



*The Whānau Development  
Māori Collective Intervention  
Project Report*

---

*Andrea Elliott-Hohepa  
Kahu McClintock  
Marsha Turinui  
Naina Watene*

The Research and Development Unit of Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa would like to emphasise the kaupapa Māori approach to this reporting structure. In particular, that while the structure of this report is 'new', the practices and processes from which this structure derives, stems from a Māori specific world view and knowledge base, which has been in existence for generations.

---

*No part or parts regarding the overall structure and  
information of this report may be reproduced  
without the approval of the Research and Development Unit.*

*Research and Development Unit  
Te Runanga O Kirikiriroa Trust Incorporated*

*Tel: 07-846 1042*

*Fax: 07-846 7156*

*Email: [andrea@terunanga.org.nz](mailto:andrea@terunanga.org.nz)*

*July 2005 ©*

---

---

***KARANGA***  
***Ritual of First Engagement***

---

## **KARANGA**

Karanga mai ra  
Ki te Kahui Ariki  
Ngā mahuetanga iho o ngā mātua tūpuna  
Ngā iwi nui tonu e  
Tēna koutou

Anei mātou  
Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa, ngā mātā waka o runga i ngā hau e wha  
I mau atu i te aroha e  
Tēna koutou

Takoto mai ra, ngā tini aitua  
O te tau, o te marama, o te wiki o te rā nei e  
I runga i te taumata tapu o ngā mātua tūpuna e  
Tēna ra koutou

Ki a koutou  
Ngā taonga whakamirimiri o ngā tūpuna e  
Tēna koutou

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>KARANGA - Ritual of First Engagement .....</b>	<b>1</b>
KARANGA.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	3
<b>WHAIKŌRERO - Ritual of First Speaking .....</b>	<b>5</b>
MIHIMIHI.....	6
PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	7
Outcome .....	7
Objectives .....	7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	8
<b>KOHA - Ritual of Reciprocity .....</b>	<b>9</b>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	10
Introduction.....	10
Outcome .....	10
Objectives .....	10
Project Approaches .....	10
Overall Summary of Results.....	11
Recommendations .....	13
<b>HONGI-HARIRU-KAI - Ritual of Encounter.....</b>	<b>14</b>
PROJECT APPROACHES .....	15
Kaupapa Māori Approach .....	15
Qualitative Approach .....	16
Literature Review.....	16
KEY RESEARCH STEPS .....	17
Initial Identification of Project Objectives ....	17
Initial Project Management .....	17
First Hui with Te Puni Kōkiri.....	18
Employment of Researcher .....	18
Literature Review.....	18
Identification of Organisations.....	19
Relationship Building with the Evaluation Team.....	19
Progress Report.....	19
Recruitment of Organisations .....	19
Focus Groups .....	20
Discussions .....	21
Transcripts .....	21
Analysis of Information.....	21
Final Report .....	21
Presentation of Final Report .....	21
Final Hui with Te Puni Kōkiri .....	22
Final Debrief and Completion of the Project.....	22
Value of the Project to the Runanga .....	22
Perceived Long Term Benefits to the Runanga.....	22
Risks and Reflections of the Project .....	23

<b>WHAKAWHĀNAUNGATANGA - Ritual of Derivation</b> .....	<b>24</b>
ORGANISATIONAL INFORMATION .....	25
Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa.....	25
Research and Development Unit .....	26
The Project Team.....	27
Quality Assurance Processes .....	28
Organisational Collaboration.....	29
Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa .....	29
Enderley Park Community Centre .....	30
Focus Group Profiles.....	31
<b>HUI - Ritual of Collaboration</b> .....	<b>33</b>
RESULTS .....	34
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	34
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS.....	36
Overall Common Themes.....	36
Unique Themes .....	39
CONCLUSION .....	42
KEY INTERVENTIONS.....	44
Intervention 1: Kirikiriroa Innovations Housing Project .....	44
Intervention 2: Kaumātua Housing.....	46
Intervention 3: Māori Early Childhood Centre.....	47
SUMMARY .....	50
<b>POROPOROAKI - Ritual of Erudition</b> .....	<b>51</b>
OVERALL SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	52
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	54
REFERENCES .....	55
APPENDIX ONE: Information Package	
APPENDIX TWO: Consent Forms	
<b>KARAKIA - Ritual of Conclusion</b> .....	<b>56</b>
KARAKIA .....	57
<b>WAIATA – Ritual of Coalescence</b> .....	<b>58</b>
WAIATA.....	59

---

***WHAIKŌRERO***  
***Ritual of First Speaking***

---

## ***MIHIMIHI***

Tōia te waka, Te Rangahauā  
Mā wai e tō?  
Māku e tō  
Māu e tō  
Mā te whakaranga ake e tō!  
Tihei Mauriora!

Ko te mihi tuatahi, ko Te Atua. Nāna nei ngā mea katoa  
Tuarua, ko Te Arikinui ko Te AtairangiKaahu  
Me tōna whare Te Kāhui Arikinui tonu rā  
Pai Marire

Tuatoru, me mihia ngā mate i runga i ngā marae maha, huri noa i te  
motu  
Nā tātou katoa e mihi, e tangi  
Haere e ngā mate, haere, haere atu rā

E ngā mana, e ngā reo, e ngā karanga-ranga-tanga maha  
Tēna rā tātou katoa.

Ka mihia e mātou te hunga tautoko  
Ko rātou te rīpoata nei i hiki ake ki runga ki tona taumata noho ai.  
He rīpoata rangahauā tēnei  
E kimihia nei ngā painga mō te whānau  
Ko rātou kua taka ki te he  
Ko rātou e kimihia haere nei te huarahi ki te tika ki te ora arā,  
Whānau Ora  
He kupu āwhina enei nō te Paipera Tapu

“Nā, anō te pai, anō te āhuareka o te nohonga o ngā taina, o ngā  
tuakana i runga i te whakaaro kotahi”

Nō reira, Ka piki te kaha, te ora, te māramatanga ki runga ki a rātou,  
otira ki a tatou katoa  
Tēna koutou, tēna koutou tēna rā tātou katoa

## ***PROJECT OVERVIEW***

### ***Outcome***

The whānau development (Māori collective) intervention (“the project”) is part of a Māori potential policy framework approach by Te Puni Kōkiri. Consisting of 13 different interventions and a total of 43 projects nationwide, the overall outcome for this particular project is ‘to enable whānau to describe their present circumstances, identify their interests, needs and aspirations and plan for the development of their ‘whānau’ in ways that are responsive to their circumstances’ (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2005, service agreement). It is intended that this information will support and assist future policy development and design by Te Puni Kōkiri.

### ***Objectives***

The key objectives of this project are “to support the development of at least three local whānau development initiatives that will:

- a) enhance whānau well being (e.g, spiritual, physical, emotional, economic, psychological);
- b) facilitate whānau to be more powerful actors in their own lives; and,
- c) explore ways in which whānau can pursue self-identified pathways” (ibid).

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

The Research and Development Unit of Te Runanga would like to acknowledge specific organisations who have contributed to the completion of this project. In particular, we would like to thank the following:

- The external organisations that participated in this project – Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa and the Enderley Park Community Centre. We thank you for the way in which you actively supported this project through the provision of focus group participants as well as openly providing information regarding potential intervention projects. We acknowledge your commitment to the issue of whānau development and wish you all the very best for the future;
- The evaluation team from Te Kowhai Consulting for the establishment of another positive professional relationship;
- Te Puni Kōkiri for approaching and funding the Runanga to participate in this project; and,
- The Chief Executive Officer (‘CEO’) and staff of Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa (‘the Runanga’) from the Administration, Whānau Ora and Strategic Development services, as well as representatives of the Mental Health services that make up the Integrated Service Approach (ISA) Committee. We appreciate the active support that was provided to this project through the provision of focus group participants as well as information regarding the Runanga intervention. We would also like to acknowledge the managers of the different services that originally met regarding this project. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the contribution of the entire Research and Development Unit for their ongoing support and contribution regarding the establishment of focus groups, planning and discussion regarding the project. It is the joint efforts of this Unit that make the day-to-day tasks an enjoyable experience.

---

***KOHA***

***Ritual of Reciprocity***

---

## ***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

### ***Introduction***

The Runanga were successful in obtaining funding for this project following the submission of an expression of interest regarding the Whānau Development (Māori collective) intervention.

Following acceptance of the application, a contract was created and agreed upon by both Te Puni Kōkiri and the Runanga.

### ***Outcome***

The whānau development (Māori collective) intervention (“the project”) is part of a Māori potential policy framework approach by Te Puni Kōkiri. Consisting of 13 different interventions and a total of 43 projects nationwide, the overall outcome for this particular project is: “to enable whānau to describe their present circumstances, identify their interests, needs and aspirations and plan for the development of their ‘whānau’ in ways that are responsive to their circumstances” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2005, Service agreement). It is intended that this information will support and assist future policy development and design by Te Puni Kōkiri.

### ***Objectives***

The key objectives of this project are “to support the development of at least three local whānau development initiatives that will:

- a) Enhance whānau well being (e.g, spiritual, physical, emotional, economic, psychological);
- b) Facilitate whānau to be more powerful actors in their own lives; and,
- c) Explore ways in which whānau can pursue self-identified pathways” (ibid).

