

Well-being and Disparity in Tamaki-makaurau
Report on the Urban Māori Disparities Research Programme

Reprinted from:
New Zealand Population Review 29(1) 2003,

Charles Crothers

“Far from being members of a homogenous group, Maori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities. The relevance of traditional values is not the same for all Maori, nor can it be assumed that all Maori will wish to define their ethnic identity according to classical constructs. At the same time, they will describe themselves as Maori and will reject any notion that they are ‘less Maori’ than those who conform to a conventional image” (Durie, 1995: 465).

“Ka kōhi te toi, ka whai te maramatanga.
“If knowledge is gathered, enlightenment will follow”.

(1) Introduction:

The research reported in this paper focused on one central question:

What factors contribute to cultural, social, economic and political well-being amongst Māori in larger urban areas, and how are these inter-related?

This question was explored drawing on data developed within several research sites within metropolitan Auckland. Since Auckland is a microcosm of the larger urban scene, this information has wider significance.

The purpose of the research was to assist in the development of policy that will transform the urban Māori situation; and to identify the factors that need attention in order to ensure that all Māori in larger urban areas have the freedom to develop their capabilities so they achieve personal well-being and contribute positively to their whānau as the pre-requisite to building a dynamic nation. Appropriate policy was to be built on evidence such as that developed in the study reported here.

This paper develops an argument based on some of the material in a larger study presented in five volumes, to which readers are referred for more detail: see appendix one for a table of contents of the volumes.

(2) Context of the research

There is a long and daunting recital of Māori / non-Māori disparities in the Te Puni Kōkiri publication *Progress towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps between Māori and Non-Māori* (Wellington, 1998). These data were updated in a report of the same title, prepared for the Minister of Māori Affairs in May 2000, and (inter alia) by the Ministry of Social Development's successive "Social Reports" (MSD, 2001, 2002, 2003). The material in these comprehensive reports is indicative of the kinds of disparities attracting official attention. Some further commentary (e.g. Benton, 2001a) has identified further disparities which deserve attention.

It has been assumed by many commentators and policy makers that there is a serious disparity between Māori and non-Māori in New Zealand across a wide range of social and economic indicators, and that, in many instances, this gap is widening. In certain circumstances, being Māori seems in itself to imply actual or potential disadvantage. There is a corresponding assumption that, as all else appears to have failed, the way to change this state of affairs for the better, to "close the gap" in a positive way, is to ensure that an increasing proportion of assistance to Māori, in health, education, social welfare and education, is provided in culturally appropriate ways, and, to a very large extent, by Māori working through Māori-mandated organizations.

However, despite the apparently compelling evidence of aggregated statistics that Māori as a group are significantly more deprived than the rest of the population, it is also clear there are many individual exceptions to this rule; that averages can conceal a more complex pattern of disparity. Hence the desire by the Government, through the Ministry for Māori Development, to find out more about the nature and

determinants of the disparities between Māori and non-Māori, and within the Māori population itself. (A description of the James Henare Cetner research program exploring this area is provided in Appendix 2.) Presumably, with this information sounder policies can be formulated and the root causes of the problems targeted more effectively. In addition, the points raised in the critical literature can be more definitively addressed.

The 'closing the gaps' debate has also drawn critical attention. Reaction (e.g. Chapple 2000; Gould 2000) has extended the 'official' approach by suggesting (inter alia) a range of points for consideration. They argue that there are often difficulties with the data (especially that based on official social book-keeping statistics). While absolute differences continue in many domains, relative differences are reducing. Dispersions are as important as averages (and that the very overlap of Maori/non-Maori dampens the differences between them). Maori, and also non-Maori, each include a range of ethnic orientations. Factors other than race/ethnicity (partially) explain Maori/non-Maori differences, e.g. education, social class, cultural/social capital etc (and consequently multivariate data analyses are required to capture the extent of these effects). There may be pockets where differences are concentrated (e.g. rural locations). "Culturally appropriate" programme delivery seldom works. Along somewhat similar lines, Gould (eg 2000) has argued a range of points.

Untangling all these points requires patient effort, together with a need to stand-back where available data are poor, and await better data rather than rushing into premature judgement.

Much of their argumentation in this "revisionist" approach is seen by some other social analysts as being limited theoretically (especially as it is framed in economic terms and couched at an individual level) and critiques have suggested that it is poorly based on data. As a result there has been considerable contestation of their work (e.g. Alexander, 2001; Pool, 2003; Rata, 2000; Rochford, 2001). A plethora of criticisms has been advanced and in this study some of these have been further explored.

In sum, the reaction to the Chapple-Gould argumentation has taken one of three forms: criticism of particular analyses, criticism of the more general framework within which their argument sits, and attempts to move the debate into wider territory.

In this study we have taken the third path. Rather than further rehearse the details of this debate, we note some of the lessons which can be derived, and then move on to begin to carry out the studies which are needed to further the mobilisation of high quality knowledge about the range of Maori situations. As well as reviewing existing studies we report on both new empirical work and appropriately focused secondary analyses.

