teo, 2010). Through the process of analysis, interpretations and speculations on marginalised groups by dominant group researchers result in the production of knowledge that can have harmful effects when acted on (Teo, 2008). In sum, the impacts on Māori through colonial practices are not limited to the history books; they are ever present when knowledge is being produced.

Colonialism, the imposition of settler society, and the scientising of Māori have contributed in the dislocation of many Māori from their land, culture and traditional ways of life. This has exacerbated intergenerational socio-economic and cultural deprivation, which for some has provided a pathway into homelessness. Thus, when addressing matters of homelessness within New Zealand, and particularly for Māori, attention must be paid to the political and historical events that have shaped and textured contemporary society. We must also inform our research into the present situations in which Māori find themselves with indigenous psychologies and Māori philosophies and cultural concepts. To ignore such relevant scholarship is to perpetuate colonialism.
Indigenous psychologies worldwide have set out to develop their own knowledge that relates to the experiences of the indigenous communities they are situated within. In responding to dominant North American position within the discipline of psychology, indigenous psychologies are still ostracised, in many ways, from the discipline as a whole (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). Although my training has been heavily laden with North American psychological knowledge and concepts, as an indigenous person, my approach to this research is textured by my ethnicity and culture. This requires me to move beyond simply employing a mainstream version of psychology, which sometimes does not appreciate the diversity and distinctiveness of other cultural groups, and to embrace traditional Māori concepts, beliefs, knowledge and values in order to inform my approach to research as a cultured being.

Situating Māori homelessness in light of the social, historical and political happenings since colonisation provides a richer and more relevant understanding of the phenomenon of homelessness than individualistic/behavioural discourses can offer. As Māori comprise a cultural group who are over-represented in homelessness statistics (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011), the focus on culture becomes central to our understanding of Māori homelessness. As homelessness is more than just the lack of a physical structure to live within, I discuss health implications of homelessness in the following section to expose the far-reaching effects that homelessness has on communities.

**Conceptualising homelessness**

Within New Zealand, Māori are disproportionately affected by homelessness when compared to the settler society (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011). Homelessness is an inherently complex phenomenon that involves more than the absence of the physical and social structures often associated with a home (Hodgetts, Radley, Chamberlain, & Hodgetts, 2007). In this section, I want to explore what homelessness is and how it has been conceptualised. Pathways and risk factors of homelessness are identified in order to see how Māori men, in particular, are affected. To end this section, I will consider
some of the barriers that stand in the way of addressing this social issue, and some possible solutions, or ways forward, to deal with societal factors that can lead/contribute to homelessness for Māori.

According the United Nations (2009), homelessness is described with reference to two general categories: primary homelessness (or rooflessness), meaning a person living on the streets with a lack of private accommodation; and secondary homelessness, which refers to people who have no on-going or fixed place to live and tend to regularly move from place to place. Within New Zealand, homelessness had been defined as: “living situations where people with no other options to acquire safe and secure housing: are without shelter, in temporary accommodation, sharing accommodation with a household or living in uninhabitable housing” (Statistics New Zealand, 2009, p. 6). This definition expands on the single aspects of shelter, and considers the lack of personal privacy, or the sharing of other people's private accommodation, within a person's living situation as being a factor of homelessness. Researchers have argued that homelessness is both an emplaced and a relational phenomena (Hodgetts et al., 2008), meaning that homelessness is not simply about an individual, but also involves structural and societal elements that contribute to the overall issue of homelessness. This moves the notion of homelessness away from a simple interaction between a person and a house (or lack thereof), and looks at the way a particular person is located within a given society. For example, research conducted in Australia that focused on indigenous homelessness uses the concept of ‘spiritual homelessness’ to describe a kind of homelessness that was outside the domain of settler society, but had a devastating impact for Aboriginal communities (Memmott, Long, Chambers, & Spring, 2003). Spiritual homelessness differs from the earlier mentioned definitions in that a disconnection from land, family, and kinship networks and the loss of cultural identity and affiliation characterises a state of homelessness for indigenous peoples. This brings into question the assumed interchangeability of the terms ‘house’ and ‘home’, in that simply having a physical home does not make up for the spiritual disconnections from systems of
kinship, attachment to places, and cultural resources that affirms a person’s sense of self and identity.

The way in which homelessness is defined, or conceptualised, is important because it can have a bearing on how research is conducted, how resources are allocated, and how policies are formed. For example, Hodgetts, Stolte and Groot (2014-in review) point out how research in the United States has a propensity to attribute homelessness to the actions and choices of the individual, whereas European based research attributes homelessness more to systemic failures. Put simply, these differing views attribute the main source of homelessness to different entities, the individual or the society. Furthermore, there is not only a lack of interest expressed with in the Western academic tradition surrounding homelessness, but also a lack of incorporating notions of culture within mainstream psychological literature about homelessness (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011). For the purposes of this research, emphasis is placed on structural and systemic explanations of homelessness that conceptualise people as inherently cultured beings. This focus is taken given the on-going impacts of colonialism and the danger in individual / behavioural focused explanations. Historically, these individual / behavioural approaches have lead to victim blaming when not considering how the ‘choices’ of individuals are shaped by colonial processes and related inter-intergroup relations between Māori and settler societies that are played out over generations (Johnson, Hodgetts, & Nikora, 2012; Nikora, Hodgetts, Groot, Stolte, & Chamberlain, 2012). Further, individually focused services can be useful in the absence of alternatives and for addressing personal emergency needs, but have proved problematic in addressing Māori homelessness long term (Johnson et al., 2012).

A structural explanation for the over-representation of Māori homelessness can be found in colonial practices of disruption, which include “conflict with settlers, epidemics of introduced diseases, dispossessed of lands, food resources and spiritual landscapes” (Nikora et al., 2012, p. 4). These conditions resulted in mass migrations of Māori from their homelands, which connected them to their tribal groups and fostered their cultural well-being and connectedness, to cities that had been built by settler society. In
this context, homelessness involves social marginalisation, social distancing, abjection and social stratification that create and maintain distance between people who are housed and those who are not (Hodgetts et al., 2007; Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Therefore, it is crucial that simplistic, individualistic, explanations for homelessness are not viewed as the sole framework for addressing homelessness, and that complex societal, historical, and political factors are examined.

One of the barriers in addressing the issue of indigenous homelessness within the field of psychology is the lack of attention that studies conducted by indigenous researchers received within the mainstream field (Hodgetts, Stolte & Groot, 2014-in review). This means that indigenous homeless people are having psychological constructs imposed upon them that were not derived from their experiences, and generally end up being quite culturally inappropriate (Durie, 2001). Much of the literature on homelessness is produced from an outsider perspective and focuses on the negative consequences of street life. This can gloss over the issue of homelessness by ignoring the reasons why some people actively choose to go out on to the streets. The experiences of street life are not always negative. This is particularly apparent for young people escaping abusive domestic situations, or for those in financial situations where their options are either to starve while maintaining a place of residence, or choosing to be homeless in order to eat. Some people find more of a home on the streets than when they are housed (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Further, sub-cultures associated with different groups of homeless people can offer ways of connecting with other homeless people who share similar life experiences and struggles (Chamberlain & Johnson, 2011). This can stand as a barrier to addressing homelessness, if the goal is to simply rehouse displaced people, as street life can provide social support and acceptance that is missing from their lives when domiciled. This makes it difficult for some to exit from when being rehoused (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010).

Researchers have argued against the notion of rehousing the homeless as the primary means of addressing the issue, showing that some homeless people feel more at home on the streets than in a house (Groot, Hodgetts,
Furthermore, simply rehousing someone does not address structural and systemic inequalities that have contributed to their state of homelessness (Hodgetts, Stolte & Groot, 2014-in review). One of the more concerning barriers lay within the political sphere. As the world went through a financial crisis in 2007-2008, the problems of poverty and homelessness were exacerbated by the political responses to this crisis and furthered the gap between the rich and the poor (Hodgetts, Chamberlain, Groot, & Tankel, 2013). Small government, low taxes, reduced public spending for social services, privatisation, and free trade serve the needs of a few, while many make the streets their home.

In order to address Māori homelessness, researchers argue that the historical, political, and cultural events that have transpired within New Zealand need to be brought to the forefront to provide a basis for working with homeless Māori to heal multi-generational wounds (Johnson et al., 2012; Nikora et al., 2012; Nikora, Rua, & Te Awekotuku, 2007). Emphasis is placed on the word with, as the process of recording homeless people’s misery can do more harm than good, turning research on homelessness into a form of ‘poverty tourism’ or ‘spectator sport’ (Hodgetts, Stolte & Groot, 2014-in review). Relationships are central to the Māori way of life (Ritchie, 1992) and can be utilised to develop spaces for care from within which to work equitably with homeless people to address their complex needs (Johnson et al., 2012). Hodgetts and collagues (2007) describe such spaces for care as extending beyond the provision of food and a place to sleep to offer routine and respite from the stresses of life on the streets. These are judgement free spaces (Trussell and Mair, 2010) in which homeless people have a say in their daily activities and are treated with respect. Such spaces can take shape in the form of service responses to homelessness, that in the present case include Māori tikanga (customs), kawa (protocol) and cultural ways of being (Johnson et al., 2012). As I will show, Māori homeless men can gain a sense of belonging that approximates as sense of home in such spaces.
Māori homelessness and the social determinants of health

Although the life expectancy gap between Māori and non-Māori New Zealanders has, in general, narrowed since 1995-1997 (9.1 years). In 2012, Māori are still living on average, 7.3 years less than non-Māori New Zealanders. Māori deaths rates for almost all age ranges remain higher than other New Zealanders (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). For Māori men, the gap in life expectancy when compared to the total population remains at 8.35 years (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Unfortunately, obtaining statistical data regarding life expectancy for homeless Māori men remains problematic, as there is currently no national census of homelessness in New Zealand (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011). Given the harsh realities and stressors of street life it is likely that homeless Māori comprise the cutting edge of inequities in life expectancy and illness experienced by Māori when compared to members of the settler society. The Auckland Rough Sleepers Initiative (ARSI) provide a snapshot of homelessness within the Auckland CBD area that showed a minimum of 91 people being homeless, with half of these people being Māori, and more than three quarters being male (Ellis & McLuckie, 2008). These findings taken together suggest that Māori men's health needs are clearly being underserved, and that for homeless Māori men, the real extent of health inequalities is unknown.

Higher rates of disease, mental health issues, and premature death are common features of homelessness (Johnson et al., 2012; Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). People who are homeless are significantly more likely to experience serious health issues, such as "lung and colorectal cancer, asthma, coronary heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes, arthritis, osteoporosis, chronic renal disease, oral disease, depression and stroke" (Moore, Gerdtz, & Manias, 2007, p. 183), when compared to the general population. Particular to those who sleep rough, the contraction of infectious diseases poses a significant threat (Joly, Goodman, Froggatt, & Drennan, 2011).

---

1 Social determinants of health, as discussed by Hodgetts and colleagues (2010), refer to the conceptualisation of health that moves beyond individualistic explanations of health by focusing on the broad societal structures that impact the health of people.
2011), such as tuberculosis (Kumar, Citron, Leese, & Watson, 1995) and hepatitis (Croft-White & Rayner, 1999). In regards to mental health, research suggests that up to 50% of homeless people suffer from some kind of mental illness (Folson et al., 2005). The difference in mental health prevalence between the homeless and the general population is significant. Research in Australia showed that 46% of homeless men suffered from schizophrenia, which compared to the national average of 0.5%, and that particularly for homeless men, general mental health issues were found to be as high as 81% when compared to the Australian population of 18% (Teesson, Hodder, & Buhrich, 2004). Rates of dual diagnoses, of both mental and drug use disorders, and cognitive impairment are also higher for homeless people when compared to the general public (Breakey, Calabrese, Rosenblatt, & Crum, 1998; Buhrich, Hodder, & Teesson, 2000). What is clear is that homelessness has a strong bearing on health.

Homelessness has been described as a “serious and lethal health concern” (Hodgetts et al., 2007, p. 3) that reflects deeply embedded societal and economic inequalities (Hodgetts et al., 2013; Raphael, 2008). These societal inequalities refer to the increased risk that people who come from low socio-economic and socially marginalised communities have in becoming homeless (Hodgetts et al., 2007). Once on the streets, homeless people are more likely to experience negative health outcome in comparison to people with domestic dwellings (Nikora et al., 2012), such as higher rates of mental illness (Lewis, Andersen, & Gelberg, 2003), and are less likely to access primary health care services (Moore et al., 2007). These barriers, or delays in treatment, can result in preventable / manageable conditions being put to the side, which are later dealt with by emergency services (Nikora et al., 2012). It is fair to say that the streets are an extremely unhealthy place to live, as the many everyday and simple things housed people do to maintain their health are not so easily achieved on the streets (Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). For example, the lack of refrigeration for foodstuffs and particular medications, heating at night and in winter, sinks and clean water for general hygiene, and privacy to unwind and relax from the day’s stresses. Stolte and Hodgetts (2013) argue that even though homelessness is linked to illness and
premature death, rehousing the homeless may not improve their health outcomes. Their reasoning is that the underlying societal factors that contribute to homelessness, such as social distancing and marginalisation, are not addressed by simply putting someone into a house.

For those who are homeless, access to health services can often be difficult, and the ability of the health services to respond to the unique challenges the homeless face stands as a barrier to bridge the gap in health inequalities (Moore et al., 2007). Nikora and colleagues (2012) point out that even if health services are utilised by the homeless, it is difficult to follow certain treatment regimes that are not conducive with daily life on the streets. For example, many aspects of health care are now embedded in private domestic dwellings (Hodgetts, Chamberlain, Gabe, et al., 2011), to which homeless people do not have ready accesses. When one lacks a refrigerator, it is difficult to follow medical advice regarding the preservation of medications (Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). Medications take on symbolic power within the home, which functions as a space for care, where daily routine and health care practices are intertwined (Hodgetts, Chamberlain, Gabe, et al., 2011). So when the notion of home is that of disruption, chaos and transitivity, the extra-ordinary nature of life on the streets can impede on the mundane act of taking a pill while following a routine, such as opening the medicine cabinet after a morning shower. Furthermore, as Nickasch and Marnocha (2009) highlight, attention to health care routines can become continuously set aside as the need for food and a safe place to rest is a constant daily struggle, requiring immense time and effort.

There is a need for health care services and social services to be viewed as an integrated, holistic service that supports the unique health needs of the homeless (Nikora et al., 2012). For example, van Laere, de Wit, and Klazinga (2009) attempt to transcend the health care service / social service divide by conceptualising the threat of eviction not only as a socio-economic issue, but also as an important public health intervention. The efficacy of service provider can be improved by increased communication and coordination between different providers, which the lack thereof can result in homeless people who actually want to engage with services being
subjected to processes that can be “dehumanizing and distressing” (Christiani, Hudson, Nyamathi, Mutere, & Sweat, 2008, p. 157). As Nikora and colleagues (2012) put it, “people have got to care about being cared for; they have to want to use services, and come to know when they need to access them” (p. 15). This reflects a dual approach in that the homeless people feel that a service is accessible and worth accessing, and that service providers deliver a service that is relevant to the realities of homeless Māori living on the streets. Some suggestions on how providers can achieve this include: building meaningful relationships, rapport and trust with the homeless, acknowledging a cultural way of being in the world particular to Māori, and by creating judgment-free spaces for care (Nikora et al., 2012). This thesis focuses on one such initiative.

Although addressing the way in which healthcare services are provided and accessed among the homeless, it would be wrong for me to assume that a change in healthcare services is all that is needed. Health inequalities are also due to structural features that do not serve marginalised groups as well as other members of wider society. These structural health inequalities are view within this research as related to processes of colonisation, which informs the over-representation of Māori in homelessness, poverty, and health inequalities in New Zealand. Not only health is undermined through structural inequalities, but people’s very sense of self and place. As I will discuss further in the following section, processes of colonisation that have displaced and dispossessed Māori from natural resources and traditional ways of life requires me to examine the notion of identity, as for the homeless, there is the serious threat of loosing the self to the streets. Not only health is undermined through structural inequalities, but people’s very sense of self and place.

**Conceptualising identity and being**

A key result of homelessness, particularly for Māori, is the threat to maintaining a sense of identity. As identity is more than just the individual self, it is important for me to examine the ways in which identity has been conceptualised and theorised. Within the Western philosophical tradition,
the concept of personal identity has received great attention over the centuries, as it speaks to the question of who we are (Daniels, 1969; Harold, 2011). A common method used to pin down personal identity employs a reductionist approach to isolate the common underlying characteristic that we all share, yet vary to make us each a distinct, autonomous human being. Some examples of this single common underlying characteristic include: the physical vessel of an individual, for example, our body over time; our brains, as it purportedly contains all of our memories, experiences, thoughts, and so forth, and; the psychological continuation of consciousness, where everything physical is irrelevant (Law, 2003). Each of these individual characteristics can be refuted as the central characteristic of identity with the use of counter examples. This has resulted in continuous philosophical discussions and strange, and sometimes extremely bizarre, thought experiments to explore the notion of identity.

It is not the result of thought experiments I find problematic. Rather, it is the way problem is framed and the way solutions are formulated that is problematic. The error, I believe, lies with the assumptions that 1) identity is a single characteristic that can be reduced by stripping away the many characteristics that make us who we are, 2) that identity is something that should be explained within a rationalist paradigm, and 3) that identity is something that is solely personal. To address the first and second assumptions, I want to consider the Duhem–Quine thesis that states that a single belief cannot be comprehensively evaluated in and of itself, as a number of auxiliary beliefs (assumptions) are required in order to entertain that original belief in the first place (Swanson, 1967). Thus, when using a reductionist approach to find a single underlying characteristic of identity, we cannot actually examine that single characteristic, as there are a number of auxiliary beliefs (or assumptions) that render the original belief meaningful. We are in fact testing many beliefs, possibly entire world-views and or paradigms when inquiring into the nature of the self.

As the Duhem–Quine thesis is originally put, it speaks to inquiry of a scientific subject matter, intended for empirical experimentation (Swanson, 1967), rather than hypothetical conjecture. Theories of personal identity
within the Western philosophical tradition are not generally considered to be scientific, as no empirical data is used to confirm or disprove them, and they are consequently not subject to the Duhem–Quine thesis. Theories of personal identity that are formulated within a rationalist paradigm assumes the position that true knowledge of the world can be achieved through reason alone (Lennon & Dea, 2012) independent of experience, culture, and historical and political factors. So by shifting away from a rationalist / reductionist approach to understanding identity, basing statements of identity in the collection of empirical data and how that statement sits within a broader landscape of meaning, we can move towards a more holistic and collective understanding of identity that is situated within the everyday lives of people.

In regards to my third assumption, that identity is something that is solely personal, I want to consider a few theories of identity that view identity as including social, material and spatial elements, to both reject a purely personal sense of identity, and to explore conceptualisations of identity that are relevant to the presented study. Social psychology, like the Western philosophical tradition, has also explored the notion of identity, but for very different reasons and in very different ways. It may seem strange to draw such a sharp distinction between the two fields when psychology had its beginnings in philosophy and continues to engage in philosophical enquiry (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). However, as I will argue, there are key differences between the two approaches that deepen our understanding of the nature of identity.

Identity, as conceived by James (1890/1983) is inherently a relational concept that situates a person within a meaningful social world. As James puts it: “There is no property absolutely essential to any one thing. The same property which figures as the essence of a thing on one occasion becomes a very inessential feature on the other” (James, 1890/1983, p. 959). What this means is that the totality of essences in the world are not separate, but are shared between social actors, places of significance, and everyday objects. This raises similarities with Plato’s theory of the Forms (also known as the theory of ideas) (Russell, 1946), in that an essence (or Form) is not
something a person, place or object has, in the sense of exclusive ownership. Rather, an essence (or Form) is something that is participated in, and can be done so by a number of people, places or objects simultaneously and dynamically. These ideas are also reflected in the traditional Māori concept of mauri (life force) that unifies and connects all things within the Māori world (Marsden, 2003), and rejects the singling out of features that contributes to who we are. Following the rationale of James, this locates the self materially in places and things, and relationally through interactions with others. It also moves away from the reductionist approach that attempts to confine the self within an individual's body (or mind), and views the self as an on-going process of becoming through different events and situations in everyday life (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). In this way, everyday life reflects a reciprocal interaction between the self and the external world that merge, leaving a sharp distinction between the self and the world unable to be made.

In the tradition of James, Hermans (2001) rejects the concept of a “core, essential self” in favour of viewing the self “as a multiplicity of positions among which dialogical relationships can be established” (p. 243). Through the numerous dialogical interactions we have in everyday life, we shape the very essence of who we are and how we relate to the world (Hermans & Hermans-Konopka, 2009). The dialogical self contrasts to a monological self in which interactions are non-reciprocal and unidirectional (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010), characterising Hermans’ (2001) core essential self. Philosophically, it is unclear if such as monological self could even exist.

Social identity theory, proposed by Tajfel (1982) and Turner (1987), provides another example to contrast philosophical methods of inquiry into identity. This theory argues that in addition to a personal sense of identity that we create for ourselves, our identity is also created through the social groups that we are members of. The first point of difference this theory has with previous philosophical approaches is that the reason this theory came into being was through a need to explain a social phenomenon in the real world as opposed to resolving complex logical problems within abstract thought experiments. Kassin, Fein, and Markus (2008) attribute social identity theory as a response to explaining in-group favouritism. This
demonstrates the different reasons for theories of identity in that they are responsive to issues that society faces at a particular time, rather than the thoughts produced by a 'rational' mind.

The second point of difference is that social identity theory was grounded in empirical data, as opposed to the apparent ‘pure thought’ of the rationalists. This is not to say that the experimental method can deliver everything we want to know about matters of identity. As Billig (1991) points out, in regard to different approaches researchers take towards extending contemporary social identity theory, when an in-group become highly specialised they run the risk of excluding out-group members from the discussion, as the language the in-group uses to describe their experimental approach is largely unknown to outsiders. Billig goes on to say: “For psychologists, this tendency carries particular perils. There is the temptation to describe subjects’ mentality in terms which only the experiment can understand” (1991, p. 945). This suggests that taking inquiries into the matter of identity to experimental extremes can also have a limiting factor on inquiry, much like extreme rationalist approaches can.

The primary issue with such an extreme use of experimental methods to discover knowledge of identity is that there is an assumption that all the factors that contribute to identity are present within the experimental design itself or that an experimental situation can approximate aspects of actuality (Ofshe, 1992). This results in the testing of what the researchers deem important or relevant to matters of identity. Furthermore, questions need to be raised surrounding who is creating this knowledge? And who has had this knowledge imposed upon them? This highlights the importance for people from different social groups to be able to join academic discussions surrounding the nature of identity. As the presented research is situated within a Māori worldview, it is crucial to explore an account of Māori identity.