### ***Project Approaches***

There were three key approaches used to complete the project. The kaupapa Māori approach was the predominant method used. Qualitative approaches and a literature review were the secondary methods. Data collection occurred through the use of focus group discussions, interview information and the collation and analysis of information.

## *Overall Summary of Results*

In terms of the overall whānau development (Māori collective) intervention, it is clear that there is some significant work that is being achieved regarding this area of focus throughout the community. What is also evident is the recognition by organisations working in the community, regarding potential future interventions that will support whānau development. Clear co-ordinated work, complementary to each other, is another indicator of the way in which organisations are collaborating with each other, and doing so in an effective manner. What is less clear is whether there is a co-ordinated approach to whānau development across government agencies. This section outlines the overall summary of results from this project, followed by recommendations that include potential plans and options for the future.

The six focus groups of the Runanga, Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa and Enderley Park Community Centre clearly identified a range of information regarding definitions of whānau, defining healthy whānau, and building healthy whānau. This information was important in order to ‘...enable whānau to describe their present circumstances, identify their interests, needs and aspirations...’ as required through the short term outcome of the intervention.

In terms of definitions of whānau, the continuum of definition ranged from whakapapa / bloodline / kinship and its variations, commonalities, shared interests and purpose and finally a unit as part of a community that provides a safe environment. As such, whānau did not operate in isolation. These descriptions align directly with the findings of the literature review.

Healthy whānau was defined through the use of the te whare tapa wha model. Again, context and the four components of tinana, hinengaro, wairua and whānau were utilised. It is important to note that housing and education were identified as components of a healthy whānau.

Building a healthy whānau saw the emergence of four themes, that is leadership, shared values / linking / building bridges, common interests and connecting whakapapa and finally communication. Again, these themes align with the framework of capacity building described in the literature review.

The fourth area of focus described how organisations supported or built healthy whānau. Each group identified organisational specific information. There was a real sense through the responses in this area, of pride regarding what could be offered to the communities through these organisations. This was also evident in the detailed profile information that was provided by organisations as well. It is

interesting to note that only three of the six focus groups (all from the same organisation) articulated the need for Māori processes and to participate as Māori. However, in saying this, the reason could be not because the other organisations consider this information as unimportant, but rather because it is an implicit part of their processes, so is not seen as separate. For example, some participants used te reo to convey their ideas, but did not specifically identify use of te reo as being important. It could be suggested that this is because use of te reo in this example, was a given or taken for granted and accepted practice.

In terms of other issues – again, the area of housing and education arose. It is also interesting to note that organisations identified services that were being delivered by other organisations that participated in this project. For example, Frankton / Dinsdale identified parenting programmes or education initiatives as important, which are programmes conducted by the Enderley Community Centre. Enderley on the other hand, identified the need for walking groups for kaumatua and healthy life styles, which are programmes that Frankton / Dinsdale currently provide. This could suggest that the participants are clear that whānau are just not about a specific age group or range. Rather, that whānau is about including all age groups. The Runanga did not articulate this and this could be because services are already delivered across age groups and ranges. It could also be because the Runanga are aware of the different services that are available for these age groups and seek to complement such services, rather than replicate them.

In terms of the three specific interventions identified by the organisations, the following characteristics were found:

- all interventions had clear self-identified goals or pathways;
- all interventions had clear pathways regarding planning and implementation of each intervention;
- there was clear rationale for the establishment of each intervention;
- there was clear identification of barriers;
- all organisations could identify the alignment of the project with current government policy at intersectorial level; and,
- all interventions were able to identify a clear focus and priority to whānau development.

In summary, it can be seen that both the focus groups and the interventions clearly articulate the need for whānau development. As well, that the definitions, capacities and aspirations regarding whānau development all align with the initial findings of the literature review and therefore the underpinning foundation of the project. To this end, the following recommendations have been made.

## ***Recommendations***

The project team recommend that:

- 1) Recognition is given of the broad continuum that may be attributed to whānau definitions and any practice or policy, whether at local regional or national level, consider these in their entirety and as a valid spectrum regarding definition;
- 2) In keeping with Recommendation 1 above, that recognition be given that there is no 'one size fits all approach' when it comes to definitions of whānau or what makes a healthy whānau;
- 3) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should consider the whānau capacity building framework reaffirmed and outlined in this report;
- 4) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should consider Māori models of practice as valid methodologies for practical implementation;
- 5) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should support Māori participating as Māori;
- 6) Māori community organisations be identified as valid pathways for the planning, implementation and delivery of Whānau Development interventions;
- 7) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should recognise some of the barriers to the interventions described in this project and determine pathways to alleviate some of these barriers; and finally,
- 8) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should support a clear and consistent intersectorial approach by government agencies.

---

***HONGI-HARIRU-KAI***

***Ritual of Encounter***

---

## ***PROJECT APPROACHES***

This section of the report will outline the approaches utilised to conduct the project. A Kaupapa Māori approach to research formed the basis of our processes, followed by both a qualitative research approach and the review of literature.

### ***Kaupapa Māori Approach***

This approach is an emerging field, providing a culturally appropriate methodology to research in the local context. The presumptions of this method are that the project must:

- take for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori, including the importance of Māori language and culture;
- recognise the unique journey of each individual, whānau, iwi and hapu; and,
- be concerned with the struggle for Māori autonomy over Māori cultural wellbeing (Smith, 1998).

This is not a definitive statement about kaupapa Māori research. Instead, it is an outline of the key concepts that underpinned this particular project. The greatest strength of using this approach is that Māori are defining the processes, doing the research for and about predominantly Māori, with the eventual outcome targeting mainly Māori. The project team felt that this was particularly important, given the objectives of this project.

The following are the specific practices that the team incorporated into this project:

- predominant use of the ‘kanohi-ki-te-kanohi’ approach to interact and engage with individuals and organizations;
- use of pōwhiri, whakatau and mihi as formal entry processes into the Runanga;
- use of hui at all stages of the project;
- use of karakia and appropriate protocols to conduct hui;
- use and active practice of culturally appropriate processes throughout the interview and focus group process including mihimihi and whakawhānaungatanga;
- use of protective mechanisms regarding cultural and intellectual property of participants;
- use of koha to participants;
- use and promotion of te reo Māori. This means that translations of kupu Māori have only been used where absolutely necessary;
- use and significance of kai;
- use of a kaupapa Māori approach to this reporting structure; and,

- use of a kanohi ki te kanohi approach when presenting the final report.

### *Qualitative Approach*

The qualitative approach was selected as a secondary method due to its complementary nature with the kaupapa Māori approach. The presumption of this method is that it must:

- provide a holistic contextual portrayal;
- use a thematic content analysis;
- focus on in-depth, open-ended interviewing and personal observation; and,
- give emphasis to the uniqueness and diversity of people's experiences and beliefs (Patton, 1996).

Like the kaupapa Māori approach, this is not a definitive statement about qualitative research. Instead, it is an outline of the key concepts that underpinned the project. Specific practices included:

- identification and discussion with service providers and service users of whānau development initiatives;
- semi-structured discussions and use of prompts;
- analysis of discussion information using key themes;
- analysis of documentation and literature using key themes; and,
- recognition of the context of information during analysis.

### *Literature Review*

A literature review was selected as a research method because it provided the ability to investigate information that had already been written in the subject area. It also enabled clarification of the topic and provided further context of the issue. Specific areas addressed through this method were:

- identification of general whānau development definitions;
- identification of specific government agency approaches regarding whānau development; and,
- identification of common themes and approaches regarding whānau development.

## ***KEY RESEARCH STEPS***

This section will describe all of the key steps that were undertaken to complete the project. This will include the processes used to define and scope the project, identification and recruitment of organisations and participants, and all other steps necessary to complete the project. The value and perceived long term benefits the project has added to the Runanga as well as the risks and reflections of the project will complete this section.

### ***Initial Identification of Project Objectives***

In the first instance, Te Puni Kōkiri invited the Runanga to submit an application to the project. Following this discussion, the Chief Executive Officer submitted an expression of interest (EOI) in regards to the whānau development (Māori collective) intervention. In terms of the initial purpose and scope, there were two significant approaches. The first is that the project would be conducted utilising a multidisciplinary approach across Runanga services. This meant that the Kaiwananga or Managers of the Research and Development, Mental Health and Whānau Ora units of the Runanga would take joint responsibility for the project and provide a seamless service approach. It was also stipulated in the EOI that three whānau would be identified and initial assessments completed with the intention of the Runanga coordinating service delivery or acting in an advocacy role to support whānau regarding their identified needs.

Upon acceptance of the EOI, a contract was agreed upon and accepted by Te Puni Kōkiri and the Runanga. The contractual term was for a period of 12 weeks.

### ***Initial Project Management***

Following communication regarding the success of the EOI, the Chief Executive Officer called a hui of the above identified kaiwananga. This was the first notification of the project to the managers of the different services. At this hui an overview of the project was provided including the integrated service approach and the general intentions of the project. Two subsequent hui were held in order to determine clarity around the project, processes and potential position specifications for an FTE position to complete this project. Further clarification regarding the purpose and scope of the project also occurred at these hui. (For the minutes of these meetings, please see Appendix I of the Progress Report: May 2005).