The 'third path' of pushing for more evidence is particularly relevant as fresh data is required for the 'closing the gaps' debate to move forward. There are several key questions which need to be raised. We need to examine the extent of pertinent differentiation within Maori (and non-Maori). We need to examine the extent of separateness between Maori/non-Maori in terms of their daily lives, experiences etc. We need to focus, in particular, on the characteristics of poor Maori as opposed to

Maori in general (and to develop explanatory models indicating the correlations involved in “explaining” Maori poverty);

We need to examine the features associated with involvement in Maori ethnicity and the adoption of Maori identity (language, involvement with Maori organizations etc.). We need to include in the analyses a range of subjective factors (e.g. Maori goals, views, attitudes, satisfactions, stresses, expressed needs etc): e.g. to examine whether Maori in fact share similar goals among themselves and in relation to non-Maori. We need to examine the factors associated with success/lack of success in Maori advancement, including examination of success stories. Moreover, these analyses cannot remain couched at an individual level but must include the collective level of Maori (and nonMaori) involvement and interaction with (Maori/non-Maori) organizations and communities (and the effects of these).

(4) Methodology:

The study whose research this paper draws on is multidisciplinary and combines exhaustive analysis of national official and survey statistics, focused census studies, intensive ethnographic research in locales chosen for special study, including - in particular - an Orakei case-study, and an innovative approach in social geography, producing a variety of representations of the interaction of place and people. (A listing of the senior members of the research team is provided in Appendix 3.)

The quantitative part examines the view of the national and regional scene using the materials most accessible to, and extensively relied on, by policy makers. Some of these data are also the subject of critique, together with suggestions concerning the ways in which these data collections and measures might be improved to provide a basis for sounder policy and decision-making (cf. Kukutai, 2003). The focused census studies provide immediate background for the ethnographic survey. The ethnography complements the quantitative part of the research programme, and allows individuals and families to speak as people rather than appear as disembodied fragments in a statistical array. The case study of Ngati Whatua ki Orakei allows the reader to see how a tangata whenua group has been able to order its affairs and maintain a presence in the heart of a metropolis since the beginnings of urbanization in New Zealand. The spatial dimension is interwoven into all these accounts. Each of the five accounts interweaves with the others.

In this paper, the main sources are the quantitative and ethnographic studies, with some supporting evidence from the focused census studies and the Orakei case study. Some more detailed methodological points from these two main sources are now provided/

The quantitative portion of the study attempts to mine relevant material on differences between Maori and non-Maori, and differences within Maori (and to some extent within non-Maori), from “official social book-keeping sources” and surveys. In particular, attempts are made to establish the extent to which non-Maori, sole/mixed Maori and ethnic/descent Maori differ in terms of social background characteristics and their reported behaviour and attitudes. One part of the study focuses on variability in people’s Maoriness, on identity, and the range of activities and occasions in which people may (or may not) feel Maori. This includes the extent to

which (essentially) non-Maori choose to support, or even to participate in, Maori activities.

The ethnographic research was conducted in three localities in the greater Auckland metropolitan area. It involved members of tangata whenua and immigrant Māori groups, and included people living in a wide variety of socio-economic conditions ranging from deprived to relatively affluent. (To some extent the study was seen as a more urban partial equivalent to the Massey University longitudinal study :Fitzgerald, 1999, 2000.)

Auckland has about a third of the Māori population, and over 40% of the 'urban Maori' population, and thus provides a good research-site for investigating issues concerning this group. Within Auckland, West Auckland, particularly Te Atatu and nearby localities, was chosen because there were significant numbers of Māori there who owned their own homes. Many had lived in the area since the government-assisted relocation schemes had encouraged resettlement of Māori families to this area in the 1950s and 1960s. This seemed to be a good contrast with the more deprived areas in Manukau (as measured by the New Zealand Deprivation Index). It was also considered important to proceed with a study of the Orakei tangata whenua community, based in a few streets near their original papakāinga, but also dispersed throughout Auckland (and much further afield), as representative of other traditional tangata whenua groups engulfed by urbanization.

An attempt to provide a more sound alternative to this way of obtaining and using relevant data has led to the formulation of the "kāwai hue" (gourd vine) methodology. The researchers believe that it is essential to consult Māori people living in a variety of situations directly, to find out what they themselves are concerned about, and what (if anything) they would like to be done to improve their life chances.

Each interview involved talking in depth to Māori residents of these areas about their life experiences, aspirations and matters which they consider contribute or detract from their well-being and that of their families. The topics that were of central importance to this ethnography are listed in appendix 4:

In South Auckland, it was possible to get a reasonable coverage of those areas in Decile 10 (most deprived) on the Disparities Index (Salmond et al, 1998), along with a complementary group of households outside these areas mostly also in high-decile areas. For the participants affiliated with Ngati Whatua o Orakei, an almost even balance was obtained between those resident in Orakei itself and those living elsewhere in Auckland.