Within te ao Māori (the Maori world), who you are as a person has many aspects, all of which are necessary to understand what identity means within this worldview. Mead (2003) discusses four attributes of identity. Firstly, ira tangata, ira atua refers to a passing down of genes from the
parents to the child. This genetic information is not the same as what scientific field of biology would say, as this genetic information, or mauri, links Māori back to the atua (gods). Through whakapapa, Māori trace their connections back to the gods, meaning that the to be Māori also includes the mauri, or life essence, of the gods as passed down through subsequent generations. The traditional Māori world is polytheistic with spiritual deities spanning the intangible and tangible parts of the Māori world (Te Awekotuku, 1996). The link back to the gods is essential as it provides an account of how Māori came into the world we currently live in (R. Walker, 1990). Secondly, whakapapa (genealogy) is something that all Māori are born into; it is a system of inter-generational connectedness to the ancestor and the gods. A person’s whakapapa also locates them within tribal life, and through participation within the iwi (tribe) or hapū (sub tribe), furthers access to tribal assets and resources. These elaborate whakapapa lines are remembered through oral tradition, such as pepeha (a set form of words containing tribal knowledge), whakatauki (proverbial saying), waiata (songs), and patere (chants) (King, 2003). Simply put, “whakapapa is belonging” (Mead, 2003, p. 43). Alongside a person’s genealogical link to kin is the notion of tūrangawaewae, or a place to stand (Mead, 2003). Tūrangawaewae is a physical scape where people call ‘home’. It is often a piece of land or lands with family or tribal links. Claims to tūrangawaewae are often through whakapapa. It is the location in which whānau (family, including extended family) hapū or tribal life is enacted. Today Māori often equate their tūrangawaewae to their marae.

Traditionally, the marae referred to the open space in front of either a meeting house (wharenuia) or a chief’s home (Te Awekotuku, 1996). In a more modern context, the term has come to refer an entire complex, which can include a large, and often carved, meeting house (wharenuia), cooking and sanitary facilities, adjoining lands, gardens, kohanga reo (Māori language preschool), and so on (Mead, 2003; R. Walker, 1990). It is a communal space for tradition, protocols and rituals to occur. The marae serves as an expression of hapū identity and the identity of the individual belonging to that hapū. These ideas are not unique to te ao Māori, as strong parallels exist
with social psychological concepts of place-based identities and place associations (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010).

Lastly is pūmanawa. This refers to the inherent talents we receive from our parent, grandparents, and ancestors. Mead (2003) uses a metaphor of te pā harakeke (the flax bush) to show how each leaf has its beginning in the centre, and grow outwards as new growth occurs in the middle of the plant. Eventually the outer leaves either die or get harvested as a resource all the while protecting the young leaves in the middle. This signifies the continuous passing down of talent through whakapapa lines. The concepts of ira tangata, whakapapa, tūrangawaewae, and pūmanawa show that for Māori, identity is not solely an expression of personal identity. The self sits within a larger network of relationships that encompass connections to place, systems of kinship, ways of being in the world, and cultural practices. This is similar to Li’s (2011) Chinese cobweb self where the individual is linked to others through a cobweb of connectedness. Each person is a cobweb as well wrapped up in a bundle of relationships beyond their social and environmental spheres.

Māori identity, or more specifically, a Māori sense of 'being', is something that extends beyond physical existence (Marsden, 2003). In contrast to the dominant Cartesian / Christian distinction between two kinds of existence, physical and mental / spiritual (Hung, 1997), Marsden (2003) believes that Māori traditionally distinguished between three levels of existence. Within the Māori cosmology is an ontological account of 'being' that begins with te korekore (of potential being), moving to te Po (the world of becoming), and then to te ao marama (the world of being). This triadic notion of being (or existence) poses significant issues for the field of psychology as it is arguably outside of its intellectual reach. That is to say that there would be considerable difficulties integrating it into current dominant North American tradition of psychological knowledge production surrounding matters of identity, or if integration is even an appropriate avenue to pursue.

The point is Māori notions of life have a significantly different beginning to Judeo-Christian notions of genesis. This difference ensures
Māori ways of being, thinking and interacting with the world is difficult for the discipline of psychology to engage with. As identity is made up of connections to place, social relationships, positioning within society, and access to resources and cultural connectedness, to loose one's sense of identity is not simply a matter of not knowing who you are. It involves a loss of the many support structures that can be crucial in the preservation of a person's health and well-being. As the homeless can be disconnected from cultural groups and marginalised within wider society, notions surrounding identity become salient when attempting to address Māori homelessness within the context of colonisation. As my research is set within a marae garden, the following section builds upon notions of identity through the active participation of social actors within a culturally textured space by means of the everyday activity of gardening.

**Community, gardens, and traditional Māori practices**

A garden is a deceptively simple concept to grasp. It refers, in many respects, to a site for basic human sustenance and aesthetic enjoyment. There are many variations in the way gardens are constructed and what plants are cared for, as it is a place “where nature and culture meet” (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2010, p. 511). This suggests that there is more to a garden than just a number of plants growing in an area soil. Communities can be grown symbiotically with gardens to develop social ties, self-reflection, and are a focal point for social interaction that can have positive impacts on a community’s physical and psychological health (Li, Hodgetts, & Ho, 2010). In this section I will explore gardening as a daily socio-cultural and historical practice that builds community health and well-being, and can assist in providing a space for care in which Māori men can rearticulate and weave into the ground their very sense of self.

Māori have a significant gardening history in New Zealand spanning centuries. Archaeological sites and excavations have done much to inform our understandings of early Maori habitation (Furey, 2006; King, 1997; Moon, 1993; R. Walker, 1990). R. Walker (1990) argues that after a brief period of hunting moa, Māori began to establish gardens to sustain and grow
the Māori population. Having migrated from the Pacific Islands some 1500 years ago, Māori experimented growing those crops brought over from the Pacific Islands and foods indigenous to New Zealand. Due the difference in tropical and temperate climate between New Zealand and the Pacific, early Māori developed new gardening methods so that the sensitive Pacific Island crops would be successful in New Zealand. As gardening practices among Māori increased, so too did the population, reaching approximately 25,000 by the year 1300AD (R. Walker, 1990). Walker goes on to explain that with this increase in population came an increased value on fertile lands that could be used for gardening. Fertile land became a valuable resource and desired by neighbouring groups and tribes. This meant that iwi and hapū needed to start defending their lands from neighbours, as it was far more efficient to take a neighbour's garden by force than to clear bush and scrub to create your own. A loss of a garden was not merely a financial or economic loss. As R. Walker puts it, if a people fail to defend their land, then they “fail to maintain their identity” (1990, p. 33) as the defeated would be either absorbed into the dominant tribe or vanquished. This highlights the concept of mana whenua, territorial rights (Marsden, 2003), where a group's mana (prestige, authority, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma) or authority over their lands is contingent on their ability to maintain and defend that very land and its resources (King, 2003). Although inter-tribal war could occur over fertile and resource rich lands, the practice of gardening was a place of peace.

Relationships between people, the physical world, and the metaphysical realm are central in traditional Māori gardening practices, as gardens connect Māori with Papatūānuku (the Earth Mother). As the Earth Mother, Papatūānuku provides Māori with the natural resources for sustenance, by growing gardens Māori connect back to her as an eternal caregiver. Traditionally, gardens were a hub of activity within Māori communities (King, 2003) with plots scattered among iwi or hapū groups. Within the gardens, the constant togetherness and bonding of iwi and hapū members helped to reinforce whakapapa links. For example, an elder, while working away in the whānau garden, could trace the namesake of a younger member of the group back to a particular tupuna (ancestor), and the stories
surrounding the life and times of that person could be transmitted to subsequent generations (Moon, 2005). Remembering the past through story telling is of great significance to Māori, as much of Māori history is oral (Te Awekotuku, 1996) and is deeply embedded within the Māori language itself (Karetu, 1992). These stories reconnected people in the present with loved ones in the past, and situated the self within the cosmology of Māori spirituality (Orbell, 1992). So the garden as a space is more than just a place for growing food, but growing people as well through time spent together and knowledge transferred.

Globally, researchers have been exploring the social value of gardens and gardening to shed light on the ways communities can be built around gardens and the way in which spaces of gardening reflect the communities who tend them. Community gardens, almost by definition, take place in public spaces, so by groups taking part in public space, they themselves become a public social group (Mitchell, 1995). This point may seem trivial to some. However, for groups of people who have had been denied public space or participation, can, by extension, have their social group hidden and unacknowledged, away from the public’s eye. Chitov (2006) goes as far as saying that spaces, such as community gardens, need to be provided to communities by local governments, as it offers “a respite from [everyday] wariness, settings where a diversity of people can feel comfortable enough to relax” (pp. 437-438). Setting up and maintaining communities gardens create space for organisations, governments, and community groups to be in continuous dialogue with each other, which has been shown to be a far more efficient system than governments or local councils merely doing things for communities (Frasure & Jones-Correa, 2010; Gough & Accordino, 2013). This highlights the importance of implementing projects with communities, rather than doing things on communities.

Community spaces are not mute, as Chitov (2006) points out, gardens “signify pride and memory of cultural heritage, represent a group’s identity in urban space, and thus, claim what Lefebvre termed the ‘right to the city’” (p. 439). This suggests a unique texturing of space through the actions of people, and as Tilley (1994) argues, space and action are inseparable. The
kinds of action and the way things are done are important, i.e. a cultured way of doing things. For example, Lombard and colleagues (2013) conducted research into the attitudes of Native American participation in local community gardens that were set up to address health needs of tribal members. What the researchers found was that people who participated in the project were drawn to educational approaches that included their own tribal / cultural traditions, observing traditional social structures (such as respect for the elders of the group), and hands on learning.

Gardens can provide a space for care in which community (and individual) health can be promoted and fostered. The principle of self-care is embedded within Māori gardening practices, in that the connections people have with all living things can be enhanced or weakened depending on how a person is able to care for themselves, and subsequently for others (Moon, 2005). This interconnectedness refers to the concept of mauri, which Marsden (2003) describes as “the bonding element that knits all the diverse elements within the Universal ‘Procession’ giving creation its unity in diversity. It is the bonding element that holds the fabric of the universe together” (p. 44). Although people, place and objects can be seen as distinct physical entities, they are not separate from one another, as they are all connected in the Māori worldview. Through gardening, Māori are able to acknowledge the mauri of all things (Moon, 2005) and strengthen their connection with the gods, the creators of all things (Te Awekotuku, 1996).

Within the garden in particular, these atua are Papatūānuku (the Earth Mother), Rongo – or Rongomātâne – (god of agriculture and cultivated foods), Haumiatiketike (god of uncultivated foods), and Tāne Mahuta (god of the forests) (Marsden, 1992). As the universe is seen as a process, rather than a thing (Marsden, 2003), there is an emphasis placed on the enactment of connection to all things through daily interactions, and cultural practices and rituals. As the Tūhoe tohunga (an expert in the Māori world) Hohepa Kereopa puts it: “whatever you do to the land, you do to yourself. So the issue of how you treat the land is really about self-respect. What this means is that you have to respect yourself before you can respect the land” (Moon, 2005, p. 36). This reflects the holistic nature of the Māori world, where the connection of
the self within social groups and the environment enhances the mauri of individual self, the wider community, and the environment (Marsden, 2003). So when a person gardens, they not only cultivates their garden, they cultivate their relationship with the abovementioned atua. This is a powerful connection.

With colonial practices of disruption, dislocation and urbanisation came a disconnection of many Māori from the traditional way of Māori life, including language, culture, identity, systems of kinship and spirituality (Durie, 2003; Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011; Nikora et al., 2012). During the 1950's, there was a decline in the number of Māori who kept gardens at their homes, as processes of urbanisation moved Māori from rural areas where gardening and agriculture took place, to urban centres, where the same connection with the land is more difficult to achieve (Durie, 2003). This was partly due to the enticement of paid employment and education, which substituted community grown kai (food) for cheaply available food that could be found at markets and in stores (Moon, 2005). This substitution was not passive in nature, in that the cultural practices, social conventions, customs, protocols, and knowledge that were associated with gardening and kai were no longer present within urban life in the same way as they were in traditional whānau and hapū gardens.

In response to societal shifts, Borg (2002) argues the likely causes of many illnesses and diseases may not purely be a matter of biology, but also stem from a particular social condition, such as colonisation. Or in other words, “illness, sickness, disability, oppression and violence could be viewed as failures of the social system” (Borg, 2002, p. 356). This has a profound effect on the way public health issues are conceptualised, moving away from viewing health as the outcome of an individual’s choice, and more to what communities are able to achieve given the current political and social climate. What Borg (2002) is arguing is that empowerment and health go hand-in-hand. This implies that health cannot be ‘given’ to a community of people; rather, it is something the community itself must be involved in and work collaboratively with agencies to improve their quality of life.
An example of the negative health outcomes by marginalised and disempowered communities can be seen in the concept of the *food desert*. Food deserts refer to the lack of available fresh, nutritious food within low socio-economic communities (Hu, Acosta, McDaniel, & Gittelsohn, 2013; Whelan, Wrigley, Warm, & Cannings, 2002). What this means is that even if a family wanted to have a healthy and balanced diet, in virtue of their income and the location of their home, this kind of diet can be unattainable. Thus, food deserts can be viewed in light of social exclusion and health inequalities (Wrigley, 2002), which draws attention to the connections between histories of oppression and current states of impoverishment particular societal groups face.

With community action working in conjunction with government or support of the state, the adversities a particular society faces can be overcome, or at least minimised. For example, during World War I and II, where in the hardship of international conflict, citizens and communities in the US were encouraged and assisted by governments to construct gardens to address issues of national food security (Hanna & Oh, 2000). These gardens were commonly referred to as *Victory Gardens* (Lawson, 2004) and were able to produce 40% all fruit and vegetables in the US during 1944 (Basset, 1979). Although the outputs of these gardens served financial and nutritional purposes during times of war, Hanna and Oh (2000) argue that gardens also provide other benefits, such as: “satisfying labour, value formation [reconnecting with nature and knowing where food comes from], neighbourhood improvement, and developing a sense of community” (p. 209). Gardens can bring people together, increase the social capital of communities (Chitov, 2006) and ease issues, such as stress, loneliness, and alienation (Oldenburg, 1989). Through connecting people and communities, and providing space to enact cultural values and practices, gardens can help address social isolation of individuals and social groups to encourage a sense of belonging within wider society (Chitov, 2006).

Gardens can be instrumental in building communities. At the core of community gardens are the concepts of reciprocity, group cohesion and resilience, social inclusion, ownership and partnership. They provide
opportunities for meaningful socialisation to occur between community members that have been shown to develop into sophisticated norms of reciprocity (Chitov, 2006). Within Māori communities, significant social events, such as matariki (Māori New Years), harvests, and hākari (communal feast), were a time when communities would come together as a part of general gardening practices (Moon, 2005; Salmond, 1975). The sharing of food came second to the strengthening of relationships, as Hohepa notes: “it was the joining together that was more important than the food” and that “it was more than just about what we were eating. It was one of the ways we connected with each other” (Moon, 2005, pp. 24-25). Gardening practices, and rituals surrounding the consumption of food, like these help to build community resilience by communities dealing with adversity collectively, rather than individually (Hanna & Oh, 2000). Chitov (2006) provides further reasoning on this point arguing that: “gardens make city life less alienated and more inclusive, they help urban communities strengthen their inner cohesion” (p. 455) and that a collective sense of ownership translates into a collective sense of responsibility towards tasks and duties within the garden. As a consequence, gardening practices build the social capital of the community, which (Hanna & Oh, 2000) suggests can, potentially, be more successful in addressing issues of poverty than traditional approaches, such as creating jobs in the market place. Genuine partnerships are also noted as an integral factor in the on-going success of community garden projects, such as local councils and cultural institutions / organisations, yet are sometimes under-utilised in community development (Gough & Accordino, 2013). Complementing the more formal partnerships are the spontaneous informal partnerships / relationships that form in-and-around gardening practices (Chitov, 2006), which need to be valued and maintained.

Briefly, gardens build communities, even though communities create them. This may seem like a contradictory statement, an inversion of cause and effect, but it only appears that way when we separate a community from its own actions. Similar to Tilley’s (1994) notion of inseparability of action and space due to mutual interdependence, communities and their actions are fundamentally inseparable. When these two things are seen as one, the
contradiction disappears. I have outlined Māori gardening practices and the need to understand the underlying epistemologies, metaphysics, and theologies that guide the complex relationships that are formed, maintained, and reproduced within that space. Māori gardens are more than the plants contained within them and more than just the space they occupy; they provide a space to connect, and re-connect, with the very essence of what it means to be Māori. In this way, gardening becomes a statement of identity.

In this chapter, I have discussed areas of key importance to conceptualise the complexities surrounding the health of homeless Māori to highlight the significance and need for the presented research. This included discussions surrounding colonisation and the production of knowledge, structural and historical factors that contribute to homelessness and the health of homeless people, and the role of gardens in fostering community health and reproducing cultural practices. The following chapter provides a detailed account of the methodology I used to conduct my research with homeless Māori men on a marae and in the garden.
Chapter Two: Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approach taken in this research. I begin with a brief historical account of Takaparawhau, formerly known as Bastion Point in the Orakei suburb of central Auckland, as a historically, politically, and culturally textured space to provide a richer setting in which this research took place. I then link this account to theoretical considerations surrounding the production and reproduction of space. Next, I review the methods used to engage with the complexities surrounding human interactions in the culturally-patterned space of the marae in central Auckland. I outline and justify the use of a culturally-patterned qualitative approach. The process of gaining access to the marae and negotiating relationships are explained, which includes background information on the participants and organisations involved in the study. I then discuss the rationale behind the use of semi-structured interview techniques, field notes, and photography. Ethical considerations are stated that reflect both the ethics of Psychologists working in Aotearoa / New Zealand and Māori cultural values. To complete the chapter, I describe the process of analysis, which was, in keeping with the bricolage approach taken, is informed by elements of thematic, abductive, and ethnographic analytic techniques.

The History of Takaparawhau

This research was centred around the Orakei marae garden, which is at the heart of Takaparawhau, formerly Bastion Point of Central Auckland (see figure 2). Takaparawhau carries significant meaning for Māori, and it was important that this meaning, in whatever shape or form it may take, be explored. Presented below is a very brief historical account of Takaparawhau that draws on material from Hawk (1998) and the Ngati Whatua o Orakei Corporate (2009).
In 1740, the territorial rights – to occupy land and maintain the area’s recourses – over much of the Auckland area, traditionally known as Tāmaki Makaurau, including Takaparawhau, were established by Ngāti Whātua, the tribal group and authority for this area. This was maintained through marriages with neighbouring tribes, maintaining and managing local resources, and occupying the land. Prior to the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840, there was very little contact between Ngāti Whātua and European settlers, but as trade spread, contact with settlers increased over time. Te Tiriti was signed by a number of Ngāti Whātua chiefs, and after this agreement, Ngāti Whātua extended an invitation to Governor Hobson to come to the Tāmaki area and set up a township / capital. The signing of Te Tiriti showed the Crown that Ngāti Whātua wanted to build a relationship. Many thousands of acres of land were gifted over time (1840-1859), or sold at extreme discount, by Ngāti Whātua to the Europeans in exchange for infrastructure that would benefit the people of Ngāti Whātua, such as schools, churches, and medical facilities. Although the Crown received large quantities of Māori land, not all of that land was used for its intended purpose; excess land was sold to settlers and other interested parties for almost 300 times what the Crown paid for it. Subsequently, Ngāti Whātua lost control of, via

Figure 2. General area of Takaparawhau, Orakei, Auckland. Retrieved from: https://maps.google.com
lawful and unlawful means, a majority of the lands they held (pre-European contact) to the Crown within ten years of signing Te Tiriti.

In 1865, the Native Lands Act was passed that gave the Crown the power to make legal decisions over Māori lands. In fear of losing the remaining land they held, a number of Ngāti Whātua chiefs took their case to the Native Land Court to protect a 700 acre piece of land known as the Orakei block, or Takaparawhau (Bastion Point). The case was won and the Orakei block was considered to be “absolutely inalienable.” However, in 1873, the Crown issued a grant in order to acquire this remaining land. This marked the beginning of Crown efforts to whittle away the legal connections Ngāti Whātua had to the Orakei block. For defence purposes, thirteen acres of coastal land were acquired in 1889 and more between 1914-1915 during World War I. On-going pressure by the Crown to partition the Orakei block opened the door to acquisition. By 1926, 600 acres of the 700 “absolutely inalienable” acres in the Orakei block was under Crown control. In the 1950’s, Government sanctioned evictions took place, removing Ngāti Whātua from their lands, leaving them with only one quarter acre piece of land in their control, an urupa, traditional Māori burial site or cemetery.

After all legal avenues to reclaim the land had been exhausted, a decision to occupy Takaparawhau was led by the Orakei Māori Action Committee. The people of Ngāti Whātua did so and on the 25th of May 1978 and after 504 days of peaceful occupation the New Zealand Police and Military forces carried out a mass eviction authorised by the Robert Muldoon lead National Government. Two hundred and twenty two people, the majority of whom were of Ngāti Whātua descent, were arrested as “trespassers”, many of whom were forcefully carried off their own papakainga (home lands). The images below depict how the evictions took place. Figure 3 depicts protesters and their living facilities in the centre, and the Police, who have formed a ‘human-chain’ surrounding the encampment. Figures 4 through to 7 show a close-up between protesters and Police, protests that took place at parliament, and the kaumatua Joe Hawke speaking with the community.
Figure 3. Police line encircling the Bastion Point occupants. Retrieved from:
https://www.google.co.nz

Figure 4. Close up shot of the Police line. Retrieved from:
https://www.google.co.nz
Figure 5. Police removing a man off the land. Retrieved from:
https://www.google.co.nz

Figure 6. Bastion Point protests on the steps of parliament against Robert Muldoon’s government lead actions. Retrieved from:
https://www.google.co.nz
By 1984, six years after the eviction at Bastion Point, the Waitangi Tribunal heard the Ngāti Whātua o Orakei case, and in 1987 recommended that Takaparawhau be returned to Ngāti Whātua. The years of struggle resulted in the passing of the 1991 Orakei Act that recognised the manawhenua (supreme authority over lands) Ngāti Whātua had over Takaparawhau. The repatriation to this place could finally take place. Figure 8 depicts Takaparawhau (the open green space in the foreground of the photograph) in more recent times. The point stands as an oasis within the Auckland harbour, as most of the land in this area has been subdivided and ‘developed’ as seen in the background of this image.