## ***First Hui with Te Puni Kōkiri***

On the 21 April the CEO of the Runanga, along with providers completing other interventions, attended a hui facilitated by Te Puni Kōkiri. It was here that the Māori Potential Policy Approach and Frameworks were explained and further information provided regarding the different interventions. This hui was a significant one for the direction of the project because it was at this hui, that it was identified that the project should be focussing not on individual whānau, but rather on whānau development interventions. As a result, not only did the focus of the project need to change (i.e. interventions not individual whānau), so did the whole approach of the project in order to meet the contract deliverables. Following the Te Puni Kōkiri hui, an internal Runanga hui was held. The outcomes of this hui, was that it was agreed that one service would drive the project from this point forward through to its completion. Participation from other organisations also needed to occur, to obtain further information about other interventions. It was from this point that the Research and Development Unit (RDU) became the lead service to manage and oversee the project. A project plan, in discussion with the CEO was created, to describe activity and key deliverables for the duration of the project. This included the identification of potential organisations to collaborate with.

## ***Employment of Researcher***

Utilising the human resource processes of the Runanga a researcher was employed to conduct and complete the project.

## ***Literature Review***

The first task of the newly employed researcher was to conduct a review of literature regarding whānau development, government agency approaches to whānau development and a general scoping exercise regarding definitions and components of whānau development. As a result of this information, it became evident that there was no one definition that was sufficient for the term whānau. As such, the approach of the project was that there is a continuum of definitions regarding whānau from a biological definition through to relationship through common mission. As such, cognisance had to be given of all definitions and the continuum along which whānau could be defined against. It was intended that the project, through focus groups and discussions would further support this view. Further information regarding this can be found in the hui section.

## ***Identification of Organisations***

Appropriate organisations were sought for this project. Because of the protracted time frame it was decided that the project would focus on three interventions – the contract deliverable minimum. As one could be described by the Runanga, this left two further organisations with whānau development interventions to identify. Criteria for inclusion became a matter of expediency. That is, organisations that were easily accessible and with established relationships to the Runanga. In the end, inclusion criteria for organisations were identified as:

- recognised affiliates of the Runanga;
- have strong established networks with the Runanga;
- have strong positive collaborative working relationships with the Runanga staff at service delivery level;
- have shared management with the Runanga at governance (i.e. the Board of Trustees) level;
- currently provide whānau development interventions; and,
- have a selected client base that includes Māori.

As a result of these inclusion criteria, two organisations were identified: the Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa and Enderley Park Community Centre.

## ***Relationship Building with the Evaluation Team***

At the end of April, the external evaluation team from Te Kowhai Consulting met with the project team. The Runanga understood that the evaluation team would conduct formative evaluation activity – that is, a focus on process regarding the way in which the project was being conducted. A number of hui, telephone calls and emails have since occurred between the Runanga and Te Kowhai Consulting, providing regular progress updates.

## ***Progress Report***

As per the contract deliverables, a progress report was submitted to Te Puni Kōkiri in May. This described activity to date.

## ***Recruitment of Organisations***

Because of the type of inclusion criteria that was determined, the project team were quite confident that the identified organisations would agree to participate. In the first instance, the CEO of the Runanga made initial contact with the organisations to either provide a brief overview of the project or explain that the project team would be in contact. Following this, the researcher of the project met with

the managers of the two organisations and identified the following information:

- an overview of the project;
- an outline of what was required from their organisation;
- an outline of the role of the Runanga regarding the project;
- a description of roles and timeframes for the duration of the project; and,
- an explanation of how this project may contribute at a regional and national level towards government policy formulated by Te Puni Kōkiri.

It should be noted that while the project team were confident that the organisations would agree to participate, this participation was not taken for granted. As such, the project team were very pleased when the organisations did agree to collaborate not only for the purposes of completing this project, but also as an opportunity to further strengthen already existing positive relationships.

Participation was required regarding two parts of the project. The first was the completion of focus groups. This was to obtain an overview of whānau, whānau development and whānau development activities, as described by the service users of the organisation. Following this, semi-structured discussions with managers took place providing information regarding a whānau development intervention (as identified by them).

### ***Focus Groups***

A total of six focus groups were conducted. A further focus group was intended with rangatahi. However, due to the time it would take to gain consent from parents and the protracted timeframe, it was decided to cancel this particular focus group.

The six focus groups included four focus groups conducted within the Runanga and one focus group each at the external organisations. Each focus group was between 40 minutes to two hours in duration with a maximum of 10 participants in any one focus group. These were conducted at the three organisations involved. Focus group discussions were based on five key areas – defining whānau, defining a health whānau, explaining how to build a health whānau, identifying how the organisation participants were part of (either as service users or employees) were supporting / building health whānau and providing any further comments relating to whānau.

An explanation of the project as well as the completion of consent forms were done before each focus group. All focus groups were recorded and notes taken. Focus groups were conducted according to kaupapa Māori processes. Kai was offered either throughout or

after the process and each participant was given a koha for their participation. A koha was also provided to the two external organisations in recognition of the use of their facilities for the focus groups and as a further expression of thanks. A summary of the focus group information was made available to each participant and consent gained that the information was a true and correct record before data analysis took place.

### ***Discussions***

Semi-structured discussions were selected as another form of data collection to gain clear information of both the three organisations and the three whānau development interventions. These discussions took place with the managers / CEOs of the organisations involved. The discussions included questions to elicit information needed to meet the project objectives. However, a format of conversation, rather than a strict interview process was sought. Information was recorded with consent and summaries returned.

### ***Transcripts***

As mentioned above, all focus groups and discussions were recorded with consent. Summaries were provided to participants and provision made to obtain approval before analysis commenced. All participants were given the opportunity to amend their information.

### ***Analysis of Information***

Following data collection and collation all information was analysed. The analysis of this information required a collation of all responses based on key themes. Within each theme recorded, a frequency of specific issues and views expressed was undertaken with full consideration of the context of information. The analysis of literature was also conducted in this manner.

### ***Final Report***

Upon completion of information analysis, a draft report was created. It was decided that the key areas from the Te Puni Kōkiri final report template would be merged with the reporting template of the Research and Development Unit. The result is this final report. A copy of this was also sent to Te Kowhai Consulting.

### ***Presentation of Final Report***

Following the successful acceptance of this report by Te Puni Kōkiri, it is intended that this report will be published into a standard report format of the Research and Development Unit. Final

presentations of the full report will then be organized to the three organisations and a copy of this full report given to each organisation. All participants will be invited and copies of the executive summaries will be provided to participants. This will formally complete the reporting back processes to participants of the project.

### ***Final Hui with Te Puni Kōkiri***

On the 8 July, the project team will attend a final hui with Te Puni Kōkiri. It is understood that this hui will focus on reflections and learnings regarding the project.

### ***Final Debrief and Completion of the Project***

Immediately following the Te Puni Kōkiri hui, the project team will have a final debrief hui. This will include an overview of the entire project, what went well and any areas identified for improvement. It is expected that by the end of this hui, a full debrief of the project will be completed. This will signal the completion of the contract of the researcher employed for this project. It will also be the formal completion of this project by the Research and Development Unit.

### ***Value of the Project to the Runanga***

The value of the project to the Runanga includes:

- further strengthening of existing positive relationships with Frankton Dinsdale Rauawaawa and the Enderley Community Centre;
- further strengthening of existing positive relationships with the regional office of Te Puni Kōkiri;
- establishment of positive relationships with Te Kowhai Consulting;
- establishment of positive relationships with the National Co-Ordinator of the project from the Head Office of Te Puni Kōkiri;
- completion of a project on a topic that has general significance to the Runanga, given the mission statement of the organisation ‘...to increase the wholistic health and wellbeing of Māori... which implicitly includes the issue of whānau; and,
- clear and co-ordinated information regarding the issue of whānau that may assist with future planning for the Runanga.

### ***Perceived Long Term Benefits of the Project to the Runanga***

Perceived long term benefits of the project to the Runanga include:

- evidence of a work record with Te Puni Kōkiri should this organisation wish to collaborate with the Runanga again in the future;
- evidence for the Research and Development Unit of working with another government organisation, for future research applications;
- a report that could support the three interventions through co-ordinated evidence, if required; and,
- a potential collaborative partner in the form of Te Kowhai Consulting, for future project/s.

### ***Risks and Reflections of the Project***

A number of risks were identified over the course of this project. These include:

- a very short timeframe in order to complete this project. This was the most significant risk and one that impacted on all aspects of the project. As a result, a range of risk management procedures were used to minimize the impact of this included establishing inclusion criteria that would utilize organisations the Runanga already had a positive relationship with; going with the minimum number of interventions; utilizing the entire Research and Development Unit at times in order to complete components of the project (such as establishment and completion of the focus groups, buying of koha, cooking of kai for focus groups) and constantly re-evaluating the project on a weekly basis to ensure that contract deliverables would be met and amending where necessary such as the cancellation of a focus group when it was identified that the consent procedure may take too long, and working whatever hours were necessary in order to complete the project;
- a lack of clarity regarding the role of the evaluators, resulting in uncertainty about what the Runanga was to report on and whether this would overlap with what the evaluators were reporting on. The risk management provision for this issue, was to establish a very positive relationship with the evaluators in the first instance, in order to create a positive rapport, Following this, clarity and transparency regarding how the Runanga perceived the project was communicated to the evaluators. As well, an email was sent to Te Puni Kōkiri seeking clarification; and,
- uncertainty regarding communication channels. It was unclear as to what the line management communication levels were in regards to Te Puni Kōkiri. As a result, all emails were sent to everyone, in order to ensure that the necessary people were contacted.