The supporting studies complement the two main areas of attention. The focused census studies cover descriptions of the characteristics of Maori resident in Auckland in terms of their iwi affiliations; the tracing of the migration flows between areas within Auckland and between Auckland and other regions; and community profiles of the areas covered in the ethnographic survey. The Orakei case study particularly involved an institutional analysis, alongside a portion of the ethnographic interviewing. It was also to an extent a restudy of the earlier classic (Kawharu, 1975).

(5) Major Findings:

(5.1) Sociographical Material

A wide range of studies was canvassed in order, in particular, to pin down the extent to which the Maori/nonMaori gap was in part explainable by other social factors. Here, there is room to summarise only four of these studies.

A major empirical question is whether the same goals are held by each grouping within a society. Are Maori goals similar to those of non-Maori? The evidence points to basically similar levels of aspiration between Maori and non-Maori, at least in terms of economic/material matters, although with Maori inclined to put more emphasis on non-material aspects (more detailed evidence is provided in Crothers, 2003). It seems reasonable, then, to proceed on the pair of assumptions that Maori aspirations are both generally very closely similar to, and yet subtly different from, those of nonMaori.

Amongst Maori, there are a range of identifications which have changed historically. Kukutai (2003) has found that 'mixed' Maori fall between nonMaori and Maori in terms of their demographic and socio-economic characteristics, with those identifying more with Pakeha being similar to Pakeha while those identifying with Maori being similar to Maori. Extending this analysis by reviewing of survey data shows that over a wide range of attitudinal issues there is a broad similarity between Maori and non-Maori views, although Maori tend to adopt pro-working class, and even more pro-Maori cultural positions. There is also some ambivalence which undermines the overall consistency of Maori views, especially in relation to taxation and increasing government services: perhaps suggesting that the level of attitude consistency is lower among Maori (or that many Maori respondents are trying to reconcile difficult positions). Responses of those of 'Maori descent' (but who don't identify ethnically as Maori) provide complex patterns. In general, their position falls between Maori and non-Maori viewpoints but more often they side with non-Maori.

Another consideration is that there is some migration of individuals between the various categories. In several secondary analyses developed to explore the topic of 'category-jumping' it was found (as in Kukutai's findings, 2003) that there is a general pattern of stability, together with longer-term trends, and that the extent of category-jumping is not great. The finding that inter-generational ethnic mobility is higher was also confirmed.

In order to investigate the central question of the extent to which the Maori/non-Maori income or resource gap is statistically explained by factors other than ethnicity, a multivariate analysis of survey data (from the NZ Election Survey) was developed which endeavours to assess the overall effect of sets of predictors on 'relative household income adequacy'. (Other recent studies of this type include Fergusson, 1991, 1993; Sporle, 2002.) The predictor set used here includes a measure of Maoriness, and measures of occupation (grouped into broad "socio-economic status" categories), highest educational qualification, family type, housing tenure, type of community, and age group. Overall, predictability of income adequacy was reasonably high (with multiple correlations of around 0.35) and with the main explanatory burden being borne by measures of family type, tenure, and age, together with some slight social class effects. The measures of Maoriness had some

but relatively little explanatory “pulling power”, and this was reduced still further once the other variables in the equation were controlled for. It follows from this line of argument (although this is debatable) that it is mainly the tendency of Maori households to be in rental accommodation, to be younger, and to live in larger households that mostly explains their economic difficulties, rather than the fact that they are Maori, although being Maori remains of some explanatory significance.

Nor should Maori/nonmaori differences be reduced to the merely socio-economic. There are major cultural differences which cascade through Maori social life: in particular, differences in reproductive behaviour involving fertility at earlier years leads to significant long-term and cumulative socio-economic impacts in terms of the various ramifications of the ‘family life-cycle’ including household tenure and income patterns (Jackson, 2002; Jackson and Pool, 1996).

(5.2) Ethnographic:

The central component of the study draws on a mass of quantitative data, and on the experiences of people who represent a great part of the range of urban Māori experience. Some of that experience has been very good, enhancing the well-being of individuals, family and whānau, and giving people the freedom to grow and prosper. For others, urban life has been disappointing, tragic, or crippling to the spirit. What impressed the research team greatly about those who participated, however, was their resilience, their hopefulness, the absence of a “victim mentality” even among those whose rangatiratanga had been most circumscribed, and the strength of whānau in enabling their members to cope with adversity and rise above it.

Most of the participants in the ethnographic study were “unhyphenated” (ie ‘sole’) Māori with iwi and hapū affiliations at the time of the survey. However, at least one informant was quite adamant that his Maoriness was unconnected to any tribal links. He neither knew nor cared about his iwi. He said that he was simply a city Māori (and a member of his whānau), and that was that!