Figure 8. Modern aerial shot of Takaparawhau. Retrieved from: https://www.google.co.nz
The marae and the gardening project

The marae that are seen in New Zealand today have their origins in the pacific islands (Mead, 2003). Marae are communal spaces for mundane and everyday activities, such as eating and socialising, and also a space for highly ritualised cultural events, such as tangihanga (Māori death ritual), hui (meetings) and weddings (Salmond, 1975; R. Walker, 1990). A marae is a statement of identity, to the extent that, as Mead (2003) argues, it was a requirement for a hapū to have its own marae in order for others to see their social group as a legitimate hapū. Traditionally, the term marae referred to the open space in front of either a meeting house (wharenui) or a chief’s home (Te Awekotuku, 1996). This space is known as the marae ātea (courtyard in front of wharenui), which is where formal oration takes place, and is the domain of Tumatauenga, the god of war and justice (Spoonley, 2009). In a more modern context, the term has come to refer to an entire complex, which can include a large, and often carved, meeting house (wharenui), cooking and sanitary facilities, adjoining lands, gardens, kohanga reo, and other required facilities to facilitate the running of the marae (Mead, 2003; R. Walker, 1990). Marae are the heart of Māori communities and have survived through colonisation and the rapid urbanisation of Māori people. Marae are the “focal point of Māori culture” (R. Walker, 1992, p. 15) that stand as a symbol of Māori resistance to colonial oppression (Mead, 2003), and have served as “beachheads” in revitalising Māori culture and language during the 20th century (R. Walker, 1990).

As many Māori have moved to the cities, marae, which were once purely found in rural areas, have become more numerous in the urban areas. Mead (2003) distinguishes between traditional and urban marae. One of the distinguishable differences is the lack of urupa for urban marae. Furthermore, traditional marae tend to be based on a system of kinship (whakapapa), whereas urban marae can be church based, pan-tribal, or teaching based (R. Walker, 1992). Urban marae face unique difficulties in that the, sometimes, lack of space comes issues of observing the separation of formal events, such as pōwhiri (traditional welcoming ceremony) and
informal events, such as food preparation and eating (Salmond, 1975). However, the core concepts of whanaungatanga (relationships based on shared experience or kinship), manaakitanga, and cultural identities that are associated with traditional marae are still present in urban marae. By in large, marae are run by the whānau and hapū members of the marae, volunteering time where and when they can, and in doing so, this reaffirms their membership in the hapū and to that marae (Mead, 2003; R. Walker, 1992). Or in other words, it is important for a person to be seen, or to have a presence, on the marae on a regular basis.

For the homeless Māori men in my study, their engagement with gardening happened on an urban marae in Auckland. The project itself had its early beginnings from the desire of the Auckland City Mission (ACM) to develop an on-going and meaningful relationship with the local iwi and marae. A significant number of Māori access the ACM and the ACM wanted to establish links with local Māori of Auckland in response. In the quote below, Kauri (pseudonym), an ACM representative, explains how the Streeties gardening project came into being:

“And one of those projects, which again included somebody from Ngāti Whātua, was to work out how could the relationship between the [Auckland] City Mission and Ngāti Whātua develop. And we have already started going to the tree planting days that were held every year up here at Orakei, and I think we’ve done one, possibly two seasons of those tree plantings and had gathered tremendous energy from clients, and some thought “Oh, you know, there’s a garden there, wonder what the possibilities were with that?””

From this question, a dialogue developed between ACM and Ngāti Whātua, which then led to a formal offer of space to the ACM to bring some of the Streeties up to garden. Six years later, when we the researchers first arrived, the gardening project is still going strong.

The gardening project at Orakei marae is an extension of whanaungatanga and manaakitanga to the Streeties. During an interview
with a representative of Ngāti Whātua, it was expressed that by welcoming
the Streeties on their marae to garden, the Streeties were helping the iwi
reclaim and “re-Māorify” a space that had almost been lost to colonial
practices. Matipo (pseudonym), a marae representative, speaking about the
Streeties involvement in the marae gardens:

“They are Māori and this is a marae and they have the reo [Māori
language]... They just felt at home. And they had a place to come to for
their wairua [spirit] and to just be themselves... You know, as a people
[Ngāti Whātu] we could identify with them because we were homeless in
our own land. You know, we had nothing left. We could identify with
them and how they were feeling. We almost got wiped out. So that was
our aroha (love) to them. We couldn’t have it that we owned all of this
and we left them over there... We are giving respect to our ancestors by
helping other people. The manaakitanga that we got from our ancestors
we have to carry that on... They’re in town, but up here they’ve got the
peacefulness. They’re Māori so they know this. They’re part of our
reconciliation of our land.”

This quote reflects a mutual understanding of the importance of having and
maintaining a space (i.e. the marae) that is conducive with a traditional,
cultural way of life. By helping and caring for others, the iwi is able to rebuild
its connection with the land by reproducing cultural values and activities that
reaffirm their identity, honour their ancestors, and assert their manawhenua
over the land. This also retextures the physical space into a culturally
patterned place where Māori can be Māori, resisted colonisation, and further
reproduce cultural practices in everyday life. In this way, the ACM, Ngāti
Whātua, and the Streeties were able to co-create a space that cared for the
people who were a part of the marae scenery.

The Production of Space
Psychologists often treat spaces as backdrops for social interactions or
simple activity settings (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). Work in disciplines
such as sociology, geography, anthropology, philosophy and even Māori studies offer more useful insights. For example, Lefebvre (1974/1991) proposed a more sophisticated, comprehensive and informed conceptualisation of the notion of place and space. Lefebvre (1974/1991) argued that there were three kinds of space: “first, the physical – nature, the Cosmos; secondly, the mental, including logical and formal abstractions; and, thirdly, the social”, which includes “the space of social practice” and “the space occupied by sensory phenomena” (pp. 11-12). This view of space stands in contrast to widely held Cartesian philosophical ideas that underline much of Anglo-American or hegemonic psychology that requires a separation of the physical and mental (Hung, 1997). On the Cartesian view, the only spaces we can conceive of are the external world and the private realm of thought. Any other spaces would simply fall under ‘physical’ or ‘mental’ space as a kind of sub-category.

The differences with Lefebvre’s notion of space are twofold: first, he recognises a third kind of space (social space); and second, his three spaces are not separate, nor independent from each other, they interrelate and influence each other. Tilley (1994) argued that we should regard space as a “medium rather than a container for action” (p. 11) and that space and action cannot be separated from each other as they are interdependent. What this means for the presented research is that with the opening up and acknowledging of a new kind of space comes the possibility of exploring other spaces that are traditional unseen in mainstream academic spheres that are unique to a given social group. For example, within the Māori world, Durie’s (1994) Whare Tapa Wha and Pere’s (1997) Te Wheke models provide insight to the spaces Māori occupy as emplaced, cultural beings. These models speak to a more sophisticated understanding of space than the Cartesian mind-body division of spaces can offer, and stands to better reflect the lived realities of Māori, as these models are derived from within Māori systems of knowledge.

Space does not come ready-made, nor is it static, nor unchanging. Lefebvre (1974/1991) holds that space is something that is produced and reproduced through day-to-day practices of individuals, cultural rituals,
community, and societal expectations. Or in other words, it is socially constructed through everyday social interactions and the practices of dwellers. As pointed out by Molotch (1993), researchers have paid much attention in examining the social nature of manufactured goods as products, but space itself, as a product, has been largely ignored. Molotch's critique does seem to be applicable to US orientated fields of positivist psychology that lacks an appreciation of the importance of space. However, other fields, such as human geography, anthropology and sociology, have been studying the production of space in sophisticated ways, of which social psychology is beginning to follow (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). This required me to read outside of my trained discipline, being psychology, and explore other fields that can offer insight into space and the way it is produced / reproduced. The severity of my disciplinary ignorance towards the notion of space is no minor issue. As Lefebvre puts it: “the production of space has nothing incidental about it: it is a matter of life and death” (1974/1991, p. 417), and for Ngāti Whātua, as pointed out in Chief’s quote, his iwi’s very identity as a people was at stake when they occupied Takaparawhau. Colonisers not only sought to control the physical space of Takaparawhau, but they also sought to control the social aspects of that space, for example, “the sort of reality that it constitutes” (Molotch, 1993, p. 888). Takaparawhau was not just a location where the people of Ngāti Whātua just happened to be, it was one of the last remaining spaces where a traditional cultural way of life could be practiced. Thus, eviction had the potential to lose more than just the land; it could have been a loss of identity, culture, and mana.

For Lefebvre (1974/1991), genuine knowledge of space must examine and critique the production of space, and not merely accept space as a ‘given’ and focus on the particular things that can be found in that given space. However, the methodological approach to this proposed form of inquiry is not a straightforward one. Merrifield (1993) suggests that a dialectic approach that extends the work of Lefebvre and that focuses on the internal relationships of all things mediated in space is paramount in understanding the nature of place and space itself. The dialectic approach is characterised as emphasising “process, movement, flow, relations, and contradictions” and
that assumed within this approach is the idea of ‘totality’ (Merrifield, 1993, p. 517). Lefebvre (1968) discussed the concept of totality as a consideration of the internal relationships between the individual parts that make up the whole. Or in other words, researchers cannot continue to view things like space, culture, people, artefacts, and identity as individual, separate, and unrelated entities. Rather, they need to acknowledge these as interconnected, interwoven, and interdependent. This reflects the Māori concept of pūtahi, whereby aspects of the world are not broken down into smaller components of sorts, rather, they are viewed within the larger context in which they are situated (Ritchie, 1992). Tilley (1994) proposed that due to the complex nature of space, we are unable to specify a precise step-by-step methodological approach to understand space; what is needed is a “continuous dialectic between ideas and empirical research” (p. 11). Furthermore, because different social groups interact, understand, and produce spaces differently, the search for universality that covers all social produced spaces will, more than likely, turn out to be an unfruitful endeavour.

Research process
As this study was carried out utilising a group-approach to research, each team member’s initial involvement began at different times, and to different extents. This group, or research team, was made up of researchers from both the University of Waikato and the ACM. My first point of contact with the homeless Māori men (or Streeties), the Auckland City Mission and Ngāti Whātua was during a pōwhiri at Saint Matthew’s church, central Auckland on the 24th of August 2012. The pōwhiri is a highly ritualised ceremony between the home people, in this case the Ngati Whatua, ACM and the Streeties, and we as researchers from the Maori & Psychology Research Unit (MPRU). The pōwhiri is a process to welcome people and show hospitality. It is also a process of connecting people through whakapapa or common kaupapa (matter of discussion or topic).

Members of Ngāti Whātua, the ACM, and the Streeties hosted the welcoming where formal protocols and customs were observed, such as the
whaikorero (formal oration), waiata (song used to lift the sacredness of the orator), and hongi (a pressing of the noses to symbolise the breath of life). A particular aspect of the pōwhiri that stood out for me was the adept level in which the Streeties delivered their whaikorero and accompanied waiata. This broke down the previous notions of homelessness that I had, as when within the Māori world, these men are not characterised by notions of homelessness, but by their abilities to walk proficiently within the Māori world. After the sharing of words came the hākari, which served as a way for connections to be made through conversations, reciting of whakapapa and tribal links, and general rapport building. Following the pōwhiri, members of the MPRU, of which my thesis research resides, from the University of Waikato made a presentation on another project. This presentation served two functions. One was to introduce who we were as researchers and the second was to showcase the type of research we have completed with Māori communities. As a result of this initial pōwhiri, we were all invited to spend time with Ngāti Whātua and the Streeties at the Orakei marae gardens. This became the central point for our data collection.

My thesis sits within a larger research project investigating the relational notions of Māori men’s health lead by Mr Mohi Rua and Prof Darrin Hodgetts of the MPRU and funded by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga over two years (2012-2014). This larger project addresses the crucial gap in research by studying the everyday lives and positive relationships of Māori men in the context of men’s health. Mohi and Darrin are also my thesis supervisors and below is a ‘stock-take’ of the ‘tools’ that each member of the research team contributed in constructing our methodological approach.

Professor Darrin Hodgetts worked with Mohi Rua to design the research project. Darrin has worked with the ACM on a range of projects for over 10 years, and his existing relationships formed the basis for our access to the gardening project. Darrin is of Kai Tahu decent, but culturally is primarily Pākehā. He has interacted with older Māori men all his life in terms of whānau, friends from childhood, time in the army and through joint research. Darrin is an international expert on homelessness and place-focused, participative and ethnographic research methods.
Mohi Rua was raised in the Māori world and worked with Māori communities all his life. His whakapapa connections are to Ngai Tūhoe and Ngati Awa of Mataatua waka (canoe) and Ngati Whakaue of Te Arawa waka. Mohi has a particular interest in the psychological aspirations and needs of Māori as well as indigenous psychology. He is a community psychologist by training. His research interests relate to community psychology, social psychology, indigenous psychology, Māori psychology, culture, heritage and language. His PhD is in the area of men’s health with a particular focus on Māori men’s health. Mohi is a senior lecturer in the School of Psychology at the University of Waikato.

Tom Roa is of Waikato-Maniapoto descent, trained as a schoolteacher with further academic leanings toward history, linguistics, and translation in the Māori-English contexts. Tom’s early upbringing was in the Māori communities of the Waikato and King Country bringing a native fluency in Te Reo Māori (the Māori language). Tom’s tertiary education was undertaken at Victoria University of Wellington, the University of Waikato, and Auckland College of Education, which impacted on his former roles as a teacher and administrator in pre-school, secondary, and tertiary institutions, and as a cultural mediator in Māori and Pākehā contexts. Tom is currently a Senior Lecturer at the University of Waikato and is a significant kaikorero (orator) and leader in the Ngati Maniapoto rohe (area or region).

Associate Professor Linda Waimarie Nikora is the director of the MPRU at the University of Waikato and has been working at the University since 1989. She is of Ngai Tuhoe and Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti descent and has spent much time working within Māori communities. Linda has expert experience in the areas of indigenous and kaupapa Māori research, culture, change, resilience and Māori development, and was involved in writing the 2002 Code of Ethics for psychologists in New Zealand.

Professor Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (Te Arawa, Tūhoe, Waikato) grew up in a family of traditional storytellers, weavers, and singers in Ohinemutu, Rotorua. Her undergraduate and masterate degrees were in English Literature, Art History and Anthropology. She completed her PhD in Psychology 1981; *The Sociocultural Impact of Tourism on the Te Arawa People*
of Rotorua, New Zealand. She has written two collections of creative fiction and many scholarly works published locally and internationally. Her work in the heritage sector has been as a curator, lecturer, critic and governor. She is the principal author of the major award winning *Mau Moko: the World of Maori Tattoo*. She professes at the University of Waikato, where she currently co-leads a large research team on the Māori ways of death, grief, and dying. Ngahuia's role is to mentor and guide the research team and collaborative writing and presentation activities.

Wilf Holt is of Kai Tahu decent and has been involved in social work since the early 80's. He is also trained in family therapy and counselling techniques having worked with a wide variety of clients specialising in sex offenders, domestic violence and conflict resolution issues. Wilf is currently the Team Leader of the Homeless Community Team at ACM. He is also a Deacon in the Anglican Church and has extensive knowledge concerning marginalised people and in particular rough sleepers. Wilf is committed in addressing the needs of homeless Māori and is a member of the New Zealand Coalition to End Homelessness (NZCEH) Māori Caucus and has been involved with the organisation since its inception.

Tiniwai (Chas) Te Whetu is a co-researcher on the larger research project with an expertise in the cultural knowledge of te ao Māori. He was raised in Tūhoe, deeply immersed in cultural practices, and is a native speaker of te reo Māori. Tiniwai was a Senior Corrections Officer for the Department of Corrections and registered social worker. He had worked for the Department of Justice as a cultural advisor. Other roles in the Department of Corrections include providing professional supervision, undertaking generic Probation Officer work, 'Kaiwhakahaere' (assisting colleagues integrate Tikanga Māori as an alternative method of Supervising clients). He is a current member of the Tūhoe Fisheries Charitable Trust, which is to administer Tūhoe’s fisheries assets for the long-term benefit of current and future Tūhoe generations. Tiniwai is also a respected kaumātua within Tūhoe.

I am Pita King and I am a 26 year old Masters student with tribal links to Te Rarawa and Ngāpuhi. My academic training has been in community
psychology, qualitative research, and analytic philosophy. I was raised in a bi-cultural family that embraced Māori and Pākehā values, customs, concepts, and identities. I was able to bring a conversational level of te reo Māori when engaging with people at Orakei marae.

The participants in my research were all Māori men who lead a transient life between being housed and homeless in central Auckland. They have a strong relationship with Kauri (pseudonym), who is a representative of the ACM that works closely with the Streeties, and the ACM. In coordination with ACM and Orakei marae of Ngāti Whātua, a gardening project specific to these guys was launched over six years ago and continues to this day. Participants were not ‘recruited’ for this research in the traditional sense of the word, rather, a process of negotiating a relationship with the people of the ACM, Orakei marae and the Streeties characterised our approach to gaining their participation. We made weekly visits to the gardens between October 2012 and April 2013, where at least one or two, if not all of us were present. Our first visit to the gardens was on the 19th of October 2012. This marked the beginning of an on-going process of building rapport and relationships. We introduced ourselves, again to those who we had met from the initial pōwhiri at Saint Mathews Church, and to the more recent arrivals to the garden activities. The marae staff took us on a tour of the garden. As we walked around both the marae staff and the Streeties narrated the meaning of the space, how things had come into being, and future aims and objectives of the gardening project.

During my time at the garden, I got to know the marae personnel and Streeties on a more personal level with discussions about politics, rugby, school, tikanga Māori, whakapapa, gardening, and of course, kai. These discussions were generally held during the Streeties’ lunch breaks from their gardening activities. It was also during our lunch breaks where I would talk about our research and their potential involvement as participants. I would discuss the project, its purpose and potential implications toward responding to street homelessness. Their contribution was vital. These discussions occurred over a period of months. All the while the Streeties were teaching me how to garden. As a researcher I would garden with the men, have lunch,
talk, socialise and gain their trust. I never pushed for an interview. I went at their pace and let them decide when it was okay to talk about their lives as Streeties. In the meantime I simply attended and became part of their gardening crew. One crucial element of our gardening participation was providing lunch and sharing with the Streeties. They would bring their lunch from the ACM and we would take ours. Part of the Māori world is to take food along and share with others (Mead, 2003), so as researchers we always ensured we had food to share with the participants. Often these were large meals to show our appreciation of the time given by the Streeties. In the Māori world it is customary to provide as much food as possible under the auspices of manaakitanga. Your mana is enhanced by your ability to provide for others. Each visit we made to the gardens developed relationships further, and more information surrounding the nature of my research was shared and understood.

Most of the time I spent in the early visits consisted of manual labour in the gardens themselves, digging holes, clearing weeds, and planting. I took the lead from matua (term of endearment toward male elder) Tiniwai in terms of my interactions with the Streeties. This was because he is a kaumātua and has expert cultural knowledge of te ao Māori. He guided my actions, pointing out the appropriate ways of doing things while in the garden. Involving ourselves in their day-to-day activities in the garden was a necessary step in the research process. Matua Tiniwai was of similar age to the Streeties and was respected by the Streeties as a result of his cultural status. His presence also meant we were culturally accepted into their space. There were many conversations that I was privy to with the Streeties that only took place because the status and mana that matua Tiniwai held. In that space, the Streeties and matua Tiniwai recognised each other’s mana as kaumātua, which was an invaluable aspect of my research. Only after we had spent genuine time with the people in the space of the marae could we take the next step in negotiating their involvement in formal interviews, which is outlined in the following sections.

Towards the end of the research process (ending formal involvement with the marae gardening project), members of Ngati Whatua, the Streeties,
and marae staff were invited out for a day’s fishing by the research team. This was a continuation of the reciprocity that had been extended to us by those involved with the marae gardening project, and was our way of showing our appreciation for the time, conversations, and experiences we had while in the marae gardens. Figure 9 depicts a fishing trip that the Streeties, Ngāti Whātua and the research teams took at the conclusion of our fieldwork. Darrin noted that because of this act of reciprocity towards the Streeties and Ngāti Whātua, higher ranking members of Ngāti Whātua were more welcoming to our research goals by reciprocating their thoughts and ideas to our project. This demonstrates the true value of genuine engagement with people within the research process through acts of reciprocity.

![Figure 9. Group fishing trip.](image)

**Interviews, field notes & photography**

We employed the use of semi-structured interview techniques that covered broad areas of interest in the interview process (Breakwell, Hammond, Fife-Schaw, & Smith, 2006). As there were three groups involved (Ngāti Whātua, the ACM, and the Streeties), the topics of conversations for each group varied according to their role in the research. Interview questionnaires were used to guide the interviews (see Appendix A and B) and were adapted during the research process in order to accommodate each interviewee’s unique
perspective. Interviews were treated more like conversations than a question / answer-based interaction, although I did have specific areas of discussion I wanted covered for my thesis. This allowed the participants to contribute to the topics of discussion, leading us into important areas of interest that were not pre-identified in our interview schedule (Dahlberg & McCaig, 2010), such as extra activities outside of the gardens, and non-ACM visits to the gardens on the guys own time. This had a profoundly rich effect on the quality of the information gathered, and on participants’ ability to articulate their views, perceptions, and experiences.

All interviews with the Streeties were conducted kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face) on Orakei marae. Each participant was interviewed individually, primarily by one member of the research team, but sometimes with multiple members of the team. All interviews we conducted with a mix of Māori and English language. Some participants were more comfortable speaking Māori, so fluent speakers of the research team conducted those interviews (Tiniwai and Mohi). Two of the Streeties held a high cultural status among their peers so our kaumātua Tiniwai as a cultural equivalent conducted those interviews. This was important for cultural reasons, and also for methodological reasons, as someone of my age and limited understanding of te reo Māori could not capture the quality of account that Tiniwai and Mohi did. I also conducted interviews with a representative of the ACM and one of the younger Streeties, although she was still twice my age.

From the beginning of the research project, each member of the research team kept a reflective journal that documented the events that took place during our time spent with the Streeties as well as things of significant meaning or interest during these engagements. After each site visit with the participants, team members would complete their journal entry and share it with the rest of the team. This sharing of reflections prompted further investigation as each team member picked up on and documented the same visit with the Streeties in different ways. Similarities and differences could be compared and contrasted, gaps in one person’s reflections could be filled with someone else’s, and information that was collected or interpreted
incorrectly could be refined. One of the benefits to keeping a journal like this is that not only could I record events, being reflective allowed me to also record the way I understood those events (Dahlberg & McCaig, 2010). On a subtler note, reflective journaling allowed us to access the in-between-ness of formalised data collection, a place where a large amount of our rationale was discussed, scrutinised, and developed. This important aspect of our research as it is a method of documenting highly informal, semi-structured, and what sometimes initial seem like quite trivial conversations, but later once de-familiarised prove more profound. For example, one day, Tōtara (pseudonym) took us to see his watercress patch. On the surface this seems trivial, but in respects to building a relationship of trust with the Streeties, this moment was rather profound, as his watercress was kept private from most people in the garden. The sharing of such as significant place of his with us as researchers signalled the level of trust and rapport that had been achieved.

Photography was also used to document garden activities and allowed us to capture and illustrate features of the space, associated practices, and relationships in play. This allowed me to capture and communicate meaning-making processes that cannot be fully articulated through the sole use of verbal and written texts, or as Henwood, Shirani, and Finn (2011) refer to it as a “different modality of meaning” (p. 330). The use of visual methods, such as photography, can improve research into the everyday lives of people by capturing realities that sometimes go ignored or unnoticed by researchers (Hodgetts, Chamberlain, & Groot, 2011). All members of the research team would photograph the day’s events as and when they could. Part of our koha (gift) back to the Streeties was a photographic compilation of our time with them and the growth of the garden (see Appendix C).