---

**WHAKA WHĀNAUNGATANGA**  
*Ritual of Derivation*

---

## ***ORGANISATIONAL INFORMATION***

This section will start by describing the Runanga, the Research and Development Unit and the project team including roles and responsibilities. Quality assurance processes will also be part of this section. Following this, an outline of the other two organisations will be provided. A brief profile of the focus groups will complete this section.

### ***Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa***

Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa was established in 1988 as a Charitable Trust and the Urban Māori Authority for Hamilton City under the guidance of the Māori Queen, Te Arikinui Te Atairangikaahu and the former Hamilton City Mayor Sir Ross Jensen.

The Runanga is mandated to focus on issues related to Article III of the Treaty of Waitangi and was developed to meet the multi faceted needs of maataa waka (or all Māori and Pacific Island peoples regardless of tribal affiliation) within Kirikiriroa.

This mandate is reinforced through the Runanga Mission Statement which is: *'to improve the holistic health and well being of Māori and Pacific peoples domiciled within the city of Kirikiriroa'*. These communities are members of the Runanga and are entitled to the following constitutional rights:

- Every Māori and Pacific Island man, woman and child living within the boundaries of Kirikiriroa and its environs is a member of the Runanga as of right;
- Every member of the Runanga has the right to have input into the appointment of Trustees and the strategic plan; and,
- Every member has the right to expect that the Runanga will adhere to the values that the Runanga aspires to.

Hence, the Runanga is a voice for every Māori and Pacific Island man, woman and child living within the environs of Kirikiriroa. The Runanga does however acknowledge the sovereign rights of tangata whenua and does not seek to usurp their prerogative while acting in this role.

The formal body at governance level is a Board of Trustees. Management is overseen by the Chief Executive Officer and conducted by Managers of the different services.

Consisting of approximately 100 FTE staff, the Runanga has a corporate office, a 16 bed purpose built youth alcohol and drug residential facility (Rongo Atea), and four residential homes for mental health tangata whaiora (Nga Whare Tuhono). There are a total of 10 services (six of which are in the area of mental health) as well as Whānau Ora (including health promotion, diabetes prevention, smoking cessation and education), Strategic Development (including policy and planning, property management, cultural co-ordination, writing and presenting submissions and overseeing the Human Resource processes of the Runanga), Corporate services (including administration, finance, information technology and co-ordination of information for the monthly Board of Trustee hui) and Research and Development. This last service will be explained in further detail below.

### ***Research and Development Unit***

The Research and Development Unit (RDU) is one of the newest services of the Runanga and was established to provide evidence that supports the advancement of tangata whenua at local and international levels. In order to achieve this aim, there are five key areas of focus:

- 1) to develop research proposals that have a strong collaborative approach to key individuals, organisations and communities;
- 2) to conduct research projects with an emphasis on direct practical outcomes to communities, wherever possible;
- 3) to assist communities to increase their research capacity and facilitate options for funding regarding specific research projects;
- 4) to complete research projects based on kaupapa Māori research methodologies; and,
- 5) to produce clear evidence regarding best models of practice for the services of the Runanga, to increase the efficacy of such services.

The RDU consists of the following staff:

- Andrea Elliott-Hohepa – Manager
- Naina Watene - Researcher
- Kahu McClintock – Researcher
- Marsha Turinui – Research Assistant / Administrator.

## *The Project Team*

A description of the different roles and responsibilities regarding the project is summarised below.

Mere Balzer: Chief Executive Officer

- creator of the initial expression of interest and facilitator of the original project plan regarding the project. Provision of final approval regarding financial expenditure, appointment of staffing, provision of the general direction of the project, and provided with regular updates regarding the general direction of the project.

Andrea Elliott-Hohepa: Manager, Research and Development Unit

- creator of the project management plan regarding the final completion of the project; decision making regarding the project on a day to day basis and any amendments and changes to the project including rationale of the same; overseeing of purchase requisitions and expenditure; attendance of regular meetings with the evaluators, Te Puni Kōkiri staff and the project team; ongoing communication to all parties regarding the project; organisation of all research processes for the duration of the project; and finalising of both the progress report and final report.

Kahu McClintock: Researcher: Research and Development Unit

- completion of all tasks stipulated in the project management plan including meeting with external organisations, conducting some of the focus groups, conducting all of the discussions with the CEO / managers regarding the interventions; writing of drafts for the progress report and final report;

Marsha Turinui: Administrator / Research Assistant: Research and Development Unit

- completion of all of the administrative tasks including the completion of consent form packs for all participants; completion of all Purchase Requisitions; purchasing of kai and koha; booking of vehicles and rooms for hui; conducting two focus groups; and formatting of all reports.

As one can see from the above, while overall management responsibility, final approvals, regular updates and the initial project plan resided with the CEO, the eventual day to day completion of the project including decision making processes was conducted by the Research and Development Unit. A researcher was brought

onboard specifically for this project with clearly prescribed activities to be completed in order to meet all of the contract deliverables of the project. Both the Runanga and the RDU have clear policies regarding processes and these were strictly adhered to. In terms of day to day decision making processes, these were made predominantly by the manager of the RDU with a view to completing the project in the most efficient and effective manner, given the timeframe and resources.

### *Quality Assurance Processes*

Quality Assurance occurred at two levels – at the organisational and service level in the first instance, to the project specific level in the second.

In terms of the organisational level, the Runanga is ISO accredited, CYPFs accredited, housing certified, recently received a favourable audit from Pareaarau Group, utilises standard practice financial processes and systems and has Audit New Zealand as its auditor (which is unique as this organisation usually only audits government organisations so the Runanga had to apply for special dispensation), has strong quality assurance systems and processes including regular hui, ongoing internal reviews, and clear and accessible quality assurance documentation.

In the same vein, RDU uses standard research practices of the highest quality such as research documentation and protocols as identified by the local and national ethics bodies. Culturally appropriate protocols and processes have also been approved by an organisational body that oversees such matters – this includes kaupapa Māori protocols and practices and use of a kaupapa Māori reporting template.

At a project specific level, all of the above processes were used in the first instance regarding quality assurance. As well, if any clarification was required by the project team, this was usually sought from the manager of RDU. If she was unable to do this, further clarification from the Runanga CEO, Te Puni Kōkiri, and/or the evaluators was sought where necessary. Ensuring that open and transparent communication occurred at all times with all parties, also ensured that there was no room for confusion regarding the position of the Runanga and the progress and activity of the project. Utilising all of the above processes ensured that robust ‘checks and balances’ were in place for the duration of the project.

## ***Organisational Collaboration***

As mentioned in previous sections, this project was conducted in collaboration with two external organisations – Frankton / Dinsdale Rauawaawa and the Enderley Community Centre. An overview of these organisations is outlined below. Information for this section has been provided by the managers of the organisations, the CEO of the Runanga and organisational specific documentation.

### ***Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa***

The Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa Charitable Trust ('the Trust') is a non-profit incorporated organisation that provides a variety of services to kaumātua in Hamilton city. The Trust has evolved greatly over the years. From being part of the former ward system as well as acquiring facilities that were part of an initiative conceived by Mrs Oraiha Whatu in 1938 (and endorsed by Princess Te Puea), the Trust currently provides social, educational, financial, and health services to over one hundred kaumātua in Hamilton.

Rauawaawa means 'the sides of the waka that embrace the chief, tohunga, and the many tribes, providing added protection as they pursue their journey forward'. Originally one of five Rauawaawa in Hamilton city that established alongside the former five ward system, it was envisaged that each Rauawaawa would become self-managing, and establish committees that would ensure the needs and concerns for Māori residing within Kirikiriroa were heard and addressed. The Runanga have always been strongly supportive of the Rauawaawa and have particularly strong relationships with the Trust.

The mission statement of the Trust reinforces its commitment to kaumātua: "Hei manaaki ngā kaumātua" - to make provision for the health, safety and wellbeing of kaumātua physically, spiritually and socially.

The Trust is governed by a Board of Trustees that consists of 12 kaumātua and a manager. A chairperson heads the Board. An executive team (consisting of the chairperson, two Board members and the administrator), assist the manager to formulate strategic plans and set the direction in which the Trust moves. The manager and executive team is supported by other administrative staff and key personnel.

The Trust is totally committed to its revitalization and continuation. Over the past four years the Trust has expanded its services creating more opportunity for kaumātua to actively participate in programmes, activities and services in a culturally safe environment.

Current services include the provision of:

- cultural development;
- health services;
- economic development;
- educational programmes;
- welfare/social services;
- financial partnership services; and,
- research services.

### ***Enderley Park Community Centre***

The Enderley Park Community Centre ('the Centre'), formerly the Hamilton Eastern Suburbs Rugby Clubrooms, was purchased by the Hamilton City Council (HCC) in 1996, for use of the property as a fulltime community centre.