Despite the professed ambivalence of quite a few of the Auckland Māori with whom the ethnographic researchers discussed the issue of where they would really like to live, it is probable that many Māori chose freely to live in Auckland and are likely to continue to do so. Certainly, quite a few of the people seemed to place a high value on social mobility, which is often linked with a shift of location, from choice rather than necessity. Urban Māori may often be treated as a “problem” by Māori and non-Māori alike because this choice is not recognized or regarded as legitimate. A “stay in your valley” attitude (also reflected by one or two people encountered in the course of the study), on the one hand, and moving on and reestablishment, on the other, are both valued. Many Māori people quite like to have it both ways in various forms, maintaining both an urban base and active links with a traditional rural community. Indeed, many urban Māori whānau still have strong links to rural heartlands. Such links of whanaungatanga also underline the importance of Māori cultural institutions such as te reo, tikanga, knowledge of one’s traditional history, heritage, and relationships with other whānau, hapū and iwi.

Urban Maori concerns differ across the different policy domains of housing, education, employment and health. Housing was a paramount concern, in particular low rates of home ownership. Education is widely seen as a key to liberation from economic hardship. There are very positive attitudes toward education. However many respondents seemed unclear as to how their educational aspirations might be realised. Respondents seemed insufficiently aware that they might find themselves having accumulated debts they cannot repay as a result of pursuing educational opportunities that have not brought tangible benefits. Employment is linked to education and housing. The lack of education (often the lack of literacy) means many people cannot find secure employment. Low wages or lack of employment makes it impossible for people to house themselves securely and have sufficient money to meet their daily needs, let alone save for the future. Long-term employment opportunities and better career development tracks led to more secure whānau situations. Health is linked to housing, education and employment. Crowded houses and meagre incomes often make even low cost health provisions unaffordable. Finally, an extremely serious problem is the perceived lack of coordination among Crown agencies, iwi social services and other bodies in the health and welfare sectors.

There is a surprisingly high level of whānau/family responsibility (and to some extent personal self-reliance) among the study participants. Many of them, including some really needy ones, expressed a desire to have more independence from broader structures, and the capacity to help one another *within* their *whānau*. Some participants spend an enormous amount of time and energy as well as money on helping parents, siblings and other less fortunate members of their whānau. Many parents and grandparents provide support to the *kōhanga reo* and *kura kaupapa Māori/Māori* attended by their children and grandchildren. It is the whānau that appears to be the first port of call for a vast majority of the participants in the study when in need of help or when they want to improve the quality of their lives. They go outside only if the whānau does not have the resources required. These expressed attitudes counter widespread criticism from some Pakeha that Maori family life is not responsible, and that it is entirely enmeshed in supposedly dysfunctional forms of solo parent households. The lived social reality is far more complex.

Respondents talked about well-being in terms of what is good for their children and mokopuna and the hopes and aspirations they have for them. Domestic well-being, a good education, a “real” job, cultural integrity – these are all seen to lead to the achievement of general well-being, for themselves and their whānau. Those who have these advantages and resources share them with those who lack them, and/or serve as role models for those who aspire towards them. *Of central importance to the achievement of general well-being is a supportive, functional whānau.*

Some urban Māori feel very insecure because Maori cultural dimensions are not part of the national fabric. This is not conducive to their well-being.

While people find it difficult to explain well-being, they have no difficulty recognizing it when they experience it. Those we spoke with had clear ideas about what they needed to achieve it (what the critical success factors are). The main themes mentioned include guaranteed rights (Treaty of Waitangi/indigenous/minority); wairua, spiritual well-being; supportive whānau and friends, and role models;

education and training in a broad sense leading to capability to access, process, use and enhance vital knowledge; a modicum of financial security which in most cases means having steady employment; inclusiveness in defining the issues and searching for solutions; a safe home, with secure tenure; cultural resilience; good coping strategies; good habits and attitudes, e.g., being focused, open and adaptable; good health; and assistance and support from the right organizations (Māori and non-Māori) at the right time.

To achieve well-being, therefore, urban Māori need to have their rights guaranteed, be secure in their identity, knowledgeable about Māori history and traditions, well-educated, in good health, gainfully employed, comfortably domiciled, with a supportive whānau within easy reach.

These components of general well-being are not ranked because, often, means and ends roll into one. For example, when people talk about the importance of a supportive whānau, they talk about it as something they value and work towards. However, although that is clearly their cherished ideal, the same people may also be concerned about divisions within their own particular whānau or the strain that the demands or incapacity of some members puts on others, factors which they see as preventing the achievement of whānau well-being.

Individual well-being and societal well-being are closely interlinked. In the final analysis, it is a problem of choice for the group and their individual members. If rangatiratanga is not taken into account and recognized from the start, there will be persistent problems in sorting out what it is that is valued and what services are needed, and also how these are to be delivered.

Some analysis was also attempted of how diverse needs and views were amongst different localities studied.