**Participants**

Eight people were formally interviewed in this study, along with another six who engaged in casual conversations that also added to the picture we were building about the garden and the people that participated in it. Those formally interviewed came from three distinct groups: the ACM, Ngāti
Whātua, and the Streeties participating in the gardening project. Wilf Holt was the team leader for the Homeless Community Service/Drop-In and had worked with us on the set up of this research project. Wilf helped form the relationship between the Mission and Orakei marae, and provided on-going support to enable the Streeties to have continuous involvement in the gardening project, such as transport and providing kai. Karaka (pseudonym) and Matipo were members of Ngāti Whātua and closely related to Joe Hawke whom I mentioned earlier lead the Bastion Point occupation. They held key roles in the day-to-day running of Orakei marae with Karaka holding a co-ordinators role of the garden. In particular, the marae gardens, native seedling nursery, and other community gardens in the area. For the Streeties, detailed personal backgrounds are provided below.

Tōtara was a 69-year-old man with links to the Tauranga-moana area. In his youth, he spent much of his time honing his skills on the rugby field. As a young adult, he made his living working for a number of regional power boards. After the company he was working for was privatised, he was made redundant and lost his job. Coupled with an expensive gambling habit and a lack of savings, Tōtara found himself on the streets of Auckland. To date, he has spent over 20 years moving about, pitching tents, and building shelters wherever he can find a place for himself and his dogs to live. He still maintained contact with his whānau while on the streets also making trips from Auckland to Tauranga-moana. Tōtara spent two years at University studying te reo Māori, but found it difficult to continue his studies as the teaching methods were moving more towards online / internet based learning; a contemporary approach to teaching te reo Māori which he found difficult. Tōtara was one of the original Streeties to take part in the gardening project from its conception. In this space, he is referred to as a leader, and many of the people, including other Streeties, previous Periodic Detention (PD) supervisors and Ngāti Whātua, call him koro (term of endearment towards a male elder).

Rātā (pseudonym) is a 56-year-old Māori man with links to Tūhoe. He is one of 11 children in his family and grew up fluent in te reo Māori. He came to Auckland in 2012 to find work and make a new life for himself. Rātā
struggled to find work, and on one occasion was turned away because of his appearance. He spent three years staying at a night shelter and sleeping rough. With the assistance of a social worker, he was able to find accommodation, but like many of the men, still found it hard to provide the things he needed in the city, and relied on the ACM for support. He also spent a lot of time on the streets and sleeping out with other gardeners, Tōtara in particular. Rātā became involved with the gardening project out of interest, just to see what it was all about. He grew up in a gardening family and enjoyed being able to continue this practice with the other Streeties.

Miro (pseudonym) was a 53-year-old Māori man with links to Tūhoe. After the passing of his parents and some personal issues at home, he moved to Auckland by himself. Similar to Rātā, the high cost of living in Auckland compared to his rural life contributed to his move on the streets. Prior to living on the streets, Miro was often left with very little money after living costs and rent payments were made. While living in temporary accommodation, Miro accessed assistance from the ACM, in terms of food and clothing, but this was not enough to fully sustain him. When he first came to Auckland, Miro spent his first month on the streets by himself, before developing links with some of the other Streeties at the ACM. In total, he spent about four months sleeping rough. Through the links made at the ACM, Miro became involved with the gardening project. Miro has children and family in Tūhoe who he keeps in regular contact with via Facebook and telephone. He also completed a te reo course at a tertiary education institution while in Auckland.

Kanuka (pseudonym) is a 49-year-old Māori man with links to te Tai Tokerau (the Northland region of New Zealand). He has lived in most parts of Auckland, moving from place-to-place, both in residential housing and sleeping rough. Kanuka had little contact with whānau, but is kept updated on events that require him to return home, such as tangihanga. He became involved with the gardening project through the ACM, and his main responsibility at the gardens is as the cook. Kanuka was brought up gardening with his whānau and understands conversations in te reo Māori, but considers himself a learner in terms of conversing himself.
Kōwhai (pseudonym) was a 53-year-old transgender Māori man / woman with links to te Tai Tokerau. She was placed under foster care at a young age, moving from home-to-home, but spent most of her time on a homestead with 14 other children. In her adult years, Kōwhai has lived intermittently in residential dwellings and on the streets since 1975. Her current state of homelessness resulted from a robbery of her prior residence. After this experience, she did not want to return to this home and could not find another place that had a bond that she could afford, so she returned to the streets. Kōwhai was involved with the ACM and sits as a committee member to take the concerns of other Streeties to meetings held at the ACM. Kōwhai became part of the gardening project at the latter stages of our involvement with the project after taking up an invitation to join from Miro.

Among the many people I met in the marae gardens, there was one person in particular that, unfortunately, was not formally interviewed, but contributed significantly to the gardens. Rimu (pseudonym) links into the marae through his sister who married a man from Ngāti Whātua. He spends his time at the marae as a jack-of-all-trades. Figure 10 depicts the Barbeque Rimu built with spare materials that he found lying around the marae. This is just one of the many examples of work that Rimu donates to the Streeties and the project in his spare time.

Figure 10. A koha to the gardening project.
Ethical considerations

Ethical approval for this research was granted by the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee, School of Psychology, at the University of Waikato, under the Aue ha! Māori men’s relationship health project. The Code of Ethics for Psychologists working in Aotearoa / New Zealand (Code of Ethics Review Group, 2002) were observed to inform our research approach so that data could be collected in a way that kept both the research team and the participants as safe as possible. This Code of Ethics stressed the importance of respect for the dignity of persons and people, responsible caring, integrity in relationships, and social justice and responsibility to society. As this research had a Māori focus, further ethical considerations were made that acknowledged culturally specific ways of being. This included the recognition of Māori cultural values, beliefs, and worldviews as a legitimate source of knowledge (S. Walker, Eketone, & Gibbs, 2006), autonomy over knowledge that influences the lives of Māori (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002), and the right for Māori people and communities to benefit from research to achieve positive social change (Hudson, Milne, Reynolds, Russell, & Smith, 2010).

Minimising the risk of harm was a key feature of our approach to this research. Participation in the research was voluntary with verbal invitations extended to potential participants during the time we spent at the gardens. Informed consent prior to interviews was obtained (see Appendix D). This involved verbally explaining the nature of the research with each participant, and providing an information sheet that contained a detailed outline of our research, their rights as a participant, and contact information of the research team and the University if they had any concerns (see Appendix E). Assurances were made, both verbally and in writing, that their identity would be protected and that they were free to withdraw their involvement in the research at anytime without penalty or personal loss. Verbal consent was requested to record at the beginning of each interview using an audio device. It was made clear to each participant that the raw data they provided us would be viewed exclusively by members of the research team. Furthermore, all written materials, publications, and presentations would conceal their
identity with the use of pseudonyms and the removal of identifying information.

**Analysis process**

In the philosophy of science, there have predominantly been two forms of reasoning that has been employed to extend and create knowledge, that is, deductive reasoning, which attempts to provide an argument to certainty, and inductive reasoning, which only result in a conclusion being more likely (Hung, 1997), such as frequency of observation or statistical significance. The use of deductive reasoning was inappropriate in the presented research as it deals with *laws of nature* and argument to certainty (Hempel, 1965); this method is associated predominantly with the physical sciences, including experimental psychology, and would be inappropriate as a foundation of reasoning in this research. Strangely within mainstream psychology, this ruling out of deductive reasoning has left inductive methods as the ‘seemingly’ default approach, posing a limited choice for researchers’ preferred method of reasoning. In examining the merits of inductive reasoning, it was also deemed inappropriate as a start point for analysis in this study as it is reliant on statistical data and the frequency of observed phenomena within a given social group (Douven, 2011). Furthermore, it tends to measure phenomena, without necessarily understanding it. Assumed within both these methods of reasoning is pre-existing knowledge in order for knowledge claims to be made, for example, the premises used to arrive at a particular conclusion were not inductively or deductively inferred, rather, they came from somewhere else, such as cultural or social institutions. By ignoring abductive ways of working, we run the risk of allowing “Trojan ideas” to work their way into analysis, constraining what we are able to do and see as researchers. For example, when I took methods courses in my undergraduate studies, I could see how those methods would work in Pākehā society, because the underlying values in the research design were the same as the values in Pākehā society, such as quick introductions and then straight to business. However, when I considered researchers doing this within Māori communities, I do not think that they would get very far at
all. This is because the production of knowledge can be seen as a tool of colonisation, of which the term ‘research’ within Māori communities can be viewed with strong aversion (Smith, 1999), even when Māori are conducting the research.

As pointed out by Tilley (1994), I am unable to specify a precise step-by-step methodological approach to understanding this space and the experiences of participants who interact there. This has required me to act as a bricolage. According to Kincheloe (2005) the bricolage embraces a multidisciplinary approach to research and analysis in a way that we “actively construct our research methods from the tools at hand rather than passively receiving the “correct,” universally applicable methodology” (p. 324). My data collection occurred within a larger research team lead by my supervisors and this approach enabled us to formulate a customised methodological approach that recognised the uniqueness of Takaparawhau as a space, its cultural and colonial history, and the day-to-day practices that were enacted there. Recognising the particular sets of skills and experiences the research team possessed (as outlined earlier) allowed us to engage in vast areas of knowledge that are otherwise inaccessible by pre-existing methodological guidelines. Kincheloe (2005) argued for the merits of the bricolage as the imposition of traditional systematic methodological approaches to largely unknown structures produces data that reflects the theoretical assumptions of the approach, rather than genuine insight into the complexities of that structure. The approach our research took is similar to the points made by Smith’s (1999) seminal work on decolonising methodologies. She highlights the inappropriateness of standard research methods in Māori communities and offers insights into more appropriate ways of engaging.

Thus, within this research, I worked abductively as a bricolage. Blaikie, (2004) argues that the use of inductive and deductive methods comes into play much later during analysis; only after abductive reasoning has taken place. We regarded abduction as the “logic used to construct descriptions and explanations that are grounded in the everyday activities of social actors” (Blaikie, 2004, p. 1). Abduction embraces creativity,
imagination, and ingenuity. Throughout the course of social science, some researchers have theorised out the way knowledge and meaning is abductively created in everyday life by imposing contrived and artificial modes of reasoning that are arguably less able to reflect the social realities in which people are situated.

Thus, an *abductive thematic analysis* was conducted on the interview transcripts, summaries, and reflective journal entries. Thematic analysis is generally characterised as a process of identifying themes and patterns within each of the participants’ accounts to compare and contrast differences and similarities on the whole (Breakwell et al., 2006). Braun and Clark (2006) argue that there are two distinct ways that a thematic analysis can be conducted, for example, a theoretical thematic analysis and an inductive thematic analysis. The former is driven by the researcher’s theoretical or analytic considerations with the goal of answering specific questions by categorising data into a preconceived coding system. Whereas the latter is data driven, where themes are generated by how they reflect the data itself, not merely the researcher’s theoretical interests or assumptions. Consequently, I employed the *bricolage* to create a ‘makeshift’ *abductive thematic analytical* tool to explore the empirical materials generated at the garden. The key point of difference of an *abductive* verses an *inductive thematic analysis* is that inductive analyses take place after data is collected in a pre-scripted manner. Whereas an *abductive thematic analysis* acknowledges the multiple levels of analysis that directly and indirectly take place from the moment research has begun.

A necessary feature of documenting this on-going process of analysis was the reflective journals of the research team, as the journal itself provides empirical material for analysis as well as comprising a necessary step in our analytic process. The journals aided me in making meaning of practices and relationships occurring at the garden as the research was being conducted, and helped with the identification and exploration of key issues that were investigated in subsequent engagements with the Streeties (Dahlberg & McCaig, 2010).
As my research incorporates ethnographic techniques, incorporating Māori cultural values into my research design allowed an interpretation of data that more accurately reflects the lived experiences of Māori than mainstream methods can offer (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Leggat-Cook, 2011). This kind of ethnographic work encourages participants to actively construct research data with the researcher. For example, the men at the gardens are considered kaumātua and are very knowledgeable in their tribal ways. In this traditional Māori space on the marae, as kaumātua they are respected elders and knowledgeable in culture despite their current circumstances. I however am not, contrary to what my social science training and tertiary level qualifications have taught me. As a student, we are often taught that research is a lineal process where analysis occurs after data collection though the journaling ensured analysis occurred simultaneous to the data collection process and they both informed each other.

Once the interviews were completed, the team transcribed the interviews so that all members of the team had access to the accounts. Many of those interviewed used both English and te reo Māori that was then later translated by research team member. One interview was conducted entirely in te reo Māori. After we compiled all the research materials for analysis, the team went through a number of stages that identified prominent themes and patterns, drawing on both Western and Māori concepts. These stages include any point where the data was discussed, such as meetings, conversations, emails, presentations, and so on. The main themes that emerged from my analysis are presented in the following findings chapter.
Chapter Three: Analysis

My analysis is presented in seven sections that document the Streeties’ gardening activities within the socio-cultural space of the marae. First, I outline the early beginnings of the gardening project to provide an account of the rationale and intentions behind the project itself. I then discuss the importance of the marae as a space of care within a broader landscape of despair. The concepts of identity and being-in-the-world are examined to shed light on the way the sense of self and cultural identity are reconstructed by the Streeties on the marae. I then examine how food functions as way of re-connecting and re-enacting socio-cultural practices, and conceptualise gardening as an everyday activity that stabilises lives of disruption. Next, I explore how the Streeties create a sense of belonging and ownership through engaging with the marae gardening project. Finally, how the gardening project addresses issues of social distancing is considered. It is important that the individual themes of this chapter are not seen as separate, isolated themes. Rather, each theme contributes to the totality of understanding through the consideration of internal relationships (Lefebvre, 1968). Thus, many of the themes speak to overlapping points, but are analysed using different theoretical frameworks.

Turning the soil: the beginning of the gardens

From the ACM’s perspective, the gardening project as a connection between Ngāti Whātua and the ACM had its early beginnings following the death of Sir Hugh Kawharu in 2006. Sir Hugh, a paramount chief of Ngāti Whātua, was described as crucial link between the ACM and Ngāti Whātua, and with his death, a void soon grew between these two entities. As part of the Committee for Auckland’s Legacy Projects (Future Leaders Project), a proposal was put forward to address this void to reconnect and maintain an on-going and meaningful relationship between the ACM and the people of Ngāti Whātua. An ACM representative explains:

“We were adamant that if there was to be a relationship develop, that it would be a relationship that was built on a mutual respect for
each other, and the relationship would reflect genuine feelings that both Ngāti Whātua and the Mission had for each other, other than just having them there, you know, when we wanted to welcome the governor general or whatever” (Kauri).

Kauri went into more detail within the interview noting that the Ngāti Whātua had had a presence in the Auckland area for hundreds of years, and would continue for many more years to come. Because of this persistence across time, the kind of relationship that the ACM desired was long term in nature, characterised by meaningful and genuine engagement. The relationship should extend beyond Ngāti Whātua providing a cultural presence for dignitaries.

A Ngāti Whātua leader attended a ‘sleep over’ night with the ACM to learn about life on the streets. This resulted in conversations lead by Ngāti Whātua on how they could contribute to ACM and homelessness. After these conversations, the Streeties became involved with Ngāti Whātua’s community planting days that were held each year. This served as the initial contact between Ngāti Whātua and the Streeties that would later become known as ‘the Mission gardening club’. Food was shamelessly used as an incentive to engaging the Streeties in the marae planting days, but as a marae staff member recounts, and despite the circumstances of the Streeties, food did not appear to be the priority.

“It really wasn’t about the food at all. That was just their kind of excuse for it, they actually just like coming. Some of them were coming up by themselves and just starting to plant. And then when the season is finished, they had a meeting with the Mission, Ngāti Whātua, and they sat down and said, “oh, can we just keep coming every week”, they want to come every week.” (Tawa – marae staff member).

Time spent at the marae was more than planting and food. It took the Streeties away from their daily struggles and engaged them in something
they would not otherwise be able to on the streets. Nickasch and Marnocha (2009) argue that for homeless people, the daily struggle for food and shelter can consume so much time and energy that time for oneself is rarely available. This is what the initial planting days seemed to do for the Streeties. With each successive year, the planting days became more of an event for the Streeties and they would bring their friends along. This event gathered energy, created momentum and enthusiasm that lead to discussions between the ACM and Ngāti Whātua about setting up a long-term role for the Streeties on the marae. A marae staff member reflects:

“They [Mission staff] wanted to make connections that were going to be long lasting and have an impact. And one of the things, that my understanding was, that there’s quite a separate world between streeties and the rest of everybody else living in Auckland. So how do you get people back together? And so they [the Streeties] started coming up to Bastion Point, with Ngāti Whātua, as part of a community-planting day. And Ngāti Whātua already have a MOU [memorandum of understanding], relationship with ACM. But I think it was a lot at the consultation meeting, board sort of level of things. But there was not a lot happening, actually, on the ground.” (Tawa)

This gap between the boardroom and the coalface was bridged when Ngāti Whātua made a formal offer of land to the ACM so that the Streeties could come to the marae and start a gardening plot. Kauri (ACM representative) recalls that first day after everyone had turned the soil:

“We [members of the ACM] just put the shovels on the ground, looked at those six and said “it’s yours, take it from here” turned our backs, walked away, got on to the bus and the cars, went home, and left that six there, and they’ve been here, well there’s been a group here ever since.”
Important here is how homeless people are offered autonomy and a level of control over the gardening process. By walking away and leaving the homeless men to garden, ACM staff offered the Streeties a sense of autonomy and responsibility. ACM staff remained involved, but at a distance to ensure the Streeties were able to create their own space. To this point I have invoked a process of organisation and support, or the back room and participation in the garden, or the front room where the men garden. On the marae, there is a process of observation and participation within tribal life that starts from a young age, continues to into the later years, and the attainment of this learning equips one to fill leadership roles once particular elders have passed (Rangihau, 1992). The Streeties, being born into this system, recognise the daily running of the marae, and support the marae in minor roles (such as general cleaning and kitchen work), and also in more major roles (such as during formal cultural rituals).

Once the daily task of finding appropriate shelter and food is met, there can sometimes be large amounts of time to find something productive or fulfilling to do. Within the city, the Streeties commented on the role activities, such as attending the library, or going fishing had in occupying their day. Borchard (2010) argues that homeless people’s participation in recreational activities are sometimes viewed by members of the general public as contributing to a person’s state of homelessness, without recognising the human need to pursue enjoyable things for enjoyment’s sake. Or in other words, there is misconception within the general public that homeless people should not be taking part in recreational activities; they should be looking for work, accommodation, or doing something proactive about changing their state of homelessness. For the Streeties, the combination of gardening as a familiar activity and the need to fill time with something meaningful resulted in the marae gardening project being viewed as a worthwhile initiative to take part in. Furthermore, it allows the Streeties to seek enjoyment in their lives for enjoyment’s sake. Kanuka explains the role of the gardens as a Streetie:
“It’s something to do really. You’ve got a choice, you can follow the programme, which is, the government will want you to go to WINZ [Work and Income New Zealand], and if you want to go on the benefit or the dole, you’ve got to go do these courses. If you want to do that, it’s your choice. I don’t do that. Places like this [the gardens], you get a free feed. They’ve got everything here I want, need. So this is what I do. Because otherwise you got to go do what they tell you to do.”

Kanuka’s quote speaks to an alternative to a system, as the current one does not seem to work for him. Due to factors such as having to reveal personal, and sometime hurtful experiences, on multiple occasions to social service providers, navigating institutions like WINZ can sometimes be a dehumanising endeavour for people (Hodgetts et al., 2013). The garden provides a place of freedom where Kanuka fills his days with ordinary, everyday activities that brings him enjoyment. Interestingly, Kanuka does not actually participate in the task of gardening itself while out at the marae. He refers to himself as ‘the cook’ and spends his time at the gardens preparing and cooking food for everyone, and then later cleans up once everyone else goes back to gardening after lunch. In this regard, Kanuka plays a role in supporting the continuity of the gardening project by enacting concepts of whanaungatanga and manaakitanga, which are central concepts within te ao Māori (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Leggat-Cook, 2011).

In becoming part of the marae landscape, the Streeties have contributed to the texturing of this space, with the gardens standing as a physical manifestation of their place on the marae that reaffirms their identity as Māori. Figure 11 depicts an empty field behind the marae gardens that shows what the garden was like prior to the Streeties’ arrival. Figure 12 shows how that space has been transformed into the garden I came to know during my research. Much of the produce is gifted to ACM’s food bank.
It was not unusual for the Streeties’ to occupy roles and responsibilities outside of the gardens. There are times when the Streeties will be asked to provide cultural support and expertise for the marae. This could vary from prestigious roles on the paepae (orator’s seating space) during pōwhiri to ringa wera (kitchen / dinning hall worker) roles in the kitchen peeling potatoes and the cleaning dishes. Social inclusion like this shows that the garden has turned into more than ‘just’ a garden, as socially stratified worlds merge and interact to promote notions of inclusion (Allman, 2013). This was an intended part of ACM’s plan from the beginning. Kauri (ACM representative) recounts:

“I know we’re not seen as a leech, because we give back, we bring energy and people. All this land, and there’s plenty more land that can be used. You could have hundreds of people up here gardening, and it would just enrich this place as well. There must be lots of marae around the country that, you know, could do with a good injection of energy. So there is a reciprocity there... But for me, the real value is being part of something that’s already existing, has a whakapapa, already has a stake in the ground in this place, and shamelessly in some ways, tapping some of that energy.”

By turning the soil and helping out more generally on the marae, the Streeties were able to anchor themselves to cultural tradition and way of doing things
that have been rarefied through processes of disconnection associated with homelessness (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Leggat-Cook, 2011). Their contributions to the marae are genuinely valued by the local iwi and add to the historical value of the marae itself. This continues the tradition of the marae and helps to build cultural resilience towards claiming / maintaining spaces as being uniquely Māori. As spaces are textured by people and actions as an on-going process, the Streeties presence on the marae contribute to the overall essence of the marae itself.

In short, by tapping into the history and whakapapa of the marae, the ACM, Ngati Whatua and the Streeties were able to set up a project that had a strong foothold in the Auckland area. The rationale and intention behind the gardening project was to build and maintain an on-going relationship between the ACM and the people of Ngāti Whātua. The garden itself stands as a physical manifestation of the success these groups have had in achieving this goal. Māori values of manaakitanga and whanaungatanga are evident in the gifting of time, energy and land into this collectivist approach to setting up and sustaining the gardening project. The Streeties make genuine and valuable contributions to the marae that further textures the already significant site of Takaparawhau. In this way, Ngāti Whātua, the ACM, and the Streeties co-create Māori spaces that are mutually supportive and caring.