The facility was completely refurbished, based on community consultation, and completed in 3 stages. Stage one was completed to allow the Centre to be opened in December 1993.

Initially the HCC appointed a temporary manager to supervise refurbishment work and begin promoting use of the Centre. That position became permanent in June 1997. Since that time staff numbers have increased to four as use of the facility has increased. As well as the Centre Manager, there is an Administrative Officer, After House Supervisor and a Cleaner/Caterer/Replacement Staff Person. All four are HCC employed staff.

When the Centre opened, the HCC was keen to bring in a community-based organization to be part of the Centres' operation as well as provide the local community with a platform from which to contribute to the development of the facility.

The first committee was appointed by the HCC, from nominations by the local community, and included a HCC representative and the Centre manager. Their first task was to investigate the role of the envisaged community-based organisation to the long-term development and operation of the Centre.

After consultation with the HCC, community groups and an investigation by an independent consultant, the committee accepted that the everyday operation of the Centre was a task best left to the HCC due to its existing resources and expertise. It was also decided that the committee would best serve the community and the Centre by becoming an incorporated society whose functions would be:

- identifying and sourcing funding for resources needed to improve and develop programmes at the Centre, resources that could not be provided by HCC;
- to encourage use of the centre by the community and to advocate (if necessary) on behalf of the community to ensure desired programmes were introduced, developed and resourced;
- to assist local community groups in developing their own programmes in the Centre; and,
- acting as a conduit between HCC and the community, to ensure local concerns and visions for development of the Centre were made known to the Council.

The committee became an incorporated society late 1997, and since then have become a vital component in the successful operation of the Centre. Since their inception, they have sourced most of the educational, recreational and cultural resources available for community use at the centre, and have employed two supervisors to run the Centres' gymnasium and after school recreation programmes as well as provided tutors for their own two computer suites. It should be noted that a former member of the RDU and the current CEO of the Runanga sit on this committee. The Runanga has also fully supported the activity of the Centre.

Current services comprise of the provision of a range of community access progress that are open to the public free of charge and include:

- fully supervised exercise and fitness programmes;
- Enderley Medical Clinic operated by Raukura Hauora o Tainui;
- Enderley Park After School Computer Programme;
- Enderley Park After School Recreation Programme including fully supervised recreational activities;
- driver license classes from learners through to full licenses; and,
- free computer courses.

### ***Focus Group Profiles***

The final part of this section will briefly describe the six groups that participated in the focus groups. It should be noted that in terms of the Runanga focus groups, the project team emailed all managers of the services to determine availability of staff. As a result of this correspondence, the following four groups of the Runanga agreed to participate. A profile of the two external focus groups completes this section.

### ***Integrated Services Approach (ISA)***

The Integrated Services Approach is an internal Runanga committee that includes representatives of all the mental health services of the Runanga. It meets on a weekly basis to discuss issues regarding

tangata whaiora such as reviews, entries and exits as well as general service and organizational issues. This was the first focus group conducted by the Project Team.

### ***Whānau Ora***

While Whānau Ora consists of one service, there are three core business activities that this service comprises of: smoking cessation, diabetes prevention and awareness and health promotion activity in selected areas including Meningococcal B, parenting and injury prevention.

### ***Administration***

The Administration team meets on a fortnightly basis to discuss issues regarding administrative activity for the Runanga. While the administrators are based in their respective services and the varied day to day activity that each administrator carries out, they must also be aware of organizational administrative processes and adhere to. There are currently six administrators, a data management /archives person and a manager for this service.

### ***Strategic Development***

Strategic Development comprises a number of key roles in the Runanga. This includes Human Resources, Policy and Planning, Cultural Co-Ordinator, Joint Venture Co-Ordinator and the Student Placement Co-Ordinator. Collectively this service assists with supporting the strategic direction of the Runanga through its core business activity.

### ***Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa***

This focus group comprised of staff and service users of the Rauawaawa.

### ***Enderley Park Community Centre***

This focus group comprised of predominantly parents of children who utilize the Centre. Many of these parents were also volunteers for the Centre.

---

***HUI***

***Ritual of Collaboration***

---

## ***RESULTS***

The data collected in the project was gathered using three key methods. These included literature review, focus groups and participant discussions. This section outlines the analysis from this data collection.

## ***LITERATURE REVIEW***

As a result of initial investigation, a literature review was conducted, focussed on whānau development, government agency approaches to whānau development and a general scoping exercise regarding definitions and components of whānau development.

Consisting of eight documents, the purpose of the literature review was to provide preliminary data regarding those areas for the purposes of the project. Aside from work by Mason Durie, all of the literature sourced came from government agencies.

Based on the literature, a traditional definition of the whānau includes a group that shares a common heritage, a common descent through biological connection (Durie, 2003). Contemporary perceptions of whānau have extended this definition to include both the traditional idea as well as its many derivatives including non biological connection, the varied combinations of adults and child groupings that may make up whānau (for example, one parent and children, two adults and no children as just some examples). Whānau may also be structured based on a commitment or interest to a common mission e.g. a kohanga reo, a kapa haka group, a gang, a community organisation.

It is true that today not all whānau are able to provide an environment for positive advancement for their individuals and the collective (Durie, 2003). It is beyond the scope of this project to provide these in more detail. However the following characteristics have been identified as significant components to support the building of strong or healthy whānau capacity:

- Manaakitia, advocating for the ability of a whānau to care for all members which relies on access to social and material resources that promote the provision of a physically and emotionally safe home environment.
- Tohatohatia, advocating for shared wealth and collective responsibility within whānau that ensures processes where everyone benefits through access to resources. Leadership is a concept that also has the potential to be developed.

- Pupuri taonga, advocates for the guardianship of heritage in both cultural and physical forms that leads to increased identity and self esteem. Cultural heritage includes language and histories. Physical heritage includes land and places of significance e.g. flax groves.
- Whakamana, advocating for the development of human capital that cultivates competent, healthy and skilled whānau members that contributes to whānau wellbeing and knowledge wealth.
- Whakatakoto tikanga, advocating for direction through longterm planning. Even though this may appear to be a sophisticated concept it is, as it was in traditional times, a key issue to whānau adaptation in a new and changing physical, social and economic environment. This process is a means to anticipate need for future generations.
- Whakatini relates to population increase. The growth of the Māori population continues to be positive (Durie, 2003:23-25).

The level of whānau wellbeing can be measured by the level of development of whānau capacities. The maximising of whānau potential has been linked to strengthening wellbeing, knowledge, resources and leadership influence (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2005:7). The development and the realisation of whānau potential are reliant on building whānau capacities inclusive of wellbeing, knowledge, resources and leadership. The traditional notion that when there was a realisation of whānau capability participation then became possible and occurred in the wider social context is just as relevant today.

From a government agency approach, there was also recognition of their responsibilities through the issue of collaboration and an inter-sectorial approach. Not only was this intended to be across agencies but also with the whānau as well - as is the case with the Strengthening Families policy that sees an intersectorial approach between the Ministries of Health, Welfare and lead by the Ministry of Social Development.

In summary, it is clear that there is no one definition regarding whānau and as such, there is no one size fits all approach. It is largely contextual based on the realities and experiences of those determining whānau. In saying this, there is no conflict with multiple meaning and definitions of whānau. In terms of whānau capacity, it is clear that there is a framework that clearly describes this, as mentioned above. Finally, government approaches are recognising the importance and commitment to a collaborative and intersectorial approach.

## ***FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS***

The following information identifies the categories and key themes from the focus group discussions on whānau and whānau development. There were five areas of focus. They were:

- defining and describing whānau;
- defining and describing healthy whānau;
- defining and describing how you build a healthy whānau;
- identifying how the organisation you are a part of, supports and/or builds a health whānau; and,
- identifying any other issues.

Due to the results of the focus groups, it has been identified that common themes occurred across the first three areas of focus. Therefore, these results will make up the first part of this section. The second part will outline some distinctions across the focus groups in regards to their own organisations.

Data analysis took place using categories and key themes. These are described under each area of focus.

### ***Overall Common Themes***

#### ***What is a Whānau?***

All focus group participants could identify more than one definition regarding whānau and there was a general agreement across all six focus groups that a whānau comprised of three specific characteristics including:

- *whakapapa / blood / kinship* - e.g. identifying as Māori, ko au, ko koe, whānau, hapu, iwi, nga tupuna uhia mai ki runga i nga mokopuna, a whakapapa link to our atua, identity, roots, as well as including all age ranges, made up of both small and large groups, a mother, a father, children, nan, koro, a gay or lesbian couple looking after a mokai (child of another family member or friend). Individual members each have their own ihi, wehi and mana, whānau whanui, everybody from te Atua.
- *commonalities, shared interests / purpose* - e.g. sports teams, kohanga reo, schools, kuratini, gangs, church, organisation that you work for such as Te Runanga, Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa, service users.
- *a unit as part of a community that provides a safe environment* - kotahitanga, manaakitanga, disputes, overprotected, domination, difficulties addressed by positive communication, balance,

functioning, security, loving, support and togetherness while maintaining uniqueness, a lifetime commitment.

### ***What is a Healthy Whānau?***

Participants identified a range of views regarding their understandings of a healthy whānau. This could be encompassed through the notion of holistic balance, e.g. feeding members, spiritually, physically and emotionally.