(5.3) Focused Census Studies

Looking only at the extreme cases in the Auckland scene, as revealed by the 1996 Census statistics, there were interesting, and not unexpected, contrasts between subgroups in terms of residential location and/or iwi affiliation, underlining the continuing diversity within Auckland's Māori population (as earlier studies have also found: e.g. Pool, 1991, *passim* especially pp. 201-204). The least affluent areas of South Auckland had the highest incidence of characteristics associated with economic hardship and disadvantage, with the same two or three iwi subgroups within South Auckland frequently appearing at the top or bottom of lists of factors associated with destitution or prosperity (respectively). One Western Auckland subgroup had the highest percentage of homeowners and none of the characteristics most associated with disparities featured among the Western Auckland subgroups. The subgroup with the lowest percentage of Māori speakers was also located there. Central Auckland Urban Area had the subgroups with the highest percentages of Māori speakers, university degrees, users of public transport, and uncrowded houses, and the lowest percentages of home owners, unqualified members of the labour force and people who drove themselves to work on Census day. North Shore groups included the highest percentages of both walkers and car users, self-employed, holders of advanced technical and professional qualifications, and older people, along with the lowest percentages of unemployed, people not in the labour

force, and people with low incomes. The spatial complexity of Maori urban populations needs careful attention. The complexity of iwi affiliation also undermines analytical attempts to unpick its effects, especially in multi-iwi urban situations.

Although net migration (the difference between the numbers of those who have left and new arrivals) is often low, the number of people affected is often very high (cf. Pool, 1991). The greatest influx of Māori into all the Auckland urban zones came from outside the Auckland region, and the majority of departures were also for other parts of the country. This kind of movement in and out of Auckland has been going on for at least the last 200 years and undoubtedly much longer. Mobility is a fact of Māori life and tradition which needs to be factored into policy.

(5.4) Orakei Case Study:

The Orakei case study delved into the defectiveness of institutional arrangements in an engulfed hapu. Much is shaped by history, and the historical context is perhaps aggravated by the community's location near the center of Auckland city and its harbour-side location. The desecration of the Orakei marae in 1951 after the acquisition of the remainder of the hapū lands deeply scarred the community and left a generation which has not had the opportunity to assimilate the tikanga of the hapū and iwi through the experiential education provided in the past by marae and kaumātua. A deep sense of scepticism about Crown and local government policies and practices remains, and from this uncertainty, lack of trust and generally negative feelings continue to flow. Few of the locally resident tangata whenua community in Orakei speak Māori fluently and virtually none are native speakers.

Development is constrained when fundamental tribal customs, protocols and prerogatives are not widely known or easily articulated in non-Māori or Māori contexts. Capacity building for Orakei, and other urban tangata whenua communities which have retained or regained a collectively owned asset base, necessarily entails reaching a balance between commercial and cultural development. Urban Hapu have many calls for participation in decision-making which often stretch their resources beyond breaking point.

A considerable constraint on Ngati Whatua o Orakei exercising kaitiakitanga effectively relates to the internal politics within the wider kin group. Traditional leadership structures that manage tribal affairs and resources have, to a large extent, been replaced by modern governance structures such as runanga, marae committees and, in the case of Orakei, a Māori Trust Board. But there are consistent challenges from within the wider kin group to the authority of the legislated bodies to represent the interests of Ngati Whatua and the Orakei hapu. While the legislated bodies seek to exercise the collective rangatiratanga and mana motuhake of Ngati Whatua, there are those that wish to retain the autonomy of sometimes smaller groups at whanau and hapu level in their dealings with Crown agencies in resource management.

The introduction of the Resource Management Act has seen the proliferation of groups representing and purporting to represent their respective sections of Ngati Whatua on resource management matters. As a consequence, there are at least eight groups that claim to represent Ngati Whatua on the Tamaki Isthmus. On their

side, Territorial Local Authorities will often consult in an inclusive manner without questioning the mandate and right of a group to represent those they purport to or Territorial Local Authorities may avoid consultation altogether with Ngati Whatua and Ngati Whatua o Orakei, on the basis that there is confusion as to who they should consult.

(6) Other Factors:

(6.1) Contextual Features:

The causes and effects of the disparities documented in the literature are complex and interwoven. Some, such as poverty and poor housing, are common to groups across any ethnic divide, while others are especially significant for Māori.

There is clearly a need to consider broader structures, beyond the purview of more technical research, which have shaped the nature of Māori / non-Māori disparity. (Other broad studies of the macrosociology of the New Zealand situation include Pool, 1991; Feras and Spoonley, 1999.) These broad features include the 'class factor' since a significant sector of the Māori population suffers from sustained deprivation and transgenerational dependence on transfer payments. In addition, it is clear that there remain the residual effects of cumulative historical wounds that are yet to be completely healed. Finally, at this broad level, it is clear that there are ongoing effects of ethnic, racial and cultural stereotyping associated with covert and overt discrimination in, for example, housing and employment.

By themselves, the basic structural factors are probably immune to intervention. Some crucial 'mediating variables' that may shape disparity and deprivation and which may be thought of as intervening between the broad structural conditions (just noted) and the outcomes include: inadequate lack of access to information; restricted access to goods and services; severely restricted communication networks; undermined confidence; resistance to potentially beneficial development; and affliction with various social pathologies. Better understanding of the intervening of these variables and the extent to which they might be subject to policy manipulation is needed.