**Developing spaces of care**

Life on the streets is a harsh and unhealthy place to be, and is becoming increasingly so (Johnsen, Cloke, & May, 2005; Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). The space between formal institutional care and homelessness/state of poverty constitutes what Dear and Wolch (1987) refer to as the landscape of despair, whereby the flow of people from institutions, which purport to provide care, to a state of impoverishment is facilitated. Drop-in centres, like the ACM, can serve as a space of care within the perils of street life by providing a space to meet other people in similar life situations, and to have people simply listen to your voice (Conradson, 2003). Stolte and Hodgetts (2013) contrast these two spaces by situating landscapes of care within a boarder landscape of despair to explore how homeless people actively seek to change the hostile
nature of street life that helps maintain one’s health on the street. The ACM drop-in centre is located within the Auckland central business district (see figure 13). This is where Streeties come to have a cup of tea/coffee in the morning, socialise with one another, have dinner in the evenings, and where many other social services are offered. For the gardening club, this is where they are picked up each Tuesday and Thursday mornings to be taken out to the marae gardens.

Figure 13. Auckland City Mission, Hobson Street, Auckland.

During one of my stays in Auckland city, I went along to drop-in to meet with the gardening club, have a hot drink with them, and to go along with them in the ACM vans to the garden. The following is excerpt is taken from my reflections to demonstrate how the Streeties transition from being homeless within a landscape of despair to being Māori within a landscape of care:

“There was a transition of reo across space. English was used in the city and ACM, but as they [the Streeties] got into the van to go to the garden, the language slowly changed to te reo Māori, and is rumaki [totally immersed in the reo and te ao Māori] by the time they were working in the gardens” (Field notes, Pita, 21-02-2013).
The content of their conversations also changed, from matters arising on the streets, such as a new place to get food or who got arrested the night before, to traditional Māori activities, such as diving, hunting, fishing, and gardening. The movement from the city – a space characterised by settler values, practices, and evidently language – to the marae – a traditional space for Māori culture, values, practices, and language – constitutes a significant *space of care* unique to homeless men who are Māori. As R. Walker (1990) maintains, the marae as a space stands as a site of cultural revival for Māori, resisting colonial practices. This allows the Streeties to re-connect with their heritage and cultural ways of being while living within a *landscape of despair*. As Rātā remarks: "Marae, our rules. Outside here is other people’s rules". This quote reflects the concept of ‘normal’ as being a relative one, viewing the marae as a normal, familiar place in contrast to the settler world; the ‘other’. The marae is a place they once knew previous to homelessness and a place they remember fondly. The marae is a portal that lets them re-enter that Māori world they once had, a place that is difficult to create yourself on streets that are characterised by settler society (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011). Members of Ngāti Whātua understood the importance of having a space to be cared for and to be Māori: "We were trying to give a place where they feel comfortable, with us too, because we knew what they were thinking... We could identify with them, because we were homeless in our own land." (Matipo – marae representative). The comfort Matipo speaks of comes through enacting Māori cultural values, such as manaakitanga and whanungatanga (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Leggat-Cook, 2011), the understanding came through a shared understanding and experiences of what it is like to be homeless.

Most of the Streeties did not whakapapa directly into Ngāti Whātua or to the Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland) area. However, this did not present a significant issue in the way in which Ngāti Whātua welcomed and shared their land and resources with the Streeties. From Ngāti Whātua’s perspective, extending awhi (to embrace) and tautoko (support) to the Streeties reaffirmed the tribe’s own identity and continued their long tradition of caring for others. Matipo explains: “A good thing for us, I guess, think you’ve
done right by your tūpuna [ancestors], that we’re still doing it, nothing can beat us, we’re still helping people that need our help.” This quote suggests that their resilience as an iwi does not solely reside in their ability to maintain themselves, but is also contained within their acts of manaaki towards others. The marae then becomes a surrogate or make-shift home for the Streeties, Miro (Streetie) reflects:

“The gift of the marae. It’s like being at home on the marae, any marae will comfort you and that’s like being at home. It’s normal. There’s no tension. The thing about it it’s being open with each other, it’s being like that on the marae. It’s the people themselves.”

Within Miro’s account is a contrasting of colonial and traditional Māori spaces that characterises the normal. Furthermore, it is people themselves who create and shape these spaces, rather than an inert feature of space itself. Building on Conradson’s (2003) notion of drop-in centres as spaces of care, the marae provides a space of care more than just a place to ‘drop-in’; it is a place to ‘join-in’ and ‘belong-in’. The culturally textured nature of the marae as a space offers the Streeties a more intimate and recognisable form of interaction than what they experience with traditional social services. On one level, the marae is a safe place to temporarily escape life on the streets. However, on a deeper level, there is more to the brief exiting of the city, as a geographical location, that the Streeties benefit from. An ACM representative explains:

“It’s safe here, there’s no cops around. There’s none of those temptations around. Look at the environment. This is one of the most magnificent spots in Auckland, and they’re blessed by being part of that. I’m blessed, every time I come out here, being part of that. And when we come out here, I’m sure you’ll see as people come out of the van, quiet often there’s a little bit of breathing, deep breathing going on as we’re taking in not just air, we’re taking in this place and that’s got to affect the way you are, the
way you ‘be’. People come back, there’s a calmness of self, of spirit. Even when it’s been a shitty day, there’s this calmness there.” (Kauri)

This quote speaks to the healing nature that a particular place can have on the spiritual and psychological well-being of people. Research shows that homeless people can go beyond the intended purpose of a particular space, such as a marae, to maintain a positive sense of health and well-being (Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). Although the marae itself is not a formal health care facility, in the bio-medical sense of a hospital or clinic, it does provide caring elements that contribute to health and well-being. As mentioned earlier it is where manaakitanga and whanaungatanga occur. These simple yet culturally engrained ways of being are recognised as essential elements of Māori health and identity (Durie, 1994). Figure 14 is a photograph that was taken from the marae garden looking north from the Orakei. In the background is part of the Hauraki gulf and Rangitoto Island. This backdrop gives the viewer a sense of the environment the gardening club engage with every Tuesday and Thursday.

![Figure 14. ACM gardens looking across the harbour to Rangitoto island.](image)

The cultural knowledge and language skills that the Streeties possess are acknowledged, admired, and encouraged by people on the marae: “They all...
know their tikanga, they all know their reo, and they’re teaching me” (Karaka). This reflects a reciprocity of Māori cultural values and knowledge that shapes spaces of care, which are co-created by both the people of the marae and the Streeties themselves. This co-created space of care also extends care to the people of Ngāti Whātua, or in Matipo’s words: “They’re part of our reconciliation of our land.” This refers back to occupation to maintain sovereignty over Takaparawhau, and that the Streeties are an important part of reclaiming and rebuilding the land back to its original state through the reproduction of the Māori culture and language. This way of engaging with the homeless characterises a reciprocal form of care, where acts of care are enacted with, rather than for, one another. Reflecting on Lefebvre’s (1974/1991) division of physical, mental and social spaces, there also seems to be meta-physical space characterised by Māori spirituality at play on the marae when the Streeties step back into te ao Māori. This space provides spiritual care through the reconnection of the individual to the atua and their tūpuna through emplaced cultural practices on the marae.

**Identity and Being in the world**

Maintaining a positive sense of identity while living on the streets is extremely difficult (Boydell, Goering, & Morrell-Bellai, 2000) as a person can become lost within street life itself (Snow & Anderson, 1993). Navigating this threat to self is central to surviving street life (Hodgetts et al., 2006). Homeless people often construct their identities through what is available to them, such as the connection to particular places like libraries, the enactment of various activities from their past such as reading, and the use of particular objects such as books (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010). Using what is at hand to construct identity reflects Wittgenstein’s (1953/2009) concept of family resemblance that set out to discern membership of particular things to particular groups. Rather than attempting to isolate a single underlying characteristic to understand a particular concept, such as identity, Wittgenstein argues that it is a collection of attributes of resemblance that constitutes membership of particulars to broader groups. For example, not all Māori speak the Māori language, and not all Māori know their whakapapa.
This does not mean that a person does not have an identity as being Māori. Wittgenstein describes membership to groups with the use of an analogy: “The strength of the thread resides not in the fact that one fibre runs through its whole length, but in the overlapping of many fibres” (p. 36). In relation to identity, this quote can be understood as meaning that the individual fibres that represent a portion of identity that compose the thread is what is important in the construction of identity.

On the marae, the Streeties are able to engage in cultural practices and ways of being that is familiar and comfortable to them. This ranges from very formal, ritualised practices, such as pōwhiri and whaikorero, to the very ordinary, such as sharing food, planting, and gardening. In this way, the garden can speak for these men who construct it through various cultural practices and rituals (cf., Li et al., 2010). The marae garden becomes a physical manifestation of identity for these homeless Māori men. A iwi representative explains the importance of the marae gardens as a place for these men to contemplate who they are, and where they are going:

“Some of them [the Streeties] were adamant that they didn’t want to go into houses, but then again, coming here every Tuesday Thursday, seeing a beautiful view like this changes people’s mind, that they’re not useless I suppose, that there is something out there for them. There’s a lot of thought here, so there’s a lot of time for them to think on their own too. Just to sit down. What am I to do? Where’s my place in this world? You know, what have I done? And that gave them plenty of time to think for themselves. Sometimes they get overcrowded, with you know, how and I going to eat? Not really get that time for thought, and ponder, where am I going?” (Matipo).

The gardens are not only a physical manifestation of identity. As this quote suggests, gardens also facilitate the psychological and cultural manifestation of identity through self-reflection and connection to place, as seen with place-based identities (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). Self-reflection can be a difficult thing to do while on the streets, as there are many daily struggles
that need to be overcome just to provide the basics of survival (Nickasch & Marnocha, 2009). Matipo’s account also indicates a level of autonomy over the way identity and self-worth is constructed. Within the settler world, these men are homeless. However, on the marae (the Māori world), these men are referred to as koro and kaumātua, a reflection of the admiration and reverence the people of Ngāti Whātua have for these men. Miro reflects on the effect the marae has on him as a Streetie:

“I get strength in knowing my te reo and in being here. To me it’s very important in keeping and building my inner confidence. Being able to be Māori here is important to my confidence. Know the differences between who I really am or who I am supposed to be in this world of ours. Half the time I am lost [on the streets]. Now, what is my purpose and I can find it here? Just taking the time here to work on it on a day-to-day basis... I miss the old days where everything was always set out, especially as a child, Māori way of growing up. Always take the lessons from our korouas [elderly Maori men] and kuias [elderly Māori females]. Just the structure in life that’s hard to keep going. That’s what I notice here is rebuilding that confidence in what you were taught back at home... And at least we know that we contribute to the whenua (land) here. And I have faith in this marae and what they are trying to bring back that structure and we contribute to that, you know”

With the marae comes the acknowledgement and validation of Māori ways of being and identifying the self. Contained within Miro’s account is the passing down of cultural knowledge from his elders that locates him within the Māori world. Being on the marae for Miro means re-joining a traditional way in which the world is structured, ordered, and given meaning. Through involving himself in the day-to-day happenings of the marae, he is able to bridge the gap between the ‘then’ (former Māori self while in his youth) and the ‘now’ (current Māori self on the marae) that homelessness has disrupted.
Within the complex nature of identities, common ground is found to connect through the cultural identity of being Māori. Miro goes on to explain:

“I think the greatest thing about it is that being Māori, no matter what culture or what iwi you’re from, or hapū, at least there’s a connection as tangata whenua [people of the land], Māori to Māori.”

Miro’s quote reflects a commonality among Māori people that serves as a way of connecting into something that is bigger than the individual self. Iwi and hapū links are preserved and shared on the marae to create a sense of Māori ‘we-ness’. This collective sense of identity was discussed with an ACM representative in terms of how the Streeties do not directly whakapapa into Ngāti Whātua, but have been welcomed in such a way where they are regarded as whānau:

“That question, for instance, in its most overt form, was never asked, “are these people going to be Ngāti Whātua or from Auckland or...?” It was never a question, and so that openness that so often characterises Māori, I think, is just not an issue” (Kauri).

This quote suggest that identity is not simply a semantic labelling of kind, but rather a cultural process of belonging through becoming involved in a cultural way of being. The individual fibres that connect these men to their iwi, hapū, whānau, reo, tikanga and culture were brought from their homelands, to the streets of Auckland, and have been re-membered and enriched in the marae gardens. The gardening project, and the wider marae, has enabled them to avoid losing their sense of identity to the streets (Snow & Anderson, 1993). The marae and the garden project adds cultural fibres to the thread that reaffirm the Streeties identity as valuable Māori men.

Research by Boydell et al. (2000) found that homeless people tended to view their identities prior to being homeless with positive nostalgia, whereas their current identities as a homeless person are sometimes undervalued. In an interview, Rātā answered a question about homelessness simply by saying:
“This is not the Tūhoe way.” These men remember a better time in their lives and have circumvented, to a certain degree, the devaluing of the current self through being involved in the gardening project.

People, place, and objects are fundamentally linked within the social fabric of everyday life (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010), meaning that in matters of identity, these aspects of life cannot be meaningfully separated from one another. Heidegger (1927/1962) developed the concept of being-in-the-world in an attempt to transcend, what he believed to be, artificial distinctions between the self, place, and external objects. This constitutes a form of radical holism (Wheeler, 2013), in which people, place and objects are not separate entities, but rather, they are all interconnected and interdependent. Being-in-the-world denotes an intimate relationship between a conscious being, the place they dwell (not just geographically occupation, but a familiar place of belonging) and the involvement of everyday objects (Heidegger, 1927/1962). For Heidegger, the involvement of objects in everyday life are part of a network, or totality of involvements, which if traced backwards from a single object would result in an entire world-view being accounted for (Wheeler, 2013). Thus, similarities can be drawn to the holistic nature of the Duhnm-Quine thesis, which argues against the singling out of objects, or statements, as further auxiliary statements are required to render the original statement meaningful (Swanson, 1967). On this line of reasoning, tracing back a single object would too result in all auxiliary statements being revealed, and thus an entire worldview. This does not mean that we should trace back every single object; rather, we need to situate a single object within a boarder landscape of meaning, and examine the way objects are part of social worlds and geographies.

To explore the connection people, place and objects have, figure 15 and 16 provide examples of objects that reflect the culture and history of the people that dwell in the marae gardens. Whakairo (Māori carving) is a traditional form of artistic expression for Māori that communicates various meanings, histories, connections and relationships (National Museum of New Zealand et al., 1989). The presence of these objects in the garden add to the
overall nature of this place, creating a familiar setting for the Streeties by marking this garden as a uniquely Māori garden.

In figure 17 (below), there is a large barbeque facility that is used to cook lunch for everyone at the gardens. Rimu, who volunteers his skills as a tradesman at the marae, constructed this barbeque. The barbeque, as an object, represents a physical manifestation of manaakitanga that embodies the connection and the relationship Rimu has with the Streeties and the marae. This gesture of caring for others has facilitated the Streeties in reproducing further acts of care towards others, such as our research group, through the medium of food. In light of Heidegger’s (1927/1962) totality of involvements, the connections and relationships between people on the marae are lived out through this object, making the barbeque a part of the people who are connected to it, rather than a mere external object.
Figure 17. Rimu posing in front of his newly built barbeque.

On a regular basis, when the Streeties are working in the gardens, there is a local PD group that is brought up to provide physical labour at the marae. A Corrections Officer, who I refer to as Aunty, supervises the group when they come to the marae. Aunty has a long-standing relationship with Tōtara, as he has spent time on PD with her as his supervisor. While on the marae, Aunty does what she can to support and care for the Streeties:

“Aunty reckons she gave the machete to him (Tōtara) and wanted Tōtara to trade his boil up pot for the machete. She’d never seen one as deep and wide but not too high that you find it hard to lift. Aunty reckons she likes taking care of Koro and cooking his kai is one way of showing her compassion for him” (Mohi, Fieldnotes, 24-11-2012).

Aunty and Tōtara discussed a trade of the machete for the boil-up pot. However, after the deal was done, Tōtara was in possession of both the pot and the machete. Aunty was well aware of this but did not try to claim the pot for herself. The machete itself functioned as a tool in the garden, which Tōtara used regularly to clear weeds (see figure 18). However, when we consider the way lives are lived through objects, the machete provides another example of how objects are used to enact relationships and to care
for others. The pot also did its rounds between the gardening group and the PD crew. When Tōtara arrived at the gardens, it was not unusual for him to give the pot to Aunty to start lunch for both groups. At the end of the day, both objects would return to Tōtara, so that future practices of caring for others could continuously be reproduced. Although Aunty was the PD supervisor, she enjoyed cooking lunch for Tōtara. She was a traditional Māori who respected her elders. Regardless of Tōtara’s life as a homeless man she still considered him a kaumātua. In this respect she felt obligated to cook him a meal and in fact she enjoyed this. She felt sorry for him in many ways but respected his choices. Her cooking Tōtara a lunch with his boil-up pot was one way she wanted to care for him.

Figure 18. Tōtara and his machete clearing space for native trees to grow.

The threat of becoming disconnected and dislocated from the people, places, and objects that ground one’s sense of identity can have negative implications for the overall health of individuals (Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). By engaging with the marae gardening project, the men are able to fulfil their cultural needs by weaving fibres of cultural identification into their very being, forming an interconnected network of relatedness, locating the self with in complex socio-cultural world.
Lunchtime in the gardens

The consumption of food is not simply the taking in of an inert substance, as food embodies expressions of identity, gift giving practices, and culture (Furst, 1997). For Māori, the sharing of food, or hākari, is part of many formal and informal meetings, where hosts demonstrate and build upon their already established mana through showing their ability to provide for others (Salmond, 1975). The sharing of food also serves to build bonds between people. Food can function to reduce tapu (sacred or prohibited), or restore spiritual balance during Māori rituals (R. Walker, 1992). The Streeties continued this tradition daily within the gardens during lunch and morning tea as a way of expressing cultural connectedness and identity. In this way, food is central in provision of care for others, which strengthened relationships, as it is a basis of Māori hospitality. In light of this, I place a strong emphasis on the contrast of spaces between street life and life on the marae in terms of the Streeties’ opportunities and abilities to engage with culturally patterned practices and interactions surrounding food.

For the Streeties, lunchtime in the gardens is a significant everyday event, as it is an escape from city life where tradition and heritage can be enacted through emplaced cultural practices. Figure 19 is a photograph of a homeless man cooking his dinner in a central Auckland car park.
Cooking in public places is a necessity for homeless people as exemplified in this photo. One of the inherent risks of cooking in such places, however, is being ‘moved on’ by police or security. This makes it difficult to simply prepare a meal, but also prevents the homeless from being able to take their time, free of fear, to enjoy their meal in a very human way. The removal and exclusion of people from public spaces in this way acts to further the de-humanisation and marginalisation the homeless. By engaging in the marae gardening project, the Streeties are able to escape, if only temporarily, the stigmas and barriers the city poses to their ability to enjoy a meal. Furthermore, the marae brings freedom to the way in which the Streeties choose when they eat, how they cook it, and who they share their meals with in a way that is healing. Kauri (ACM representative) reflects:

“To be able to come here, you know, sometimes perhaps, somebody might come over, “hmmm a lot of work done,” but that’s not the point, you know. Might do a kai, put the jug on, cleaned up afterwards. So they’re playing a useful part and all of that’s been
washed with, I guess, the aroha and the comfortableness of a marae setting. It’s all in that context, which is healing, it’s soothing, it’s strengthening.”

Lunchtime at the gardens is a time where bonds between people are created and maintained, and where cultural connections are reaffirmed. Awhi and tautoko is mediated through the sharing of food, which is a significant practice within the Māori world. Lunchtime provides a safe and relaxed place for the Streeties to fulfil their cultural needs for emplaced, meaningful relationships. It also serves to stabilise lives of disruption and displacement by providing space to enact ritualised cultural practices that inform appropriate etiquettes of consuming food, such as karakia (prayer) and communal eating. A normal day in the gardens at lunchtime during the time I spent at the marae is depicted in figure 20. There is a stark difference in this image when considered in light of figure 19.

Figure 20. Darrin, Miro, Pita and Tōtara having lunch in the gardens.

When I first entered into the gardens, I found it difficult to initiate conversations with some of the Streeties, as they were busy with their own work and I was new to that place, an outsider. Later that day, I experienced
first hand the hospitality that comes with the daily lunchtime and morning tea rituals. The following is taken from my personal reflections:

“I wasn’t able to talk with any of the guys before the first tea break, but when everyone came together in the kitchen hut, the conversations started to flow” (Pita’s field notes, 19-10-2012).

The more time I spent there, the more I got to know everyone, which demonstrated the importance of taking the time to sit, relax, and eat together. Many of our most important conversations took place over lunch, as it was a time where everyone, the Streeties, marae staff and researchers, would come together during the day. The conversations ranged from things that needed to be done in the garden, to rugby and the politics of the Middle East. It was a common occurrence to see Rimu (the marae handyman) and the Streeties debating complex social and political issues that were circulating in the media. Events like this embody the connectedness and relatedness that accompanies the sharing of food. Mohi recounted:

“The guys really like Rimu. He’s sociable, humorous and really respectful. Always has a kai with them, discusses politics and sport, doesn’t pry into their personal lives, and helps them when and where he can” (Mohi 22-11-2012).

Food functioned to provide depth to social interactions, as an icebreaker or sorts, nurturing in-depth and meaningful conversations. More importantly, Mohi’s account shows the depth and respectful quality of socialisation and bonding that takes place during lunch breaks in a very human way. Likes and dislikes, common interests, and points of difference could be discussed. In this way, the sharing of food was symbolic of the sharing of life stories and experiences that formed the basis of interconnectedness and meaningful relationships in the gardens. The formation and continuity of these relationships centred around material objects that provide the opportunities to enact cultural practices surrounding food and its consumption, which
would otherwise be less accessible on the streets. Such material objects include the barbeque Rimu built for the Streeties, Tōtara’s pot (both seen in figure 21), and the tea hut.

Figure 21. Garden barbeque and boil-up pot cooking lunch.