It became evident that the information that was being described under this section aligned well with the te whare tapa wha model that includes the areas of whānau, tinana, hingengaro and wairua. Implicit to this model is the recognition that these areas all complement each other, and that should there be imbalance in one area, this will impact on the other three. Conversely, if all are well supported then there is balance across all four areas:

- *Tinana* - Access to nga taonga tuku iho, whenua, moana, tane mahuta, drawing on natural resources, economic viability, the provision of kai, housing, shelter, physically healthy, involved in sports.
- *Hinengaro* - Nga kete e toru, matauranga, knowledge of whakapapa, tikanga, kawa, nga taonga tuku iho, kia mau ki nga tohutohu a o matua herea ki to kaki hei taonga pupuri, unique whānau gifts, knowledge of maunga, awa, whakapapa and whenua, Te Reo Māori, education, access to wananga e.g. Raukawa
- *Wairua* - Whakapono (belief), tumanako (hope), aroha, manaakitanga, a ratou ahuatanga e pa ana ki a ratou tupuna, why, who and where they come from, connected with higher self, karakia, belief in god, a focussed pepeha, maintaining memories of koro, nan, kaumatua, potential, positive affirmations, encourage, understanding, communication, expression of feelings, happy, laughter, care, share, acceptance to be yourself, protect, safe, correct, nurture, respect, support, mental and social stability, hardworking, sets good standards, accepted norms, boundaries, code of conduct.
- *Whānau* - Identity, whakapapa, security, Tiaki tamariki (look after their children), role models, responsible parenting, children involved, code of conduct, laws, lores, living without abuse and violence, acknowledged as individuals.

### ***How Do You Build a Healthy Whānau?***

Participants identified a broad range of views regarding their understandings of how to build a healthy whānau. As a result, four key themes emerged

- *Leadership* - ethics and integrity, optional plans for their future, setting realistic measurable goals, dreams, visions, forward thinking and planning, kotahitanga, empowerment, positive role models kaumātua (koroua / kuia), matauranga (knowledge roles for male and female), matriarchs who are strong leaders supporting males in their roles, defined roles, tuakana, teina, guidance healthy parents who work to provide gentle nurturing, love, honesty, a commitment to provide shelter, food and clothing.
- *Shared Values, Linking, Building Bridges* - full involvement of members working as a collective, building on strengths, high expectations e.g. rangatahi coming through will exceed their kaumatua, confidence, manaakitanga (care), aroha, sets boundaries, a core belief in health, safety, welfare and wellbeing in the home with the absence of risk, alcohol and physical abuse, decolonisation, resisting tauwiwi trying to redefine who we are as Māori, valuing the ethics of work, self discipline, playgroup, preschool, educational pathways, career pathways, resources e.g. money, and exercise.
- *common interests and connecting whakapapa* - kaupapa Māori, te wairua o nga matua tupuna, tamariki o te iwi Māori, reclaiming Māori histories, identity and all that goes with being Māori, te reo, tikanga, a sense of belonging and identity of who we are, Okohoro, a place to lean on, a place to stand, neutral ground, strong foundations, belonging, turangawaewae, whenua, starting with ko au (myself), by Māori for Māori, building a healthy you, an environment that encourages growth, thinking, unconditional love.
- *Communication* - understanding, teach each other, education e.g. parenting, specific training for parents PAFT (Parents As First Teachers) with a Māori focus, teaching parents to be involved with schools and education, censoring all television programmes that are inappropriate for children, being lawyers, promoting healthy practises, care, share, empathy, charity, appreciation protect, correct, support, willing participation, open to change.

Outlined in the next section are the unique themes, some that emerged from the previous focus areas in addition to the varied responses that informed the last two areas of focus.

## ***Unique Themes***

### ***What is a Whānau?***

In terms of this first area of focus, there were two focus groups that outlined information that could be described as ‘negative aspects’ of whānau such as ‘disputes, domination and conflict’. However these views were taken in the context of the prevailing positive comments made about the notion of whānau.

### ***What is a Healthy Whānau?***

Three focus groups spanning the organisations elaborated further by saying that a healthy whānau:

- *has many layers* - being part of a collective, collective responsibility, pulling together collectively, collective internal and external influences, traditional ways of raising children, not just parents looking after children, ratbag, kaumātua and kuia play a big role, parents, children, nana and koro, ahakoa ko wai, not just about individuals.

### ***How Do You Build a Healthy Whānau?***

In terms of unique themes, there were none in relation to this particular area of focus.

### ***How Does the Organisation You Are a Part Of, Support/Build Healthy Whānau?***

Participants identified a broad range of views regarding their understandings of how an organisation supports or builds a healthy whānau. These views inform the major themes that have been identified.

Three focus groups from the same organisation strongly identified the following:

- *Māori processes and celebrations* - powhiri, poroporoaki, mihi, karakia, waiata, kapa haka, tangihana (sharing loss, grief, opportunity to attend funeral), noho marae, whakawhānaungatanga, te reo Māori, Matariki dinner, Waitangi day.

Two of the same three focus groups also acknowledged Kingitanga, Mana whenua links set up for nga maata waka, Taumata (kaumātua advisors) which provides guidelines (kawa), ngā mea Māori ethical boundaries, kai, Māori treatment programmes, Powhiri Poutama, Te Whare Tapa Wha, oranga tinana, oranga whānau, interconnectedness, celebration of successes, whānau acknowledgement.

Five of the six focus groups from two organisations strongly identified:

- *Policies, procedures, clear practise and boundaries* - follow and adhere to Te Runanga mission statements and core values, quality governance systems and policies, setting bench marks, strategic planning, human resource management that is both flexible and accountable, consultation, nil hierarchy practises with staff, a restorative element of the individual and collective, access to resources and ongoing training through team meetings, team building exercise, remuneration that values and reflects the skills we bring to the job, employment of skilled kaimahi, multi-tasking, leaders, nurturing, provision of accommodation, a work environment that is heated, warm and user friendly, Rangi and Papa.

In terms of this area of focus, groups were service specific and identified the importance of their organisation in terms of appropriate service delivery to community. This is outlined by organisation below:

- *The Runanga* - educates, informs, supports, promotes, communicates and delivers to whānau locally, regionally and nationally, support for low socio economic families, whānau ora, iwi health, wellness through healthy life style programmes that focus on diet, exercise and smoking cessation, consumer participation, empowering whānau, whānau who require mental health services supported in a process that provides unconditional understanding, acceptance, warts and all and others being fully aware of what a mental illness is, interaction with wider community.
- *Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa* - Kaumatua looking after kaumātua, providing programmes and educating all participants in holistic wellbeing, offering a safe learning environment, forward planning by management and executives who see the big picture, leaders who have a vision and then work towards implementation beyond all limits and make it happen, supporting new initiatives, having no barriers, all skills are valued no matter what they are, all people are valued and promoting work is lifetime and age is no barrier.
- *Enderley Park Community Centre* - building for the community, playgrounds for the community, community events e.g. Christmas in the park, café, crèche, Doctors' clinic, sports and fitness centre, sports coordinators, community worker, youth worker, after school programme, holiday programme, computers, Te Reo Māori classes and Drivers licensing classes.

### *Other Issues*

In terms of other issues, the following points were identified by the three organisations:

- *The Runanga* - Government need to take responsibility for the role they play in supporting whānau into housing. In terms of a local body, Hamilton City Council need to work closer with Māori community organisations to progress the aspirations of the Māori population within the Hamilton City boundaries.
- *Frankton / Dinsdale Rauawaawa* - A programme needs to be established by Māori to support young Māori parents, Māori for Māori to break the cycle of abuse. Māori need to write and facilitate the programmes. Ko te whānau te mea nui; there is a need for communal housing to overcome isolation for kaumātua. The communal housing could be based on the papakainga concept. Wrap around support (intersector) for kaumātua by community organisations may also be needed even within the papakainga; like the Runanga, it was identified that Hamilton City Council need to work closer with Māori community organisations to progress the aspirations of the Māori population within the Hamilton City boundaries.
- *Enderley Park Community Centre* - Walking Groups for Kaumatua and a programme regarding healthy life styles; Māori Early Childhood Centre Project Enderley Park Community Centre - A new group motivated to drive the Project; better use of Enderley Park Fields; development of a sports complex – netball courts; to purchase a van to take groups to wider community activities such as the field days as one example.

## **CONCLUSION**

The six focus groups of the Runanga, Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa and Enderley Park Community Centre clearly identified a range of information regarding definitions of whānau, defining healthy whānau, and building healthy whānau. This information was important in order to ‘...enable whānau to describe their present circumstances, identify their interests, needs and aspirations...’ as required through the short term outcome of the intervention.

In terms of definitions of whānau, the continuum of definition ranged from whakapapa / bloodline / kinship and its variations, commonalities, shared interests and purpose and finally a unit as part of a community that provides a safe environment. As such, whānau did not operate in isolation. These descriptions align directly with the findings of the literature review.

Healthy whānau was defined through the use of the te whare tapa wha model. Again, context and the four components of tinana, hinengaro, wairua and whānau were utilised. It is important to note that housing and education were identified as components of a healthy whānau.