Finally, service delivery is not always optimal: it is very clear that, despite sporadic successes and notable exceptions, existing programmes on the whole do not meet Māori needs effectively. They are unlikely to do so while attempts continue to apply general "solutions" to localized and specific problems.

(6.2) The Power of the Whānau

An emphasis on the role of whānau as a Maori institution which continued to operate within urban contexts, and to also connect the urban and the rural, seemed to arise out of the data.

The ethnographic study found clear linkages between individual and collective well-being – or more specifically, that individual well-being is contingent upon whānau well-being. For example, in seeking to achieve well-being, two-thirds of the 91 ethnographic survey participants said they would draw on the support of whānau and

their own resources, while only 4% would seek support from a Māori organisation, 4% from a Government agency and 3% from a health provider. Research participants expressed strong preferences for greater autonomy and flexibility to respond to their own whānau needs. Whānau seemed to be able to articulate their own needs, as a consequence, there is a need for whānau involvement in the design and delivery of services, and the broad based support for localised solutions for localised problems

Without dynamic whānau able to advance their members' interests and welfare, hapū, iwi and the wider Māori and New Zealand social orders will be based on very shaky foundations. The whānau as an institution exists independently of the units above it, and transcends the boundaries between these higher-level institutions. The principle of subsidiarity applies strongly here – what *can* be done well by the whānau *should* be done by the whānau and not by some higher authority. The role of the higher authorities is to facilitate the development of whānau capacity to do themselves whatever they can do best. Yet, at present, whānau are often mobilised only in negative circumstances: as in family group conferences.

What policies are needed to capitalize on these attributes and actual and potential strengths? One problem many whānau face is how to organize effectively for collective action in an urban setting, where their economic base is fragmented and often insecure. The idea of Whānau Trusts (like those which can be established under the Ture Whenua Māori Act, but not limited to landowners) was raised by some participants in the ethnographic study as a way for families to mobilize their collective talents and resources. Some had established successful trusts under the Act. They considered such trusts offered a model that could be further developed. Such Trusts would enable whānau to focus on resources, identify talent, set educational and training objectives, generate employment opportunities through entrepreneurial activity, and provide links with networks outside the city. Whānau can also have commercial potential and there are already families who have succeeded in developing this, thus providing tangible success models.

New avenues are needed to enable whānau to save for major capital expenses, and especially homes, that are now out of reach. Something akin to the old family benefit (with or without additional tax concessions) that could be capitalized to assist with home ownership, and would be available without discrimination to people on benefits, could also have a transforming effect on many peoples' lives. Such an approach could be combined with "sweat equity" and cooperative approaches to high quality, low cost housing on a much wider scale than is being done at present.

However, there are also obstacles to such kinds of development, again noted by some of the people who talked about this to the researchers, such as lack of confidence in dealing with public officials (e.g. Land Court staff), lack of financial resources to follow the bureaucratic process through, and lack of information about where to go and who to talk to, in order to find out about procedures, entitlements and opportunities for development.

Such obstacles could in turn be overcome by providing workshops for whānau members, conducted by competent facilitators and simplifying bureaucratic procedures. There are of course many Māori people with considerable experience in

rūnanga, marae committees, kōhanga and other pre-school organizations and in various voluntary organizations who form a pool of talent which could be tapped to assist in facilitating such a process of development.

Since exploration of the social role of the whanau was not built into the design of the study, only some emergent features of its operation emerged: more research is needed.

(7) Major Policy Implications:

The overall study includes a valuable specific exercise in endeavouring to interrelate research findings and policy implications. Although a slew of fairly detailed policy suggestions was developed, the main thrust of the recommendations is to recommend the building of a sounder platform for Maori-related policy development than presently exists.

Given the paucity of good quality information building a sounder platform for policy making and policy implementation must surely involve direct and in-depth consultation with those whom the policies are designed to benefit. For example, policy makers could serve internships working directly with people who will be affected by the policies which they formulate. Such an approach should also be supported by long-term programmatic research which can identify general trends, place local and regional concerns and possibilities within a national and international context, identify structural strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, since at present "Māori" data is uneven and does not adequately distinguish between Māori, one way of improving this is routine collection of high quality social and economic data on Māori, which distinguish between various sociologically meaningful categories of Māori in a systematic way.

The research study drawn on here has indicated a variety of considerations which should inform policy development, including the significance of both material and non-material aspects and of promoting choice and self-reliance. It is argued in the more general report that strengthening the whānau, and harnessing its capacity for exercising 'responsibility', and its potential for social and economic development should be a major focus of national social policy. While reflecting and supporting the variation within Maoridom, policies should not undermine the common miro or thread of "Maoriness" which transcends social, economic and descent-related divisions. (Some key more specific recommendations are noted in Appendix 5.)