The mere sight of a boil-up pot stirs curiosity for many Māori, as the phrase, “kia ora bro. What have you got in the pot?” was a common phrase to hear when in the marae gardens. The pot itself is a beacon of community and togetherness that, through being-in-the-world (Heidegger, 1927/1962), the relationships people have with one another are lived through the pot itself. The following is taken from my field notes:

“We broke for lunch. The kai came from the garden [potatoes, kumara, and kamokamo, a kind of squash] and was cooked on the barbeque Rimu had built. Miro was head chef and had brought a few sausages along. He was saying that the people from the marae would come along and use the barbeque. He didn’t say this in a way that came across as “this is our BBQ”, but in more of a way to complement the facility that had become a socially shared space for anyone who wanted to come and cook a feed.” Pita, 21-02-2013
The primary intention of constructing the barbeque was to provide a place where the Streeties could cook and enjoy their food. Previously, the tea hut has been used for cooking. However, due to building regulations, there was no power or gas installed in the tea hut, meaning the Streeties would have to cook on the ground using a gas burner. Further benefits followed from the initial intention behind the barbeque that brought more people into the gardening space through curiosity and admiration for the new facility, and also because of the food. The coming and going of people, and the interactions that took place because of the barbeque revealed the level of immersion within the marae space the Streeties had been able to achieve. As people on the marae congregate around the barbeque and take part in lunchtimes in the gardens, the way in which the Streeties have become embedded within the marae landscape is recognised by the tangata whenua. The marae space also provided further opportunities to connect with people outside of the marae itself through fundraisers. Miro talks about a fundraiser where he and the Streeties had a couple of stalls:

“I was doing the mussel fritters at $4 a mussel fritter and bread. Tōtara was doing the boil up. Ah man I was so shocked, so shocked about his price. We did a big mean as boil up, brisket, silverbeet and reweti (type of Māori kale) and riwai (potato) from the gardens. “Boil up’s ready!” I was looking at the plate, mean as plate, mean as kai you’ll get from the restaurant served on a plate, “2 bucks!!” Aaaaeeeee?! (laughs). Ah man I just about died! I just turned around and left him. Sold out just like that. Not even 10 minutes. Man I should’ve just brought it off him and sold it. But he told me at the end of the day, because it was new to him, he’s got such a big heart Tōtara, he’s got such a big heart. He doesn’t care how much it’s costing him he’s just thinking about him and his dogs.”

Contained within Miro’s account reflects the selfless nature of care the Streeties are able to extend to others from the opportunities provided for by the marae and the garden. A plate of boil-up is generally sold at places like
festivals for around ten dollars. In Tōtara’s case, the price of two dollars is
more of a koha to help cover costs. Much of the contents of the pot came from
the marae garden, so there is a reciprocal koha, or gift giving, which is taking
place, whereby the person offers a monetary koha, and Tōtara reciprocates
with a koha of kai. This reciprocal gift giving through the medium of food is a
cornerstone in enacting cultural practices of whanaungatanga and
manaakitanga (Salmond, 1975).

Gardening provides the opportunity for the Streeties to not only re-
connect with aspects of their past lives but to also make plans for the future,
in terms of care for the garden, as well as taking to plan for and celebrate
holidays and festivals. After the Christmas / New Years period (2012-2013), I
spoke with Miro about what he did on Christmas day. He told me that,
unfortunately, he had spent the day alone. However, he took real pride in
telling me about how his Christmas dinner had come from the marae
gardens. Although Miro was alone on Christmas, he was able to connect with
tradition and heritage through the kai that he was consuming. Below, Miro
recounts his re-enactment of a social event that took months of planning and
work to ensure that he was able to enjoy his Christmas dinner in the way he
saw as appropriate:

“I like my kai to come from the ground. I don’t like kai from what
you get off the shelf. I like making my own food or preparing my own
food. The way I do things at home are more... It’s not achievable
what you are trying to achieve here [on the streets]. You can’t do
much here because there’s so much protocol that you have to
recognise. It’s alright on the marae, you pick up on the protocol
straight away.”

Being part of the marae gardening project provided Miro with the
opportunity to reproduce this social event, which would otherwise be
difficult solely on the streets. Being able to connect with people, places, and
objects beyond the individual self through the everyday activity of gardening
is one of the most important benefits of, what can be perceived as, a rather
The food that is consumed from the gardens is different from the food consumed in the city. Having grown most of the ingredients for the meal aids depth to bonding through food and the cultivation of a sense of connection with people and place, tradition and culture at lunchtime. This is particularly significant when we realise the broader functions of food. Food is much more than a commodity and is such a human thing. Food is about tradition. Food is a focal point for care and relationships; it is a basis for extending hospitality. It epitomises care and connection. Food, then, takes on deeper meaning than mere calorific sustenance in that a single potato can contain the history, traditions, and biographies of a person that is then shared with the wider group. There is spiritual and cultural sustenance contained within the food that reminds us who we are, where we are from, and where we belong. The objects depicted in this section do not simply reflect social practices, but also create opportunities for these practices. It is through daily activities such as lunch breaks and the use of mundane objects that these men can realise themselves as interconnected within the material world (Heidegger, 1971).
Lunchtime in the gardens show culturally embedded practices and relationships are reproduced and kept alive by the Streeties.

**Gardening as an ordinary and everyday activity**

The focus on everyday life within the field of psychology has gained traction in response to Anglo-American approaches that fail to situate people within meaningful and expansive worldviews (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012). Everyday life refers to the taken-for-granted personal and social-cultural practices that exemplify the ‘normal’, and is characterised by routine, flow, and the mundane (Hodgetts, Rua, King & Te Whetu, 2014-in review). Research has shown that everyday gardening practices texture and give meaning to place, creating a sense of belonging and home that contributes to people’s “well-being and quality of life” (Li et al., 2010, p. 788). As homes provide a setting for much of everyday life (Mallett, 2004), difficulties arise for people who are homeless when attempting to establish routine and normality (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010). For the men in my research, their everyday lives are characterised by chaos, disruption, and uncertainty. This sets them apart in some respects from dominant domiciled groups in society. The everyday lives of the general public can become momentarily disrupted by extraordinary events, whereas for someone on the street, such disruptions are quite ordinary. This is not to normalise or minimise the suffering of people on the streets, but to propose that an ordinary activity for members of the general domiciled public, can be an extraordinary activity for someone who is homeless. Effectively, the act of gardening disrupts a life of disruption ushering in routine, predictability, and normality (Grabbe, Ball, & Goldstein, 2013), which demonstrates the importance of focusing on the everyday activity of gardening in my research.

Adding further complication here, we would note that many of the Streeties came from family traditions of gardening. Gardening was an ordinary part of their everyday lives as children and young adults. However, as an everyday practice gardening is now being rediscovered through this project. When the ACM’s gardening project begun, there was a lot of interest expressed by the Streeties themselves. Given that the marae gardens are
located away from central Auckland and situated within a culturally texture space, gardening offers respite from the men’s homelessness (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010), while allowing the Streeties to re-engage with all things Māori. Kōwhai describes the role of gardening for her while being homeless:

“It [gardening] releases all that crap from you. Just getting into dirt and having dirt under your nails, just that feeling. Getting in there and doing something to the land, that’s it, that’s what it does for me.”

Kōwhai’s quote speaks to the need for Māori to maintain physical and emotional connection with the whenua; a prominent characteristic of being Māori. The activity of gardening transcends the action itself, as it is a means of enacting the relationship Māori have with Papatūānuku as tangata whenua (Te Awekotuku, 1996). Moreover, gardening serves as a medium of re-membering cultural, familial, and spiritual connections that may have been lost while on the streets. In this context, the re-membering of the past is not in the form of cognitive recall of a past memory, rather, it is a practical re-membering through doing and re-joining a tradition. Examples of this can be seen in the kinds of crops the Streeties choose to cultivate. Tōtara has his watercress and pūhā (perennial sowthistle) patch (see figure 23 and 24), and Miro grows pārakaraka (also known as peruperu), the name of a Māori potato that was traditionally grown when he was young in his homelands. These three foods are well-regarded delicacies in the Māori world and very sort after.
Everything from when and how they are planted, cared for and harvested connects the Streeties back to an older, more familiar way of doing things with their whānau and hapū. The culmination of their labours is seen in the way that the food is then shared with others, whether it is lunch in the gardens, or contributions to the ACM food bank. This demonstrates how the everyday activity of gardening fosters the re-membering and enactment of traditional Māori values of manaakitanga and whanaungatanga (Ritchie, 1992). Kauri, the ACM representative, expands on this point:

“At a very basic level, it’s getting out of the city. It’s fulfilling the day with something useful, that’s at a very basic sort of a level, obviously it transcends that... For some of them, for some, it’s a remembering, because it wasn’t used, like a muscle. If you don’t use it, it’s not going to work as well. So there was a real sense of re-membering, not just for “this is the name for that plant, these leaves, how you cook it, how you grow it, the medicinal value and what of it.” But that whole way of being is a re-membering from childhood, and you will often, I’m sure, hear the guys talk about when they were young, or at home, or on the farm at home. So I think that’s pretty healing too.”

With each activity and task that is performed in the garden, more is re-remembered. As Kauri’s account suggests, the processes of re-membering that take place in the marae gardens facilitate a re-connection with people, places and objects that are familiar and cherished, but have been forgotten, or
disrupted, by street homelessness. Figure 25 and 26 show some of the Streeties working in the gardens. One thing the Streeties also love about the garden is the autonomy. They can plan the garden and engage in ways that are particularly meaningful for them. In this way, the garden served as a kind of portal, that when stepped into, transported them from the settler world of street life, and allowed them to step back into and re-enter the Māori world, a place where they are no longer characterised by notions of homeless. These gardens provide the Streeties moments of predictability, routine, and flow (Grabbe et al., 2013).

Figure 25. Rātā and Tiniwai watering the garden, having a chat.    
Figure 26. Tōtora working in the garden.

In my interview with Kauri, he noted that the gardening activity itself is not the main point of the ACM’s project. Rather, the point is about bringing people together to connect and to build relationships with other Streeties, ACM and the marae folk. This emphasises the importance of everyday activities that help to maintain the health and well-being of people who are homeless (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012; Stolte & Hodgetts, 2013). Gardening just happened to be a traditional Māori practice that Ngāti Whātau could facilitate, and was something that many of the Streeties could identity with pre-homelessness. Marae staff recognised this when asked what the most important thing the Streeties get out of the gardening project:

“Probably re-connection...it’s reminded them of whanaungatanga. The practices that they used to do when they were young, what they
thought, from their tūpuna. You know, I still garden the same way my mother did.” (Karaka, marae representative and garden co-ordinator)

Re-connecting with the Māori world is important to the Streeties as this characterises their worldview and way of being. While on the streets, they are forced to negotiate life within the worldview of settler society (Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, & Rua, 2011). The actions that take place in the marae gardens are a continuation of actions that stem from the Streeties’ earlier lives with their whānau. By joining in collective action in the marae gardens, the Streeties begin to form hapū-like links with one another, and the people of Ngāti Whātua, anchoring their place on the marae. Thus, re-connecting with whānau and hapū as a result of re-entering the Māori world through gardening has been beneficial for these Streeties and has assisted in the rebuilding of the self. What seems to be central to the gardening project is presenting the Streeties with the opportunity to connect, or re-connect, with something familiar. Kauri (ACM representative) explains:

“I know the guys, everybody who virtually, who’s spent long periods of time up here, being on the marae, gardening, farming, forestry, have been part of their younger lives and those memories are still strong. And there’s a yearning perhaps, a little bit of the good old days, but they’re also quick to say those were bloody hard days. When you’re younger, and you were kids, quite often learning stuff at the feet of their grandparents, invariably their grandmothers. So there’s a connecting there in peoples’ older years in what had been... being able to recapture some of that... Don’t expect all the outcomes to be found just in the garden, you will find them in unexpected places.”

Not only does this reflection speak to notions of re-membering and re-connection, it also alludes to the way in which the benefits the Streeties get from the gardens leak out into the world, bettering other aspects of the
Streeties’ lives. Gardens are not mute, nor a passive setting for everyday activities, as they communicate meaning about the people who created them, reflecting history, culture and heritage (Li et al., 2010). For Māori, as all things have a mauri, including people and the gardens, the mauri of place and people are enhanced and strengthened through everyday activities (Mead, 2003; Moon, 2005). For the Streeties, this space has facilitated processes of re-membering a way of being that connects them to their past and to forge new relationships with others on the marae. Thus, the benefits of such as normal and everyday activity for people who live lives of chaos and disruption cannot be underestimated, as gardening allows these men to re-enter and anchor themselves in all things Māori.

Creating a sense of belonging and ownership
For Māori, one’s traditional sense of belonging and self is anchored in whānau, hapū, and iwi links, often centred around the marae, and reinforced through reciprocal acts of manaakitanga that speak to the collective caring of the social group (Salmond, 1975; R. Walker, 1990). As homeless people comprise a marginalised and dislocated group (Grabbe et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2012), finding a place to belong, to feel at home while away from home, and to have a sense of pride and ownership in the way time is spent can be challenging. Heidegger uses the term dwelling to refer to the connection a person has with a particular place of familiarity (Heidegger, 1927/1962; Wheeler, 2013). To dwell in a place is not simply to occupy that space, but a unique sense of belonging that a person feels within that space. In light of this, the marae is not a space that the Streeties simply occupy in a spatial sense; it is a place in which they dwell, a place where they belong. It has become in many regards their tūrangawaewae for the time-being.

Although many of the Streeties do not directly whakapapa into Ngāti Whātua or the marae, the Māori sense of belonging has been extended to the Streeties who tend the gardens. For Ngāti Whātua, it was important to continue their tradition of openness and the welcoming of all as a way to overcome historical land transgressions and to rebuild Orakei marae. This restoration project stood in the face of colonial practices and is now a source
of strength for the iwi, as they have been able to revitalise and reproduce traditional ways of life and being for Māori. A marae representative explains:

“Coming back here [to the marae], it’s reconnecting back to where they’re [the Streeties] from, and now, they’re like tangata whenua...

Yea, really just part of us, everybody knows them. I’m leaving in two weeks, and I was say to everyone “while I’m gone, you have to maintain that manaakitanga for all those who come through here.”

That must be maintained when I leave.” (Karaka, marae representative and garden co-ordinator)

The manaaki that is being passed down from the older generation to the younger exemplifies the iwi’s attitude in addressing structural and systemic histories of dislocation and disruption Māori have endured through colonial practices (Nikora et al., 2012). While there is a process of the Streeties reconnecting back into te ao Māori through the marae, there were also examples of the Streeties re-connecting the marae back to their own iwi member’s that had ended up on the streets. A marae staff member reflected:

“Other things that are happening that have been funny, from the beginning, somebody came up, some of the Streeties from the Mission, and said to Karaka “oh, your nephew, is at the Mission,” and she goes “no he’s not” and they went “no, no, he’s homeless” and she goes, “No! he’s not!” And they said “no, no, he’s been around”, “you tell him to get home! He’s not homeless.” But you know, in that story was about he had lost his job and his flat and he’d become disconnected for a bit, and he’s been a bit whakama (shy or embarrassed) and when they found out, they went “no, come home.””

(Tawa)

This philosophy of caring for others is a historical quality of the iwi, and is actively encouraged by the elders to the younger marae staff and iwi members. A marae staff member who primarily works in the gardens, gave
an example of this when Tōtara's bike had been accidentally run over by a ride-on-lawnmower at the marae. She was adamant that the marae replace Tōtara's bike and went around the marae looking for one. She found one, gave it to Tōtara, and mentioned how other marae staff would sometimes see him traveling around town on his new bike and yell out: “nice bike there Tōtara!” This act of kindness towards Tōtara as a Streetie reflected the extent of relationships built over time between the marae staff and the Streeties. They were no longer Streeties from ACM, they were marae members too and they were being looked after. It was also important for Tōtara to have a bike, not only so he could get around, but so he could return to the marae and tend to the gardens outside the usual Tuesdays and Thursdays. Tōtara loved this place and would often be seen at the gardens tending to his watercress patch and so forth. The bike also enabled him to return to his tribal lands during hui, such as tangihanga and weddings. Although this was difficult for Tōtara as he does not have a phone or clear lines of contact. But he has made his family aware of a contact route. He explains:

“I said, if somebody dies, you know, like uncles or aunties, and cousins and that, ring up the Mission, that’s all you have to do. The Auckland City Mission, I told them, ring there. I said, aunties, uncles, you know, close family, just ring up and say blah blah passed away, something like that.”

Tōtara comes from Tauranga-moana and told us that when he gets the call to go home, if he leaves at daybreak, he can make it home when the sun sets, travelling on his bike. This is over a 200 kilometre bike ride for a man of 69 years. The sense of belonging that Tōtara has with Orakei marae and the ACM enables him to maintain the belonging he has in Tauranga-moana, through simple acts, such as passing a phone message on and replacing a run over bike. For some, going back to their tribal lands is not as easy, for a variety of reasons as indicated by the distance Tōtara has to travel. Home, then, becomes something that is created from previous notions of home to craft as sense of belonging. Miro (Streetie):
“I miss the Tūhoe, or the home way. Being here you’ve got to understand their way. I’m quite proud of Ngāti Whātua, their way of doing things. Quite understandable the amount of whenua that they’ve lost and what they’re doing right now. So I help them along by doing their planting every year.”

By Miro helping them he is also helping himself stay in touch with the Māori world. Miro brings part of his home in to the marae gardens as well by planting crops from his homeland (see figure 27). This exemplifies the way in which the notion of home is reproduced in the gardens.

Figure 27. Miro’s potatoes, pārakaraka, also known as peruperu.

A sense of home and belonging is also created through Māori rituals, such as pōwhiri, that the Streeties take part in on the marae. Kauri (ACM representative) recounts:

“When, for instance, Ngāti Whātua welcomed on a visiting Japanese group, something like that, our guys sat as tangata whenua, because they all helped to set up, clean up, and all of that, a couple of times, and that happened very smooth, very easily.”
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Kauri referred to this moment as a marker, of sorts, that indicated that the Streeties had truly found a place at Orakei marae to belong. This signalled to Kauri that the ACM’s goal to develop an on-going and meaningful relationship between the ACM and Ngāti Whātua had progressed in a positive way. The Streeties felt so at home on the marae that on many occasions, they expressed their desire to come back to the marae as often as possible. In Kōwhai’s words: “If I had a choice, I’d come up here every day and do this garden.” Miro had also jokingly said that he wanted to bring his tent up to the marae, sleep there, work the gardens, and fish from his fishing spot across the road from the marae. For Miro, the marae provided safety, as an escape from the city, but more importantly, because of the social and cultural practices on the marae, it was a place where he could dwell, not just be:

“I get really paranoid in the city. I hardly ever go out at night. Too paranoid something might happen. But it’s all right at home [Waimana and Te Urewera], you can do what you like. Don’t have to watch your back. That tree will look after me but over here that building won’t look after you... I think it’s about tatou, te wairua o te tangata (it’s about us and the spiritual/soulful connection of the person).”

More than just physical and socio-cultural protection, Miro’s account also picks out a spiritual protect that places have in connecting people with the spiritual realm. For Māori, all aspects of the physical and metaphysical worlds are associated with an atua (Te Awekotuku, 1996). Particularly within the gardens, these atua are Papatūānuku (the Earth mother), Rongo – or Rongomātāne – (god of agriculture and cultivated foods), Haumiatiketike (god of uncultivated foods), and Tāne Mahuta (god of the forests) (Marsden, 1992). Through emplaced daily socio-cultural practices in the marae gardens, the men engage with and strengthen their connection with these atua. This can take the ritualised form of karakia for planting, harvesting, or eating, or less ritualised forms, such as simply sitting only with nature in self-reflection.
From all the benefits the Streeties get from being involved with the marae gardens, the culmination of their effort and hard work is during the harvest. This is a time where the Streeties are able to bring physical representations of what they have been doing on the marae back to the ACM and the wider community of homeless people. The kai they produced is gifted to the ACM food banks, which during peak harvest, can contribute up to twenty bread trays of kai per harvest day. This speaks to the idea that the Streeties are not simply recipients of care; rather, they are able to sustain their mana as people who care for others. A marae staff member recalls these days of harvest: “the best thing too, is to watch them take out boxes of kai, getting ready to get picked up at the end of the day” (Tawa – marae staff memeber). The kai that is taken back to the ACM’s food banks can been seen in figure 28 and 29. On the left is kale, which featured in many of the lunchtime boil-ups in the gardens. On the right is a kamokamo that will turn into jarred pickle for sale during the marae fundraisers.

Being cared for by the marae, the Streeties are able to then care for others. This characterises a form of snowball care, where acts of manaaki enables the further reproduction of manaaki in a snowball-like effect. By finding a place to dwell (Heidegger, 1927/1962), the Streeties build a sense of belonging through daily interactions, and take ownership and pride in the tasks they perform. In turn, this builds the social capital of the group, which buffers group members from various forms of hardship, while affirming the sense of
community, mutual trust and shared goals, and support (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010). This highlights the social inclusiveness that comes with being able to connect with the marae.

Towards addressing social distancing
Contrast to the notions of inclusiveness on the marae mentioned in the previous section is the notion of social exclusion and social distancing of the homeless within wider society. Social distancing refers to the distance people feel about others based on their membership to differing social groups (Simmel, 1908/1921). Distance can not only refer to physical distancing between groups of people, but also to the exclusion of an individual to a social group when in close proximity to each other (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Furthermore, Hodgetts and colleagues (2013) argue that the socially constructed symbolic nature of spaces have contributed in perpetuating divisions in physical space that reinforce social distancing between the ‘undeserving poor’ and the ‘productive member of society’. This is important to the presented research, as the men involved in this research are homeless and homelessness is tightly linked with concepts of distance, marginalisation, and isolation (Johnson et al., 2012). The information that people of the general public use to build their understanding of homelessness, and homeless individuals, can contribute in maintaining social distance, increasing it, or in closing the social gap (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010).

However, social distancing is not a straightforward concept that can be simply viewed as a problem that needs to be solved or overcome through the ‘re-integration’ of homeless people with the general public. Researchers have found that some homeless people actively seek to maintain and create distance from the general public to avoid the risks and harms of street homelessness by using isolationist strategies that attempt to minimise contact with the outside world (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Hodgetts, Stolte and colleagues (2011) argue that: “the ultimate product of social distancing is the threat of positioning homeless people as existing outside the scope of justice” (p. 1751). Being situated outside the scope of justice can result in discriminatory policy that negatively affects people who are homeless.
The people of Ngāti Whātua recognised the gap between the homeless and domiciled. Within their relationship with the ACM is the desire to bridge this gap by welcoming homeless people onto their marae and to get them involved with the social happenings of day-to-day life. This relational project was not about housing the Streeties. It was an opportunity to provide activities outside of their normal routine. It was a chance for the marae to provide a space for care. There was a lot of enthusiasm when the gardening project was created, and the marae wanted to offer further resources to develop this bridging process. A marae staff member recounts an early conversation:

“I remember in my ignorance, right at the beginning sitting down with Kauri [ACM representative] and saying “so how much food do you need? We’ve got more land, we can grow more food” and him going “you’re never going to be able to grow enough food for what we need” and I’m like “no, but really, how much? How much do you need” and he said “the Mission feeds up to another 30 food banks,” and I think the shock started setting in, you know, even for us, we didn’t realise how big a problem, or how extensive the help and need, and what that Mission’s challenge is. So it’s been good for us to get a grip on it as well” (Tawa).

In bridging the gap between the homeless and the housed, research emphasises the importance recognising the humanity of homeless individuals through shared experiences (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). On the marae, the concept of manaakitanga is extended to visitors, in particular, through the provision of food (Salmond, 1975). The quote above shows that the caring for others is extended beyond the confines of the marae itself, and out into the world. In doing this, Tawa comes to comprehend the extent of the issues that the ACM, and New Zealand society, faces. This realisation humanises homelessness and marks a crucial step in moving towards addressing social distance.
A key talking point for me was when one of the Streeties described life on the streets and some of the difficulties homeless people face:

*Pita:* So can you walk me through a week on the street? The things you have to do to get by. Basically, things that outside people wouldn’t even think that you guys have to deal with, or do...