Building a healthy whānau saw the emergence of four themes, that is leadership, shared values / linking / building bridges, common interests and connecting whakapapa and finally communication. Again, these themes align with the framework of capacity building described in the literature review.

The fourth area of focus described how organisations supported or built healthy whānau. Each group identified organisational specific information. There was a real sense through the responses in this area, of pride regarding what could be offered to the communities through these organisations. This was also evident in the detailed profile information that was provided by organisations as well. It is interesting to note that only three of the six focus groups (all from the same organisation) articulated the need for Māori processes and to participate as Māori. However, in saying this, the reason could be not because the other organisations consider this information as unimportant, but rather because it is an implicit part of their processes, so is not seen as separate. For example, some participants used te reo to convey their ideas, but did not specifically identify use of te reo as being important. It could be suggested that this is because use of te reo in this example, was a given or taken for granted and accepted practice.

In terms of other issues – again, the area of housing and education arose. It is also interesting to note that organisations identified services that were being delivered by other organisations that

participated in this project. For example, Frankton / Dinsdale identified parenting programmes or education initiatives as important, which are programmes conducted by the Enderley Community Centre. Enderley on the other hand, identified the need for walking groups for kaumatua and healthy life styles, which are programmes that Frankton / Dinsdale currently provide. This could suggest that the participants are clear that whānau are just not about a specific age group or range. Rather, that whānau is about including all age groups. The Runanga did not articulate this and this could be because services are already delivered across age groups and ranges. It could also be because the Runanga are aware of the different services that are available for these age groups and seek to complement such services, rather than replicate them.

## ***KEY INTERVENTIONS***

This section describes the three interventions identified by the three organisations. They are:

- The Runanga: Kirikiriroa Innovations Housing Project;
- Frankton / Dinsdale Rauawaawa: Kaumatua Housing; and,
- Enderley Community Centre: Māori Early Childhood Centre.

It should be noted that while the Runanga and Frankton / Dinsdale have both identified housing, they are doing so from two distinct approaches. As such, the project team determined that this was two different interventions, albeit related.

In terms of the significance of this section – the importance of this is that it articulates ‘...ways in which whānau are pursuing self-identified pathways...’ as well as describing initiatives that ‘...facilitate whānau to be more powerful actors in their own lives...’.

In terms of identifying interventions – the project team left that up to the respective organisation to identify. However, we did emphasise the need for these interventions to be based around whānau development interventions. Aside from this, no other criteria were given. The rationale was to ensure that the interventions were self-identified and described by the organisation. All information regarding the interventions was provided by the three managers / CEOs of the organisations and service documentation.

### ***Intervention 1: Kirikiriroa Innovations Housing Project***

The intended long term goal for the housing project is whānau ora and the economic advancement of Māori within Kirikiriroa, through home ownership in a community based on the traditional papakainga concept of communal responsibility and reciprocity.

This intervention aligns with the Government housing priority (Housing New Zealand, 2005) to address the unmet housing needs for groups such as low income whānau, special needs whānau and kaumātua. The Trustees of the Runanga, in consultation with the Hamilton City community, identified the need to support Māori into home ownership in their 2000 strategic plan

Advancing this intervention relies on an application to be made to the Housing Innovation Fund to build homes and to the Direct Resource Funding to implement a wrap around (intersectorial) component by community and government organisations to provide

ongoing support to whānau who consent to become apart of this intervention. Criteria for participation include whānau groupings from:

- low income, special needs and the elderly;
- organisations who already have whānaungatanga, established relationships with Te Runanga e.g. Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa;
- whānau who consent to participate in specific training designed towards home ownership eg budgeting, home maintenance.

The Runanga have been fortunate to obtain some funding to complete a scoping exercise at the local level that provides the evidence regarding the need for this project. The expected completion date is June 2005.

In terms of other intended timelines, there is the policy development specific to tenancy – completion date September 2005 and policy development specific to contractual obligations related to wrap around services – completion date November 2005.

The intervention will enhance whānau wellbeing by establishing a community environment which is active in the process of physical and emotional caring - for example being nosy will be legitimised as a process of caring. The intervention also encourages collective responsibility or community participation in the decision making process that will benefit the community. Specific communication training, such as democratic processes and how to participate in community decision making will be facilitated through a community house that will be central to the intervention. Within this process will also be an opportunity to develop leadership skills.

In addition access to cultural and physical heritage will be provided through a community house. Training programmes provided may include te reo me ona tikanga, traditional weaving, gardening and other programmes as determined by the whānau. Programmes will encourage whānau participating as Māori.

Furthermore the housing / papakainga intervention will encourage the development of human capital through training programmes offered by a community house or joint ventures made with Tertiary Education providers e.g. a Trade Training Project. Training programmes will enhance the opportunity to gain rightful employment. The accumulation of skills will also improve self determination for whānau healthy life style choices and financial independence through home ownership.

## ***Intervention 2: Kaumatua Housing***

This intervention is based on the notions that kuia and koroua like to remain in a whānau environment; that whānau want to live with their kuia and koroua and that the provision of sustainable housing with community participation promotes wellbeing.

The intention of this intervention is to:

- provide an opportunity for appropriate, cheap rental housing to be available for kaumātua short term or longterm depending on the needs of kaumātua;
- kaumātua can make choices about living by themselves or with extended whānau in their households as currently there is no flexibility for those in Housing New Zealand accommodation for such choices;
- whānau to be safe in their environment and a flow on affect where kaumātua feel safe; and,
- health, wellness and wellbeing and an opportunity for kaumātua to participate in community activities.

The need for this intervention was identified by the kaumātua themselves who have in the past made contact with or who engage in activities provided by Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa, an organisation which plays an advocacy role for kaumātua living in Housing New Zealand accommodation, and the Kaumātua Needs Research Report 2005 completed by Te Peka Development Trust for Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa.

A consultation process involved Kaumātua, Housing New Zealand, Hamilton City Council, and Te Rūnanga o Kirikiriroa. An agreement in principle exists with Frankton/ Dinsdale Rauawaawa to work closely alongside the Rūnanga. Approval by Housing New Zealand for the first phase of the Intervention which is a scoping exercise has been confirmed. The progress of the Intervention is reliant on the outcome of the scoping exercise, the development phase.

Some of the positive aspects of the intervention include:

- opportunity for appropriate housing for kaumātua;
- the physical and emotional needs of the kaumātua being met;
- strengthened relationship with the Rūnanga to trial accommodation options; and,
- opportunities for growth of the organisation, wider contracts, putea (funds).

The intervention will enhance whānau wellbeing through flexibility with housing, how kaumātua want to live, by themselves or with whānau. Housing New Zealand limits housing choices only allowing

the tenant (kaumātua) to occupy Housing New Zealand accommodation which does not always suit the extended whānau living arrangements. This intervention will give whānau greater autonomy in terms of making a choice that are their aspirations.

Local and national consultation has occurred with Housing New Zealand resulting in the approval by Housing New Zealand at the national level for the scoping exercise. Te Puni Kōkiri has also been a key government organisation at both the local and national level, and provided support through Sustainable Kaumātua Funding for a wrap-around service that included housing and encouraged relationship building with other community organisations e.g. Te Rūnanga.

In terms of barriers to providing appropriate housing, these include the existence of an unutilised housing complex in Hamilton, the Bryant Village Complex, Pukete comprising of 36 pensioner units with a community hall onsite, which has been empty for 3 years. It is managed by BV Bryant Charitable Trust, which has refused to have any dialogue with Housing New Zealand, Hamilton City Council and Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawawa about the possibility of utilising the complex.

Short time frames where kaumātua in need of housing can not always receive immediate assistance which is frustrating.

Little practical support from Hamilton City Council who agree in principal to initiatives but bureaucratic processes don't always progress Māori initiatives. The Hamilton City Council needs to have Māori who will advocate for Māori community development.

The low profile of the Iwi, Tainui in the delivery of whānau development, their responsiveness, their social consciousness. Where is it? When will it link?

### ***Intervention 3: Māori Early Childhood Centre***

The Māori Early Childhood Centre intervention provides an opportunity for Māori children from disrupted homes, solo parent homes, homes where individuals do not regularly engage with their iwi links, or where children are living in a low socio – economic area to be provided with early support in order to be better equipped to succeed in education. The intervention will contribute to whānau wellbeing, whānau development by providing an opportunity to access education to improve opportunities that will lead to a better quality of life. Accessing education at the earliest possible stage increases opportunity to succeed and ensures that there is a level playing field for the children from the Enderley community - one that will improve the chances for their educational success.

This intervention aligns with the Ministry of Education, Strategic Plan for Early Childhood, ([www.minedu.govt.nz](http://www.minedu.govt.nz)) as outlined in the Early Childhood Strategic Plan – Pathways to the Future, Nga Huarahi Arataki. Emphasis is on a greater empowerment of parent/whānau to be involved in the early learning of their children.

Two key areas identified in the Strategic Plan are:

- a) to increase participation with quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) Services that provide for communities where participation is low, are Māori and who live in low socio economic areas; and,
- b) to promote collaborative relationships between education, health and social services for young children and their parents and whānau.