(8) Conclusions:

It can reasonably be argued that "Māori" and "urban Māori" have both become prescriptive terms used to classify and isolate an "other" group that has become a problem to the State, and those social elements with whose interests the State is most concerned. The concentration on the negative aspects of Māori life exacerbates this situation, generating and reinforcing an image of a dependent, ill-educated, criminally inclined, unhealthy and fractious minority (cf Chapple, 2000). It is not surprising that many Māori have fled the country to escape this labelling process (cf. Harwood 1993) or that others may have come to believe there is no

escape from the stereotype, so they may as well live up (or down) to it. For that reason, the commissioning of this research has been heartening, as it signals official recognition that the term “Māori” covers a multidimensional reality, which may have equally diverse needs and aspirations worthy of attention by government policy makers.

However, obtaining a good handle on this multidimensional reality has difficulties. To a considerable extent, systematic research on the topics addressed in this report has been lacking. There is a large store of relatively low-quality (error-ridden and under-analysed) data which have been partly worked over in other studies and which are sampled in this. Better quality data, together with the more sophisticated approaches to data analysis that are needed to elicit the processes at work is rare, and only some exercises are provided in the report. As a result, there is a wide range of work that remains to be tackled in order to provide the evidence-base on which good quality policy might be built.

Even so, the researchers are confident they have made some progress in understanding the issues affecting urban Maori, and ways to address problems or overcome obstacles, although our understanding is far from complete. It is the second task, developing appropriate policy based on what has been learned (which includes communicating this to other people), that is the really hard one.

In this study the ‘closing the gaps’ debate has been opened up to wider understandings. Substantive, but not large, differences have been found between Maori and nonMaori, amongst Maori (including those with different ethnic identities, those located in urban v rural areas, and those located within different regions within Auckland). Much of the difference between these groupings is not solely attributable to Maori features but flows from other characteristics such as age and socio-economic status. Although there are some topics and concerns which set Maori and nonMaori apart, there is much similarity in terms of aspirations and attitudes. Whanau are important in Maori social life, but are not too different from many Pakeha extended families, which are also laced together by a range of interactions and rituals. In sum, reality is not simple and linear, and apparently stark initial differences are often found to fade into less striking hues on closer and more sophisticated examination. Policy development needs to be sophisticated to deal with this complexity.

Appendix 1: Contents of Volumes (2002)

Richard Benton et al Volume 1: *General Overview*

Charles Crothers Volume 2: *A Sociographic Perspective: Some Ways of Being Māori*

Nene Benton et al Volume 3: *Nga Whakaaro o te Iwi*

Merata Kawharu et al Volume 4: *Ngati Whatua ki Orakei: A Case Study*

Richard Benton (ed) Volume 5: *Background Studies*

Appendix 2: James Henare Center studies

In 1999 the James Henare Māori Research Centre was commissioned to construct a research strategy that would provide frameworks and priority topic areas to address the second of eight cross-portfolio long-term research questions identified by the Officials Working Group on Applied Social Science (OWGASS):

What are the current and future determinants of the key disparities between Māori and non-Māori (in education, employment, dependence, health, economic development and crime); and what are the consequences of the determinants for policy initiatives promoting improved Government outcomes for Māori?

The resulting report, (Ulrich Cloher et al., 1999) was widely distributed by the Ministry of Māori Development (Te Puni Kōkiri), and provided the impetus for a number of subsequent research programmes into the needs of urban Māori sponsored by or through the Ministry, including the one reported here. The exploratory phase preceding the research reported here was covered in a report to Te Puni Kōkiri, *Drowning in the Mainstream* (Benton et al., 2000a) and followed by a brief review of the policy implications of this preliminary work, *Echoes from the Voiceless Land* (Benton et al., 2000b). The research reported here is built on that foundation.

Appendix 3: Research Team:

The research team comprised seven senior authors, variously involved in writing the 5 volumes, and a large supporting cast. Given space limitations only the former will be named.

Richard Benton (Director, JHC, UOA)

Ngapare Hopa (Maori Studies, UOA)

Charles Crothers (SSS, AUT)

Nena Benton (JHC, UOA)

Merata Kawharu (JHC, UOA)

Cluny Macpherson (Sociology, UOA) and

Pip Forer (Geography, UOA).

The study owes a very great debt to the members of the households, social service, community and government agencies who cooperated in the Auckland part of this study (and who have agreed to remain part of a reference group of Māori Aucklanders if it is possible to continue our research), along with those who

contributed to Dr Merata Kawharu's study of the wider networks of Ngati Whatua ki Orakei

Appendix 4: Topics covered in Ethnographic Survey

- the participants' own view of well-being and disparities between themselves and others;
 - how to achieve well-being;
 - employment and income;
 - education and aspirations;
 - mutual assistance patterns and coping strategies in various situations (e.g. Where do people go for help in time of crisis? What organizations are they aware of and which ones are they involved in?)
 - health (including who urban Māori go to for medical assistance);
- transport and communication.

Appendix 5: Specific Policy Implications for Urban Maori.