*Kōwhai:* We deal with public ridicule.

*Pita:* That’s a big one is it?

*Kōwhai:* Yea, that’s just common. I just look at them and go, “oh yes, you’ll be out here next year, you watch, complaining you got no food and you can’t afford to pay for things.”

*Pita:* Next world credit crisis?

*Kōwhai:* Yea, and I just look at them and laugh, yea. I laugh at them.

Kōwhai had spent many years on and off the streets since the mid 1970s and had experienced the passage of people from housed to living on the streets and vice versa. She spoke about constant sense of disdain by the general public towards homeless people, in particular, the labelling of the term ‘beggar’ to someone who was homeless. In the interview, Kōwhai made her point clear that she was homeless, but she was not a beggar. In her view, beggars are people, some times homeless people but not always, that ask others on the street for money, or panhandling as it is also known. Kōwhai detests this practice, as she believes it reinforces negative stereotypes about homeless people and can sometimes contribute to creating a sense of fear towards homeless people. What this highlights is that the problem of social distancing is not just between two groups, i.e. the homeless and the housed. There are complex and diverse intragroup processes that take place that
contribute to the wider issue of social distancing, highlighting the dynamic nature of social distance (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011).

A way of reducing my social distance is exemplified in Figure 30. It shows Tōtara and me potting pumpkin seedling so that the plants are strong enough to survive once transplanted in the main garden.

![Figure 30. Tōtara and Pita potting pumpkin seedling to be later transplanted.](image)

Involving myself in garden tasks served to enhance my methodological approach in that spending time with the Streeties built rapport and trust. However, more importantly, it demonstrates how social distance between the homeless and the housed can be meaningfully addressed through the shared everyday activity of gardening. In my naïvety, when we went out to transplant the older pumpkin plants that had been potted a few weeks earlier, I grabbed the seedlings that we had just potted. These pumpkin seedlings needed time to establish in small pots or, as the Streeties warned me, the local pūkeko (native New Zealand bird) would pull out and eat the not yet established seedlings. This mistake was made clear to me and many jokes about this followed that day. However, this was a positive experience in light of social distancing because at first, many of the Streeties can be quiet and if they do not like you, they will let you know very clearly. Research suggests that the use of humour has positive effects on bonding and rapport
building in social settings (Wilkins & Eisenbraun, 2009). So in a strange way, being made fun of in a light-hearted, jokingly way signalled a kind of acceptance, or tolerance, of me in a space that was of great significance to the Streeties. It also suggests that as a University student I am not beyond learning from others.

Figure 31 is a photograph that was taken outside the wharekai (dinning hall) while the Streeties waited for their ride back to the city. Tōtara brought his guitar along to the gardens and told Tiniwai and I that he was going to the city library to learn some chords. Tiniwai took this opportunity to share and exchange ideas and skills with Tōtara, in particular, blues progressions and chords. They sat there for a while, singing and playing blues together. This point marks one of the many significant moments of bonding that took place during our time together in the gardens. The significance of waiata in te ao Māori is strong, as the language itself was oral, waiata were used to communicate cultural and historical information and knowledge about different Māori tribal groups (Karetu, 1992). Bonding, through humour and music, was an important aspect of daily practice in the gardens that shows that the recognition of homeless people’s humanity can be achieved not only through the understanding of moments of sorrow and sadness, but also in moments of joy and laughter.

Figure 31. Tiniwai and Tōtara having a jam outside the marae kitchens.
Through the gardening project, the Streeties engage in meaningful relationships with people of the general public. For example, each Tuesday and Thursday that they go up to the gardens, they get personal time to talk with ACM staff during the van ride out. Each trip takes about twenty minutes. So in one week, the Streeties get almost an hour and a half of time with the ACM staff that they would not otherwise get. Kauri noted that due to budgeting reasons, recipients of the ACM’s services would not normally get this kind of quality time with staff to be listened to and to converse with. This is one of the unseen bonuses on the gardening project.

Another example of the way the Streeties engage in meaningful relationships with people of the general public is situated within the social nature of the marae space. As the marae is a hub of social and culturally activity (R. Walker, 1990), the Streeties constantly meet new people from all walks of life. For instance, there is a PD group that goes out to the marae to work as part of their community service. The PD group clear weeds, clean up around the marae and even plant vegetables when required. One day a member of the PD group noticed Rātā speaking te reo Māori. He complemented Rātā on his reo and remarked: “maybe one day you’ll give me a lesson there matua.” Rātā responded by saying: “yea, us Tūhoe know what we’re doing.” There was also a link between Tōtara and the woman, Aunty, who supervised the PD group and supervised Tōtara when he used to do PD. They would sometimes organise lunch for both the PD workers and the gardener in the form of a boil-up. Since Tōtara held a kaumātua status, Aunty was expected to monitor the cooking while Tōtara worked in the garden. She was more than happy with this arrangement. Aunty would also pack up left over non-perishable items for Tōtara to take with him. Sometimes she would also take food to Tōtara’s place of residence and leave them for him. These are just a couple examples that show the way in which the Streeties are able to engage with others outside of street life in a way that connects them with a larger social group. Kauri (ACM representative) explains this point:
“The more marginalised you are, the less, especially in the city, the less opportunities, I think, you have to be part of something that’s bigger than you, to be part of something that is wholesome, that’s good, that you can give to and receive back, and certainly in intangible ways.”

There are many physical benefits to being part of the gardening project, such as being able to leave the city, doing something physical, and the kai that is harvested. Kauri’s quote also speaks to the meta-physical benefits of the project, such as the re-joining a cultural tradition that is difficult to enact on the streets, the social connections that are made (whakawhanaungatanga), and the impact all these things have on the wairua of an individual. Kauri also spoke about the absence of most things Māori within the cityscape by the Streeties. However, when they started coming out to the marae, it was as if their wairua had been restored or replenished just by being able to relax in a place that was familiar. There was a distance between a former Māori self and a present homeless self that was traversed by being part of a social group that promoted the ideals of inclusiveness. Now that the gardening project has been running for a number of years, it is common for the Streeties to preform cultural rituals, such as whaikorero, waiata, powhiri, and tangihanga, within the city, particularly at Saint Mathews Church.

As the people of Ngāti Whātua recognised the social distance the Streeties face, they actively welcome and encourage the Streeties to be more than just a person who visits the marae twice a week, but to stand as kaumātua and tangata whenua. For example, Kauri (ACM representative) spoke about how the Streeties played an important role in welcoming visitors to Orakei marae. The Streeties sat on the paepae and delivered a whaikorero as part of the pōwhiri ritual. This demonstrates that the role of the Streeties on the marae extended further than their gardening activities. This reflects the traditional way in which Māori men progress across time within the iwi, starting off with basic chores, such as gardening and food preparation, and then graduating into more important roles performed by kaumātua and elders (Rangihau, 1992). The Streeties regularly visit the
marae outside of the regular Tuesday and Thursday ACM visits tending to the garden when there is a lot to do. They also respond to marae requests for cultural support during important marae events. Matipo (marae representative):

“If you want them to help with certain things that are happening on the marae, they come and help too, besides the gardens. Because we’ve got functions up here, they come and help us. “oh yea, we’ll be there” and they’re here. When we’ve got something big, they’re usually here.”

In this way, the Streeties give back to marae that solidifies their place there and allows them to enact reciprocity to build and maintain the relationship they have with the people of Ngāti Whātua. Matipo noted the contribution that the Streeties made on one community planting day that saved marae staff about three months of work by helping plant thousands of native trees. This is only one example of the many things and ways that the Streeties engage in meaningful activity on the marae. The implication of this inclusiveness has had a positive effect on the way the Streeties are on the marae and back out on the streets, as they know there is a place for them to be Māori. The gardening project is a manifestation of a desire to maintain an on-going and meaningful relationship between ACM and Ngāti Whātua. Notions of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ are broken down to ‘we’, as the similarities between the housed and the homeless as social groups are found and nurtured.

**Chapter discussion**

In this chapter I have presented the key findings of my research. These findings centred around the way in which relationships can function to support the health and well-being of people. Gardening as an everyday activity brings normality, predictability, and flow, and aids in the process of re-membering cultural traditions and ways of being that can become lost on the streets. In the sharing of food, ritualised bonding and hospitality takes
place that connects people to former and present selves and social groups through cultural practices. The sense of self is strengthened through re-joining the tradition of the marae, and is lived through people, place and objects. The marae, then, serves as a space of care within a larger landscape of despair that acts as a safe haven, becoming a tūrangawaewae for the Streeties, protecting people from the harsh realities of street life. The marae is a place to belong and where great pride is taken in being able to contribute in order to solidify one’s place within the socio-cultural world. The barriers of social distance are set to the side, as a collective sense of Māoritanga (Māori culture, practices and beliefs) on the marae provides meaningful interactions between the housed and the un-housed. In the final chapter, I explore the broader implications of my analysis in terms of shedding more light on the reproduction of Māori culture through gardening, the construction of identity as a practical process, and the connections between people, place and objects that play a role in fostering Māori men’s health.
Chapter Four: Discussion

Sporadic research into the health of Māori men often focuses on illness and negative societal trends. This thesis moves away from deficit-focused research on Māori men by placing emphasis on the reproduction of healthy relationships that are embedded within the everyday lives of a group of homeless Māori men. The purpose of this thesis was to explore these men’s gardening activities on a marae to shed new light on the reproduction of culturally-patterned ways of 'being' through emplaced day-to-day practices. My findings suggest that there are novel ways in which the social issue of homelessness can be addressed through the building of genuine, meaningful, and on-going relationships between homeless organisations and local iwi. By creating a garden space, my participants are able to re-enter the Māori world and mutually benefit from engaging in reciprocal acts of care that supports their well-being and the well-being of others. Particularly for homeless Māori, the marae is a place where a sense of self can be strengthened through participation in the daily on-goings of marae life. The marae is where they find a place to stand and belong. This chapter reviews and expands upon key findings, and explores some of the broader implications from this research.

The garden, social inclusion, the reproduction of culture and relationships

In examining the early beginning of the gardening projects, I was able to document the inner workings of the project that stemmed from the desire to maintain an on-going and meaningful relationship between the ACM and the people of Ngāti Whāuta. In the process, I was able to find a more effective way of addressing the needs of homeless Māori men. Central to this relationship were acts of reciprocity and manaakitanga between the two organisations and the Streeties themselves. Ngāti Whātua were able to restore the mana of their land after the threat of being made homeless themselves, and in turn, provided a place for other homeless Māori to seek shelter from settler society, allowing participation on the marae that contributed to the social group as a whole. The gardening project stands as a manifestation of whanaungatanga, or the act of building relationships, which
captures the essence of this project. This stands as a direct contrast to settler society that remains socially distant from those experiencing street homelessness.

Although the marae in question is a safe place, the world remains a place of social distance, public ridicule, and often hostility towards homeless people. By working in the marae gardens, the Streeties were able to engage in meaningful interactions with people of the general public, which acknowledges the humanity of the homeless through shared experiences. Fides and Lappin (2010) argue that the importance of enjoyable and meaningful programmes for the homeless to participate in, like gardening, cannot be underestimated. The meaningful interactions on the marae start to break down inter-group differences by shifting focus to the similarities and shared experiences. There are shared goals, life stories, and culture on the marae that welcomes in the Streeties within a wider world of exclusion and distance. Also, this opened the door to conversations surrounding the realities of street life that can sometime be absent in mainstream media.

Some researchers suggest that people who have been homeless for extended periods of time need to be able to leave, or disconnect, with homelessness as a sub-culture in order to re-enter society (see, James-Nevell, 2012; Perusco, 2010). Or in other words, homeless people need to learn how to be more like ‘us’ (people in the general public). This approach positions homelessness as something outside of society that needs to be left in order to become ‘normal’. This conceptualisation of homelessness can be harmful, as many on the street draw social support from other homeless people to maintain themselves on the streets (Chamberlain & Johnson, 2011), of which the marae gardening project itself is a prime example. More complex understandings of homelessness are needed that see homelessness intimately connected with wider society. For example, Austin (2010) argues that researchers need to understand the range of barriers and limitations present within the system itself that contribute in matters of homelessness. On top of structural issues, such as the follow on effects of colonisation, are issues surrounding the participation, or inclusion, of marginalised people, such as the homeless, within wider society.
It has been suggested that societal practices of exclusion, whether physical or social, reflects a “questioning of belonging” for homeless people and can have serious negative health consequences (Hodgetts et al., 2007, p. 722). The reverse of this would suggest that social practices of inclusion supports notions of belonging and can have positive health outcomes. Within the accounts of the Streeties lies diversity in situations and experience. This is particularly apparent when we consider that re-connection with their own tribal groups is sometimes possible, and sometimes it is not, and sometimes there is a personal desire to reconnect, and sometimes there is not. What is clear is that ‘going home’ does not necessarily result in disconnected people being better off. There are a whole host of positions that are taken by these men that demonstrate the diversity and complexity of their situations that must be acknowledged and appreciated.

In order to address homelessness, researchers must be able to draw out and expose the complex and diverse nature of the social issue to avoid over-simplifying what it means to be homeless and how people end up there. Hodgetts and colleagues (2012) distinguish two general kinds of homelessness to explore the diversity among the homelessness in an attempt to resist generic responses to the social issue. Drifters refer to those who have come from low socio-economic backgrounds where experiences of homelessness are not completely removed from when they were housed. Droppers refer to those who come from middle class working backgrounds and have ended up homeless. This broad categorisation was seen in my research in that not all of the Streeties desired to be ‘rehoused’ or, in a more Māori context, to re-connect with their tribal roots. Although the concept of drifters and droppers refers to class background, and does not speak directly to the intergenerational effects that colonisation has had on the current state of Māori impoverishment, it does provide a more in-depth way of conceptualising homelessness that rejects homogenising experiences of homelessness into a few general stereotypes. Furthermore, this concept could prove useful in addressing Māori homelessness by recognising those where re-connection is possible with tribal groups and where it is not. Particularly for those where re-connection is not possible, or at least at the
moment, the marae is a place where homeless Māori can have a sense of belonging within a space that acknowledges their worldview. It is a place to heal while being displaced. This speaks to the idea of community cohesion, which has been shown to have a bearing on health outcomes, particular for Māori who have endured colonial practices (Groot, 2006; Hodgetts, Masters, & Robertson, 2004). The Streets take pride in being able to support the marae and in providing food for the ACM food bank from their labours. In a snowball-like-effect, manaaki continuously reproduced manaaki, allowing manaaki to leak out and permeate out into the world.

Social distance is a complex social phenomenon that takes more than forcing people together and expecting them to resolve their differences. For example, research shows that people create social distance between themselves and those with psychological / mental disorders (Dietrich et al., 2004; Jorm & Oh, 2009) and the homeless (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Further research draws attention to how some homeless people desire being socially distant from society as a defence and coping mechanism from outside threats (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2010). What is clear is that a house is not going to solve issues of social distancing, as the underlying social and structural inequalities that exist are not addressed through simply providing a house to someone. In order to appreciate the complexities of homelessness, researchers need to include alternative methods of knowledge creation that reject dominant, and sometimes simplistic, conceptualisations of homelessness (Walsh, Rutherford, & Sears, 2010), avoid relying solely on deficit focus conceptualisations, and for researchers to be mindful of the political nature of knowledge construction (Finley & Diversi, 2009).

Moments in the garden have broader significance for participants and their sense of belonging. For instance, lunchtimes were recognised by participants as offering respite from the city, and a forum for cultural reconnection and engagement. While on the streets, the kinds of food available and the lack of facilities required to prepare food disconnects homeless Māori from being able to reproduce cultural traditions themselves. However, on the marae, these cultural practices were observed in the gardens on a daily basis. Participants could take their time in preparing their
food, free of the fear of being moved on and displaced due to processes of social distancing (Hodgetts, Stolte, et al., 2011). Lunchtime for these men provided a space to re-enact and re-produced Māori cultural practices surrounding the consumption of food, such as karakia, hospitality, ritual connection, and manaakitanga, which is difficult to achieve on the streets. Lunchtime constituted an event where ritualised bonding takes place and cultural ties are affirmed. My findings provide support to research that demonstrates strong links between food, culture (Furst, 1997) and identity (Lindenmeyer, 2006), highlighting the broader significance of food sharing practices within social groups.

The provision of food in the Māori world is a “measure of the generosity and hospitality of the people responsible for putting it on” (Barlow, 1991, p. 17) and through the cooking of food, the essence of kai “ascends to the gods,” (Barlow, 1991, p. 19), or atua. Through karakia, blessing of the kai, this apportions the kai, offering the essence to ngā atua (the gods), while leaving the sustenance for the people (Marsden, 2003). The sharing of food fulfils “social obligations to the gods and the manuhiri (visitors)” (Marsden, 2003, p. 9), meaning that no expense is spared in extending hospitality through kai to people, as the offering also honours ngā atua. Through such cultural practices, we see the broader reproduction of Māori culture and the cultivation of a place for these displaced men within their own traditions and cultural heritage.

There is more to being homeless than simply finding a meal and a place to sleep; friendship, support, and community are just as important. My findings support the view that it is a mistake to assume that materialistic needs, such as food, must be meet before that of psychological and relational health needs (Hodgetts et al., 2007). Both basic (food) and higher order (cultural affiliation) needs are intertwined in daily practice. Lunchtime in the gardens illustrates how homeless Māori are able to meet material, psychological, social, and cultural needs through emplaced cultural practices. The marae gardens then become more than just a setting where food is shared and consumed; it is a place where healthy relationships and culture are reproduced through the preparation and sharing of food. Previous
research has illuminated the complex meanings and symbolic power of food and the way that the food we eat embodies emotions and memories of nostalgia (Rosenbaum, 2005), and can help reground those who have been dislocated (Collins, 2008). The kinds of food that are eaten, the way these foods are consumed, including rituals and etiquette, the places where eating practices are conducted, and the people who take part are ways in which the cultural self is constructed and maintained (Bell & Valentine, 1997; Genoe et al., 2010). By engaging the marae gardening project and daily lunch rituals, the Streeties are able to take part in an everyday event that embodies symbolic cultural meanings that connects them to heritage and tradition. In this way, food functions as a way of connecting fragmented life stories, bringing together familiar spaces of the past and present (Ahmed, Casaneda, Fortier, & Sheller, 2003; Collins, 2008). The blending of these life stories, times and spaces are brought into the gardens and shared over lunch, building the relationships between the people who partake.

**Re-thinking the re-membered self**

As the threat of losing one’s self is a real danger of street life (Snow & Anderson, 1993), the Streeties were able to build resilience to this threat by re-entering the Māori world on the marae (cf., Groot et al., 2010). As the marae is a social hub of activity and social action for Māori, the men were able to become part of the social fabric of the marae, reciprocating what James (1890/1983) refers to as essences of identity that can be shared, reflecting the notion of the self as inherently relational being. The relational self is constructed from the cultural and situated aspects at hand in everyday life that adds fibres to the thread of identity, strengthening one’s place and meaning in the world. My findings support the view that identity is a dynamic on-going process of negotiating the self within a complex world. This supports concepts such as place-based identities (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010), whereby the marae as a socio-cultural space offers a familiar, culturally structured place for the Streeties to connect to and become a part of, solidifying who they are as Māori men.
My findings suggest that identity can be constructed in a *make-shift* kind of a way through incorporating both familiar and emergent cultural and situational aspects into the concept of the self (Wittgenstein, 1953/2009). For example, at one stage in the gardens, the Streeties and the researchers were sitting on the side of a hill, looking out over Takaparawhau. Miro took a leaf and started to make birdcalls with it. He told us the Māori name of the plant, what its medicinal values were in traditional Māori society, and showed us how to make native birdcalls that were used by Māori in the bush. Contained within this seemingly mundane act are deeply symbolic cultural features that connect the Streeties back to the traditions of being Māori. Each of these small aspects of the act represents a fibre of Māori identity, and when taken together, with all things Māori done on the marae, constitutes a strengthening of the overall tread of Māori identity.

The example of small acts that add fibres to the thread of identity shows the way in which marginalised people are able to reaffirm their identities by becoming part of the collective action on the marae. The concept of *family resemblance* (Wittgenstein, 1953/2009) is also compatible with Māori notions of identity, as the example of *te pā hararkeke* (the flax bush), put forward by Mead (2003), argues against identity as a state, but rather as a process. As each flax bush is made of a number of leaves that come and go over time, starting from the centre and moving outwards, identity is seen as a process of the collection of attributes a person is able to connect to, or express, at any given time. In this way, the notion that identity moves away from static snapshots of a person or social group at particular place and or time, and is seen as an on-going process of becoming within the world. The marae and gardening project actively facilitates this process and is a significant point in my research.

Processes of self-reconstruction and the re-creation of belonging take place in gardens, demonstrating that “vegetable beds can function as memory beds” (Li et al., 2010, p. 789), particularly when textured by Māori ways of life. As many of the Streeties grew up gardening and farming in rural communities, processes of re-membering took place in the marae gardens, whereby cultural traditions and practices were re-joined through active
participation in daily activities. In the Meno, Plato (1956/387-380 BC) speaks to the notion of re-membering by arguing that knowledge is not learned by people, rather, it is re-membered, by demonstrating the way in which the mind (soul) can derive knowledge through participating in social actions. For Plato, the placeholder of knowledge is not part of the physical world, and it is our soul that serves as a bridge that connects us to this place of knowledge. Through participating within a particular tradition, we come to acquire knowledge through re-membering past practices and places, rituals, people and meanings associated with gardening, and the use of material objects.

For the Streeties, the marae was a cultural focal point where they were able to re-claim who they are as Māori while being homeless. Through processes of re-membering, their daily actions allowed them to rebuild their identities within a setting textured by all things Māori. Chomsky (1965) argues that innate ideas (knowledge) are present within children when learning languages. This flies in the face of long held philosophical and scientific suppositions that assume that when people are born, our minds are blank slates, or empty containers to be filled. Here, I refer to the work of the British Empiricist John Locke (1959/1689). The assumption that we are born as blank slates is a doctrine that indirectly excludes the connection between people, beyond that of genetic transmission, and social groups, such as the Māori concept of whakapapa. Returning to Plato’s concept of re-membering, it is important to note that his ideas about knowledge via re-membering need not appeal to theological or metaphysical entities of sorts, as in a modern context, this would view his work outside of the context in which it was originally written. In a more modern context, Wittgenstein (1953/2009) locates meaning and knowledge within the world itself, through the actions, social conventions, and cultures of social actors, as opposed to the private minds of the ‘lonely philosopher’ apparent in the work of the British Empiricists. Consequently, if we re-work Plato’s notion of re-membering with Wittgenstein’s location of knowledge and meaning within the world, then we can see how re-membering through active participation is not simply a cognitive recalling of information. For Māori, it is a re-joining with the collective knowledge of the tūpuna through whakapapa within the material
world. Whether the Streeties actually did things on the marae that they learned from their whānau or not, their whakapapa connects them (in the same way Plato’s notion of the ‘soul’ connects people to knowledge) to a tradition of knowledge that can be re-membered while working away in the gardens.