Some 50 specific policy points have been developed in the study report, most of which pertain across the board. Several pertain, though, to specifically urban-based or whānau-supportive concerns. In particular, the Ministry of Social Development's pilot Whānau Development Project (where a number of Māori communities have been provided the opportunity to define whānau development in their own terms, have been funded to deliver services that will contribute to their own goals for whānau development and are involved in the evaluation of the pilot initiative) appears a useful initiative. However, while the Whānau Development Initiative and other "bottom-up" interventions (e.g. Local Level Solutions) are positive programmes for participating communities, they are typically implemented in rural areas: fuller consideration needs to be given to programmes being implemented in urban Māori communities. A similar point is that initiatives aimed at encouraging Māori into home ownership are largely directed at rural Māori communities and Housing New Zealand Corporation should consider extending existing programmes targeted at assisting Māori low income families into home ownership to include urban Māori communities. Existing initiatives such as the Health Housing project, which is improving the living conditions of Māori in South Auckland deserve support.

(9) References

- Alexander, WRA and Williams, John (2001) "A critique of Maori Socio-economic Disparity" *New Zealand Population Review* 27(1&2): 27-35.
- Alexander, WRA et al (2001) "Maori disadvantage in the Labour Market" Dept. Economics, University of Otago Discussion paper 0108.
- Benton, Richard et al. (2000a) "Echoes from a Voiceless Land", James Henare Centre, Auckland University.
- Benton, Richard et al. (2000b) *Drowning in the Mainstream?* James Henare Research Centre, University of Auckland.
- Chapple, Simon (2000) "Maori Socio-Economic Disparity" *Political Science* 52(2): 101–115.
- Durie, Mason (1995) "Nga Tini Aho O Te Ao Hou framework: a Maori identity measure", *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 104(4): 464–4.
- Fergusson, D.M. et al. (1991) "Family ethnicity, social background and scholastic achievement: an eleven year longitudinal study", *New Zealand Journal Of Educational Studies* 26(1): 49–63.
- Fergusson, D.M. et al. (1993a) "Ethnicity, social background and young offending: a 14-year longitudinal study" *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 26(2): 155–170.
- Fitzgerald, E. et al. (1999) *Te Hoe Nuku Roa: Maori Profiles Research Project*, Te Putahi Te Putahi-a-Toi, Massey University. (5 vols.)
- Fitzgerald, E. et al. (2000) "Assessing and addressing Maori outcomes: preliminary findings from THNR household research" *New Zealand Population Review* 26(1): 115-121.
- Fleming, Robin (1997) *The Common Purse: income sharing in New Zealand families*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Fleras, Augie and Paul Spoonley (1999) *Recalling Aotearoa: indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*, Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Gould, J. (1996) "Socio-economic differences between Maori iwi", *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 105(2): 165–183.
- Gould, J. (2000) "Closing the Gaps?" *Political Science* 52(2): 116–124.
- Harwood, Aramiha (1993) "Our Hearts are in Aotearoa – but our wallets are in Australia". Auckland: University of Auckland. (Research essay: MA-Sociology)
- Jackson, Natalie (2002) "The Doubly-structural nature of indigenous disadvantage: a case of disparate impact?" *New Zealand Population Review* 28(1): 55-68.
- Jackson, Natalie and Ian Pool (1996) "Will the Real New Zealand Family please stand up?: substantive and methodological factors affecting research and policy on families and households" *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 6: 148-176.
- Kawharu, H (1975) *Orakei: a Ngati Whatua Community*. Wellington: New Zealand Council Of Educational Research
- Kukutai, Tahu (2001) "Maori Identity and 'Political Arithmetik': the dynamics of reporting ethnicity" MSocSc thesis: University of Waikato.
- Kukutai, Tahu (2003) *The Dynamics of Ethnicity Reporting: Maori in New Zealand* Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri
- Metge, J. (1995) *New Growth for Old*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

- Ministry of Social Development (2001b) *The Social Report 2001 Te Purongo Oranga Tangata: indicators of social well-being in New Zealand*, Wellington.
- Pool, Ian (1991) *Te Iwi Maori* Auckland: University of Auckland Press.
- Rata, Elizabeth (2000) "Constructing the Gaps" *New Zealand Population Review* 9(3): 24-30.
- Rochford, A (2001) "Don't Shoot the Gap" Wellington: Wellington Medical School.
- Salmond, Clare, Peter Crampton and Frances Sutton (1998) *New ZealandDep96: Index of deprivation*, Wellington: Health Services Research Centre.
- Sporle, Andrew et al (2002) "Social Class Mortality Differences in Maori and non-Maori men aged 15-64 in the last two decades" *NZ Medical Journal* 127-131.
- Te Putahi-a-Toi, Massey University (1999) *Maori Profiles Research Project*.
- Te Ropu Rangaha hauora e Eru Pomare (2000) "Counting for Nothing: understanding the issues in monitoring disparities in health", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 14: 1-16.
- Te Puni Kokiri (1998) *Progress towards closing social and economic gaps between Maori and non-Maori*, Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokiri (2000a) *Progress towards closing social and economic gaps between Maori and Non-Maori*.