People, place and objects
What it means to be Māori and how people achieve cultural connectedness and identities is complex and dynamic. The Streeties participating in this study had the language and were experienced in terms of marae protocols. What they lacked prior to the gardening project was a sense of place to stand, a tūrangawaewae where one’s ancestors stood, to anchor their sense of self as Māori. In considering these issues through an exploration of the everyday cultural patterning of a Māori woman’s street life, Groot, Hodgetts, Nikora, and Rua (2010) state that: “To be Māori is to have a tūrangawaewae (a place of strength and belonging, a place to stand)” (p. 125). These authors invoke this traditional perspective to then consider how this connection is approximated by homeless Māori people somewhere new. Such a realisation of the importance of place in Māori identity was also recognised by Ngāti Whātua and reflected in their efforts in welcoming the homeless men onto their tūrangawaewae. Ngāti Whātua consciously offered the Streeties a new place to stand. By taking part in gardening on the marae, the Streeties were able to carve out a place to belong by contributing their “efforts, desires, history and biography” (Li et al., 2010, p. 787) into the physical and social landscape of the marae. In the process, the life stories and experiences of both the Streeties and the people of Ngāti Whātua are implicated in the texturing of the marae. Gardening provided a vehicle for weaving the Streeties back into a marae. As Li and colleagues (2010) remarks, “people can literally grow the self as they cultivate vegetables” (Li et al., 2010, p. 794) that helps to reshape the world into a place of belonging. For the Streeties, gardening allowed them to reshape their worlds into a place to be Māori.

Māori have a long history of successful gardening and agriculture, particularly when adapting to introduced varieties (Salmond, 1997). In the
present context, not only does this everyday activity provide respite from the cityscape, it also re-shapes the land back to a distinctively Māori space. When early European colonisers settled in New Zealand, they used gardens and agriculture as a way of symbolically marking the land as distinctively English (Moon, 2006). Historically, this is also symbolic of disruption to the social ecology of Māori society. In Ngāti Whātua’s efforts to reclaim their land, re-shaping and re-texturing it as a distinctively Māori space, and inviting the Streeties to be a part of it, my finding show how gardening as an everyday activity is also a social action of resistance to the continuity of colonial rule.

Through daily interactions on the marae, the Streeties shaped and gave meaning to the garden as a space that reflected their histories, biographies, spirituality, and culture. As discussed by Kawharu (1975), the success of traditional Māori gardens were not only measured by technological and productivity advances, but also in terms of the social advances that are nurtured in the garden. This was apparent in my participants’ accounts of their gardening activities, from the way in which grass filled paddocks were transformed into fertile producers of food, to the community relationships that were built around it. Kawharu further states “Yet his customary social organisation had no need of a church to maintain and transmit belief in the supernatural. Religion appeared in every facet of his life” (1975, p. 91). The emergence of Māori spirituality through gardening was evident in my participants’ accounts, such as the use of karakia and the acknowledgment of the mauri of the marae gardens. As Kawharu’s quote suggest, Māori participation in traditional gardening practices can be just as spiritually important and valuable as the traditions of Judeo-Christians’ attendance to church services and holy sites. The marae garden was a place where the men could enact their spiritual connections with Papatūānuku, Tāne Mahuta, Rongo, Humietiketike and other atua.

My findings demonstrate that the marae can become more than just a place to be, in the geographical sense, as it is a place to belong and dwell. In this way, the marae functions as a space of care within a broader landscape of despair. The Streeties are able to leave settler society, if only for a while, to re-enter the Māori world on the marae. Notions of belonging for many of the
Streeties are textured by a traditional Māori worldview that situates belonging within whānau, hapū, and iwi links, and are enacted through everyday interactions. On a simple level, the marae provides a place of safety that allows for practices that promote wellness, such as general hygiene and personal time to reflect. On a deeper level, it is a place where the men ground themselves in all things Māori. What is significant about the marae as a space of care is that the cultural elements necessary to support the well-being of homeless Māori men, such as spiritual and cultural connectedness, have always been present there, and will continue well into the future.

Conradson (2003) warns us about the fragile nature of spaces of care in that the features that change within spaces of care can sometimes render it less caring, or uncaring, for some. Conradson (2003) found that the deeply personal relationships that developed between drop-in staff members and homeless individuals formed and textured the physical space itself, meaning that relationships were the foundations of the space of care, rather than the physical space itself. He found that when a staff member finishes their employment, or moves on, the relationship that ties a single homeless person to this space of care can become compromised. Although this may be a similar issue at the ACM as a drop in centre, the marae presents a unique cultural resilience to this problem. To be a member of an iwi, hapū and marae is dissimilar to a position of employment, as this membership is something a person is born into and spans their lifetime. This shows the strength of the marae as a consistent space of care where Māori can anchor themselves for long periods of time to be cared for, and to care for others.

The Streeties show that the self is not contained to an individual’s body. It extends out into the world through spiritual connections to place and the use of everyday objects that relationships and culture are lived through, reflecting Heidegger's (1927/1962) notion of being-in-the-world. The role of everyday material objects, such as the boil-up pot and barbeque facilities, in my research also offers important insights into the everyday practices of these homeless Māori men. Much attention has been given to objects of high culture, such as carvings (Brake & Simmons, 1986; Myhre, 1987) weaved objects (Pendergrast, 1987; Puketapu-Hetet, 1989) and other such artworks.
(Adsett, Whiting, & Ihimaera, 1996), and taonga (sacred Māori objects) (National Museum of New Zealand et al., 1989). The importance of everyday objects, such as the boil-up pot, extends on the shift from Anglo-American approaches, that can sometime decontextualized lives, by focusing researchers’ attentions on the socio-cultural patterning of everyday life (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012). Identities, culture and togetherness were lived through everyday objects, which permitted the reproduction of traditional and healthy relationships among these men. In my analysis, I presented the significance of the everyday objects that are part of the Streeties’ daily practices on the marae, and how these objects are used for ritualised connection, showing hospitality, and engaging in traditional Māori customs and practices. I would argue that the use of everyday objects within the gardens is a manifestation of manaakitanga, whanaungatanga, and cultural connectedness.

**Looking out from this thesis and into the future**

Coming out of this research and reflecting on my own approach to my first substantial piece of research, my attention has been drawn to the way Western philosophy, Māori knowledge and the discipline of psychology can be brought into conversation. This thesis is an attempt at moving towards a psychology that better reflects the lived realities of Māori people, within a broader discipline dominated by Western knowledge, beliefs, and values (Nikora, 2007). I place particular emphasis on the relational, contextual, and fluid nature of human life within a discipline that has historically taken the viewpoint of static, individualistic approaches to the human condition, which primarily relies on experimentation. Like many other indigenous researchers (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010), I am advancing an alternative psychology that decentralises US based psychologies as the primary producer of knowledge. I do this by incorporating Māori thoughts, experiences, values and notions as tools of analysis. By making a space for indigenous knowledge within this thesis, I have been able to contribute to the work of other indigenous researchers (Hodgetts, Drew, et al., 2010) in their attempts to broaden the way in which people within the field of psychology create knowledge that
impact upon indigenous people. A process I hope to continue with in future research.
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Appendix A

Aue Ha! Maori Men's Relational Health Questionnaire

Please note the below are areas of investigation only and not specific questions.

a) Biographical information including narrative of participant’s background
   • Tell us about yourself…

b) the nature of wellness-promoting relationships,
   • Purpose of the group
   • Individual role within group
   • The role of women, children and extended whanau
   • The importance of relationships within the group

c) how these relationships are enacted,
   • Activities of the group that promote relationships
   • The impact these relationships have on each other

d) the opportunities or circumstances that make and support such relationships, and

e) how and why men engage in these, or not.
Appendix B

Maori men and gardening

Participant Background Sheet

Interviewee Name: ________________________________

Interviewer: ___________________________ Date: _______________

Duration of the interview: ________________________________

Age: ________________________________

Iwi/Hapu: ________________________________

Current housing status: ________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Additional information (including health issues, disability, area of origin etc)

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Location of the interview (brief description): ________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Charting the interview

Impression of the interviewee: ________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Impression of how the interview went: _____________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Initial themes to emerge in the interview: ___________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Synopsis: ___________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Maori men and gardening
Initial Interview

Introduction
Talk with the participant and explain the aims of the initial interview and how this relates to the larger project. This conversation:

- enables me to get to know you and to explore what it means to be homeless and to be involved in the gardening project
- provide you with the opportunity to recount your experiences
- You should approach this as an informal discussion, so relax, ask questions, and when talking about issues try to think of examples.

Whakapapa / links back home

- Where are you from? / What are your iwi connections?
- What are some of the towns or cities did you live and for how long?
- What links do you have back home? / Do you go back home?
- What is your connection to Auckland?
- What does it mean to you to have te reo and tikanga Maori?
- What does having this knowledge and background mean to you as a streetie?
- Are you still in contact with your whanau?
- If you were to summarise what it’s like to be homeless what would you say?

Gardening project

- How did you get involved with the gardening project?
- Why do you take part in this project?
- What is the most fun thing?
- What’s your favorite thing to do out here?
- What is your key job/contribution?
- Who is a regular here? Why?
- Were you brought up gardening? Did your family garden?
- What happens to the vegetables when they’re ready?
- What does it mean to be on this Marae on such a regular basis?
- This seems like a living Marae or place to hang and do domestic things…

Photos of the site
[Use Wilf’s photos of the set up first then use the one’s we’ve taken onsite recently]

- Present each photograph to the participant – Tell me about this scene or place? – What does the picture show?
- Lay the photos out and get the guys to sequence the photos into a story of the opening of the garden or a typical day when they’re out here?
- Out of all the photographs which would you say best captures the day or your work here?
• Which photographs best capture your experiences of being here?
• Who is important in the photos? Why?
• Who is not in the photos but is important to you?
• In this place, which areas are important to you? How/why?
• Are there any important places, which do not appear on the photos?
• Do any of these pictures relate to te kanga etc you were brought up with?
• Discuss conceptions such as whanaungatanga, manakitanga etc as enacted in this place
• Some of the guys are just there for the tree planting and not the regular vege growing days. Why?

**Becoming and being Maori and a streetie**

• Tell me about the first time you thought of yourself as being homeless.
  [You could start by describing the experience and then take your time to fill in the details.]
• What lead to you becoming homelessness?
• What happens for you on a typical week both here and in your life in general?
• Are there any particular places where you feel comfortable or safe?
  [Tell me about that/those]
  How does the gardening fit into you’re routine? What does it mean to you?
  Are there particular people you hang out with more than others?
  Who are they and why?

Tell us about the people that are important to you?
• Other guys like you
• Whanau
• Children you may have
• Marae people like Shar and Ngahuia
• Mission staff like Wilf

**Closing the interview**

Summarise the main points from the interview and encourage further input from the participant.
• Would that be an accurate synopsis?
• Is there anything you would like to bring up or thought should have been discussed?
• Do you have any questions concerning this study?
Appendix C

Orakei Marae
Gardening Project:
A photo album in honour.

Māori and Psychology Research Unit, the University of Waikato.
Appendix D
Aue Ha! Maori men's relational health
Participant Consent Form

☐ I have read the information sheet for this study and have had the details of the interview and project explained to me. I have had a chance to ask any questions that I may have had. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction and I understand that I may ask more questions at any time.

☐ By signing this one form I consent to participating in this research project via 1-1 interviews and which may include several 1-1 engagements, in a discussion group (focus group) with others or by simply providing images and resources.

☐ I understand that I am free to withdraw from this interview at any time, and to later, withdraw any permissions, information, images or resources if I so wish without penalty or disadvantage.

☐ I agree to provide information to the researchers on the understanding that they will protect my anonymity and not use any information, images or resources given to them for purposes outside of this project unless I have given my written permission.

Full name: ____________________________

Contact Address: ____________________________

Phone no: ____________________________

Email: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

Research Participant Signature: ________________

Interviewer name: ____________________________

Interviewer signature: ____________________________
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**Principle Investigators**

Mohi Rua (*Tuhoe, Ngati Awa, Ngati Whakaue*), Maori & Psychology Research Unit, School of Psychology, University of Waikato, PB 3105, Hamilton. Phone 07-856 2889 ext 6187, Email mrua@waikato.ac.nz

Prof Darrin Hodgetts (*Ngai Tahu/Kati Mamoe*), School of Psychology, University of Waikato, PB 3105, Hamilton. Phone 07-856 2889 ext 6456, Email dhodgetts@waikato.ac.nz

**Lead Investigators:**

Tom Roa (*Ngati Maniapoto*), School of Maori & Pacific Development, The University of Waikato, PB 3105, Hamilton. Phone 07-856 2889 ext 4649, Email tomrtoa@waikato.ac.nz

Wilf Holt (*Ngai Tahu*), Auckland City Mission, Email wilf.holt@aucklandcitymission.org.nz

**Associate Investigators:**

Assoc Prof Linda Waimarie Nikora (Maori & Psychology Research Unit, School of Psychology, University of Waikato), Prof Ngahui Te Aweokutuku (Centre for Maori & Pacific Development Research), Tiniwai Te Whetu (Maori & Psychology Research Unit, School of Psychology, University of Waikato), Pita King (Maori & Psychology Research Unit, School of Psychology, University of Waikato).
Background
Research into the health of Māori men often focuses on illness and negative societal trends. Such illness-focused research remains sporadic and effectively invisible in the public domain. Research into health and positive aspects of Māori men’s lives is virtually non-existent. More needs to be done if we are to understand the dynamics of Māori men’s relationships and how these promote health today. This study explores the relational nature of Māori men’s health within the broader context of Te Pā Harakeke as manifest in traditional and contemporary settings. The intent is to extend our understanding of the nature of wellness-promoting practices within naturally occurring groups that forge and support positive relationships for Māori men, their families and communities. We employ a case-comparative ethnographic method to explore the relational health of Māori men engaged in traditional practices in their home settings (Ngati Maniapoto Pito ki te Paepae Kaumatua); those who have migrated to an urban centre and who work to maintain links back home (Tūhoe ki Waikato); and those who are experiencing street homelessness (Pani me te rawakore). All three groups are engaged in practices that foster supportive relationships and positive social interactions. For each case we scrutinise the group and investigate the relationships among men, and with women and children. We also consider each group closely, comparing practices and processes and integrating insights from previous studies. The first beneficiaries of our study will be the participants; research results will be shared with them, their whānau, and the Māori community throughout the project.

Project aims
To explore the social and relational nature of Māori men’s wellness in the wider context of Te Pā Harakeke. Our intent is to develop an informed understanding of: a) the nature of wellness-promoting relationships, b) how these relationships are enacted, c) the opportunities or circumstances that make and support such relationships, and d) how and why men engage in these, or not.

Who is the research team?
The research team are Mohi Rua (Tuhoe, Ngati Awa, Ngati Whakaue), Prof Darrin Hodgetts (Kati Mamoe/Kai Tahu), Tom Roa (Ngati Maniapoto, Waikato), Wilf Holt (Ngai Tahu), Assoc Prof Linda Waimarie Nikora (Tuhoe/Te Aitanga a Hauiti), Prof Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (Te Arawa, Tuhoe, Waikato) and Pita King (Te Rarawa, Nga Puhi). We are all responsible for the ethical conduct of the research and research team.

What am I being asked to do?
You are being asked to agree to be interviewed about the nature in which you actively engage and constructively participate, engage and contribute to your whanau and community.

I will make contact with you to arrange a time and place for an interview about your story. As I would like to audio-tape your interview and to take notes, a quiet place where we are unlikely to be interrupted is probably the most ideal. It is over to you to decide whether you want whanau or other
people to be present. After the interview, I will complete an interview report for you to read, change, add to or to simply comment on. We will also maintain telephone contact or email with you to make sure that you feel okay about the interview, the project and your participation.

If appropriate I may also take photographs showcasing the points you make or highlighting particular items, people or places of significance relevant to your story. This will be negotiated with you at the time. This is not a significant requirement, just an option worth considering. These photographs will be added to my working archive for your particular story. If photographs are taken, these might be included in publications or exhibitions arising from the study.

To maintain anonymity in the photographs, I can “black out” people's faces or signs that could identify you or someone or something of significance that could compromise you and your personal wellbeing. I will discuss this with you at the time.

You can also withdraw the pictures at any time. Use of images by me as principle investigator, for purposes other than educational i.e. academic lectures, community or conference presentations will require your written permission. If you do not wish for photographs to be taken, but will still do an interview, that is fine too.

**What will I be asked in the interview?**

The questions are based around the thematic areas described above. They are really conversation starters rather than questions that have an exact answer. I will ask you some general questions to prompt you to explore the nature in which you actively and constructively participate, engage and contribute to your whanau and community. I will also prompt you to talk more specifically about how Maori men's role and identity relationships they engage in engenders a sense of wellbeing within and between individual men and their whanau. The thing to remember is that this is **not** a test. There are no right or wrong answers. It's your story and you tell it your way.

**What will happen to my information?**

All the information that people provide us with will be studied to find commonalities and differences. We are interested in general themes and patterns as they relate to the experiences of Maori men. I may use what you say to help illustrate some of these general themes.

Once I have finished studying the information that has been given to me, unless you tell me otherwise, I will store the summary of the interview, audio files, photographs, consent forms, data, and contact information will be stored digitally and password protected on the University of Waikato server. Participants have a right to request a copy of the material with the originals held by the researchers at any time.
**Will other people know who I am?**

**Only if you want them to.** If you want others to know that you participated in this study, and you wish your name to appear next to any published quotes or other information you provide, then I will do so. **BUT,** if you wish that others not know, then I will keep your identity anonymous. This means that I will make sure that no one can identify any information that might belong to you.

**What if I agree to participate and then change my mind?**

**You can change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time.** Any information, resources, recordings or images (in any form) that you have provided to me will be returned immediately (or destroyed if you so wish). This will not be held against you in any way.

**How can I find out about the results of the study?**

Once you have completed your interview, we will maintain contact to ensure updates which may include personal emails and invitations to presentations. We will also present the findings to the participating groups of concern. We hope to also write a number of articles in magazines, and in academic journals.

At anytime, you are more than welcome to contact me or my supervisors to find out about my progress.

**Who can I speak with about my participation in this project?**

If you have further questions or concerns, I will be happy to discuss these with you. Contact details for me are attached.

**Will I be asked to sign anything?**

**Yes.** Before the interview commences, I will ask you to sign a consent form acknowledging that you have been adequately informed about: a) the study, b) what you are being asked to do, c) what will happen to your information, and d) your right to withdraw without being disadvantaged or penalised. This clearly identifies those things that we can or cannot do with your information or resources.
Ethical approval

This research has received ethics approval from the Department of Psychology Research and Ethics Committee for a [__________] period from date of approval (__________ 2012). For any questions or concerns about the ethical nature of the research or it’s investigators/researchers, please contact the following person:

Dr Nicola Starkey  
Convenor for the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee  
School of Psychology  
University of Waikato  
(07) 856 2889 ext 6472  
nstarkey@waikato.ac.nz

If you wish to proceed to the interviewing stage, please let me know via email or phone.

I look forward to working with you,

Kia hora te marino,

Mohi Rua, Darrin Hodgetts, Tom Roa, Wilf Holt, Linda Nikora, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, Tiniwai Te Whetu, and Pita King.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroha</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atua</td>
<td>God / gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awhi</td>
<td>To embrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākari</td>
<td>Feast / sharing of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Sub tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haumiatiketike</td>
<td>God of uncultivated foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongi</td>
<td>A pressing of the noses to symbolise the breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira atua</td>
<td>The gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira tangata</td>
<td>A human life that has inherited a collection of genes from their parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikorero</td>
<td>Orator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiwhakahaere</td>
<td>Director / organiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamokamo</td>
<td>Type of squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi ki te kanohi</td>
<td>Face to face / in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumātua</td>
<td>Male elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa</td>
<td>Matter of discussion or topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values of Māori society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāwanatanga</td>
<td>Governorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia ora</td>
<td>Common greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koha</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanga reo</td>
<td>Māori language preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>Term of endearment towards male elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroua</td>
<td>Term of endearment towards male elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuia</td>
<td>Term of endearment towards female elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Prestige, authority, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki-(tanga)</td>
<td>Caring for others, hospitality, kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawhenua</td>
<td>Supreme authority over lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuhiri</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Indigenous people of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māoritanga</td>
<td>Māori culture, practice and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Communal complex used for everyday Māori life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae ātea</td>
<td>Courtyard in front of wharenui (meeting house)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matariki</td>
<td>Star constellation / Māori New Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matua</td>
<td>Father / term of endearment toward male elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauri</td>
<td>Life force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paepae</td>
<td>Orator's seating space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Non-Māori New Zealander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakainga</td>
<td>Home lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatūānuku</td>
<td>God of the Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārakaraka</td>
<td>Type of Māori potato / also known as peruperu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patere</td>
<td>Chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepeha</td>
<td>A set form of words containing tribal knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruperu</td>
<td>Type of Māori potato / also known as Pārakaraka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōwhirī</td>
<td>Traditional Māori welcoming ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūhā</td>
<td>Perennial sowthistle / <em>Sonchus arvensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūkeko</td>
<td>Native New Zealand bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūmanawa</td>
<td>Personal characteristics / traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatiratanga</td>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reweti</td>
<td>Type of Māori kale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringa wera</td>
<td>Kitchen / dinning hall worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riwai</td>
<td>Potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohe</td>
<td>Area / region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongo / Rongamātāne</td>
<td>God of agriculture and cultivated foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumaki</td>
<td>Total immersion in the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaparawhau</td>
<td>Bastion Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Makaurau</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāne Mahuta</td>
<td>God of the forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>People of the land / hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangihanga</td>
<td>Traditional Māori death ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Anything to have great value within the Māori world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>Sacred or prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautoko</td>
<td>To support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ao Māori</td>
<td>The Māori world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ao marama</td>
<td>The world of being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te korekore</td>
<td>The world of potential being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te pā harakeke</td>
<td>The flax bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Po</td>
<td>The world of becoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>The Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tai Tokerau</td>
<td>The Northland region of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekoteko</td>
<td>Carved figure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Term</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūmatauenga</td>
<td>God of war and justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupuna / Tūpuna</td>
<td>Ancestor / Ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūrangawaewae</td>
<td>Place to stand / stomping ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urupa</td>
<td>Cemetery / burial ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairua</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe (referring to the great migration of Māori to New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaikōrero</td>
<td>Formal oration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakairo</td>
<td>Māori carving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakama</td>
<td>Shy / embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatauki</td>
<td>Proverbial saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakawhanaungatanga</td>
<td>Process of establishing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Family (including extended family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Relationships based on shared experience or kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharekai</td>
<td>Dinning hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharenui</td>
<td>Meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>