In addition improving Māori education outcomes is identified as a priority of the ECE Strategic Plan. The cornerstone of this work is the family and how it can be supported to access a better quality of education. There are three specific goals for meeting the needs of Māori which include:

- a) enhance the relationship between Crown and Māori;
- b) improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of ECE services for Māori; and,
- c) increase the participation of Māori children and their whānau.

The need for the intervention was identified through consultation with the Enderley community and the three primary schools in the area, Insol Avenue, Fairfield Primary and Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Te Ara Rima. The schools reported that the children from the Enderley community have historically struggled and continue to struggle on entry to primary school and that there is a need for extra support for them in order to achieve age appropriate levels in both literacy and numeracy tasks. The lack of preschool participation was identified by the primary schools as a major contributing factor in the children needing this extra assistance.

Presently the majority of parents of the Enderley community choose to send their children, who are non speakers of Te Reo Māori and who are not affiliated to the local hapu of Ngati Wairere or Ngati Mahanga, to either Insol Avenue or Fairfield Primary. There is little attendance from the Enderley community to Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Te Ara Rima which receives children from all Te Kohanga Reo throughout the Hamilton City boundary. Nor do the Enderley community choose to access Te Kohanga Reo which is onsite of Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Te Ara Rima.

Lack of transport but perhaps even more an enormous belief in having an early childhood facility of their own, run for the Enderley community and by them for their children influences the decision not to attend the other local early childhood centres that feed into Insol Avenue and Fairfield Primary. The proposed Centre is viewed by the Enderley community as an opportunity for them to determine and to shape what is needed for their children to succeed.

Consultation has also occurred with the Hamilton City Council for Resource Consent to build a facility as well as with the local Ministry of Education regarding compliance of this facility as a education provider. Provisional approval has been granted. However the Project requires a fulltime dedicated position, someone who understands the needs of the Enderley community, who has invested interest in the community and has a commitment to the wellness of the community.

In addition the establishment of a committee to advance the Intervention is needed and while some parents have come forward there is also a need for the involvement of people with specialised skills for dealing with Government bureaucratic processes.

Barriers to the intervention are:

- a) Lack of community expertise and funding to employ a person to deal with bureaucratic processes to efficiently and effectively liaise with local and government bodies in order to advance this Intervention.
- b) Community comprised of mainly unemployed families where day to day survival remains the priority.
- c) Government that lacks an understanding that the priorities of parents maybe different to the needs of children when basic survival is the priority.

## ***SUMMARY***

It is clear from the above information, that the three organisations have put some considerable thought and analysis into determining their interventions. It is also clear, that these interventions have not been determined solely at management level. Instead, there has been wide consultation by all organisations regarding their interventions.

The rationale, planning, short and long term goals are clear. So too, is the direction by which organisations would like to see their interventions proceed. Risk management provisions have also been identified through the list of barriers. It could be here, that future projects and policy planning by Te Puni Kōkiri may be able to assist such interventions. Also significant is the alignment of the interventions with government policy and strategic planning. This last point cannot be underestimated, given the policy focus of this whānau development (Māori collective) intervention.

In summary then, all of the above interventions have the following characteristics:

- clear self-identified goals or pathways;
- clear pathways regarding planning and implementation of each intervention;
- clear rationale for the establishment of each intervention;
- identification of barriers;
- identification of the alignment of the project with current government policy at intersectorial level; and,
- a clear focus on whānau development.

---

***POROPOROAKI***  
***Ritual of Erudition***

---

## ***OVERALL SUMMARY OF RESULTS***

In terms of the overall whānau development (Māori collective) intervention, it is clear that there is some significant work that is being achieved regarding this area of focus throughout the community. What is also evident is the recognition by organisations working in the community, regarding potential future interventions that will support whānau development. Clear co-ordinated work, complementary to each other, is another indicator of the way in which organisations are collaborating with each other, and doing so in an effective manner. What is less clear is whether there is a co-ordinated approach to whānau development across government agencies. This section outlines the overall summary of results from this project, followed by recommendations that include potential plans and options for the future.

The six focus groups of the Runanga, Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa and Enderley Park Community Centre clearly identified a range of information regarding definitions of whānau, defining healthy whānau, and building healthy whānau. This information was important in order to ‘...enable whānau to describe their present circumstances, identify their interests, needs and aspirations...’ as required through the short term outcome of the intervention.

In terms of definitions of whānau, the continuum of definition ranged from whakapapa / bloodline / kinship and its variations, commonalities, shared interests and purpose and finally a unit as part of a community that provides a safe environment. As such, whānau did not operate in isolation. These descriptions align directly with the findings of the literature review.

Healthy whānau was defined through the use of the te whare tapa wha model. Again, context and the four components of tinana, hinengaro, wairua and whānau were utilised. It is important to note that housing and education were identified as components of a healthy whānau.

Building a healthy whānau saw the emergence of four themes, that is leadership, shared values / linking / building bridges, common interests and connecting whakapapa and finally communication. Again, these themes align with the framework of capacity building described in the literature review.

The fourth area of focus described how organisations supported or built healthy whānau. Each group identified organisational specific information. There was a real sense through the responses in this area, of pride regarding what could be offered to the communities through these organisations. This was also evident in the detailed profile information that was provided by organisations as well. It is

interesting to note that only three of the six focus groups (all from the same organisation) articulated the need for Māori processes and to participate as Māori. However, in saying this, the reason could be not because the other organisations consider this information as unimportant, but rather because it is an implicit part of their processes, so is not seen as separate. For example, some participants used te reo to convey their ideas, but did not specifically identify use of te reo as being important. It could be suggested that this is because use of te reo in this example, was a given or taken for granted and accepted practice.

In terms of other issues – again, the area of housing and education arose. It is also interesting to note that organisations identified services that were being delivered by other organisations that participated in this project. For example, Frankton / Dinsdale identified parenting programmes or education initiatives as important, which are programmes conducted by the Enderley Community Centre. Enderley on the other hand, identified the need for walking groups for kaumatua and healthy life styles, which are programmes that Frankton / Dinsdale currently provide. This could suggest that the participants are clear that whānau are just not about a specific age group or range. Rather, that whānau is about including all age groups. The Runanga did not articulate this and this could be because services are already delivered across age groups and ranges. It could also be because the Runanga are aware of the different services that are available for these age groups and seek to complement such services, rather than replicate them.

In terms of the three specific interventions identified by the organisations, the following characteristics were found:

- all interventions had clear self-identified goals or pathways;
- all interventions had clear pathways regarding planning and implementation of each intervention;
- there was clear rationale for the establishment of each intervention;
- there was clear identification of barriers;
- all organisations could identify the alignment of the project with current government policy at intersectorial level; and,
- all interventions were able to identify a clear focus and priority to whānau development.

In summary, it can be seen that both the focus groups and the interventions clearly articulate the need for whānau development. As well, that the definitions, capacities and aspirations regarding whānau development all align with the initial findings of the literature review and therefore the underpinning foundation of the project. To this end, the following recommendations have been made.

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

The project team recommend that:

- 1) Recognition is given of the broad continuum that may be attributed to whānau definitions and any practice or policy, whether at local regional or national level, consider these in their entirety and as a valid spectrum regarding definition;
- 2) In keeping with Recommendation I above, that recognition be given that there is no 'one size fits all approach' when it comes to definitions of whānau or what makes a healthy whānau;
- 3) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should consider the whānau capacity building framework reaffirmed and outlined in this report;
- 4) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should consider Māori models of practice as valid methodologies for practical implementation;
- 5) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should support Māori participating as Māori;
- 6) Māori community organisations be identified as valid pathways for the planning, implementation and delivery of Whānau Development interventions;
- 7) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should recognise some of the barriers to the interventions described in this project and determine pathways to alleviate some of these barriers; and finally,
- 8) Policy regarding whānau development and the building of whānau capacity should support a clear and consistent intersectorial approach by government agencies.

## ***REFERENCES***

Durie, M. (2003). *Launching Māori futures*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Enderley Community Centre pamphlet (2005).

Frankton/Dinsdale Rauawaawa. (2005) Business Plan and Service documentation.

Ministry of Health. (2002). *He Korowai Oranga, Māori Health Strategy*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Ministry of Social Development. (2004). *Whānau Development Project Final evaluation report*. Ministry of Social Development.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2005). *Intervention Framework*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.

Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa (2004) Service handbook.

### **Websites:**

[www.huitaumata.Māori.nz](http://www.huitaumata.Māori.nz)

[www.strengtheningfamilies.govt.nz/about.html](http://www.strengtheningfamilies.govt.nz/about.html)

---

***APPENDIX ONE***  
***Information Package***

---

---

***APPENDIX TWO***

***Consent Forms***

---

---

***KARAKIA***

***Ritual of Conclusion***

---

## ***KARAKIA***

Ki te taha wairua, hei whakahonore tātou

Kia tāu te rangimarie me  
te aroha ki runga i tēnei rā

Tukuna atu ki ngā tūpuna  
hei ārahi nei ki a mātou

Whakahōnoretia

Tukua mai to mātou aroha

Ki te whānau e huihui nei  
Kia mau ki te aroha, te whakapono  
me te ture hei tohutohu nei ki ngā mahi kātoa

Koinei tō tātou whakaaro tumanako  
ki ngā tāngata e taka ki te he

Uhia nei ngā whakamoemiti, whakawhetai  
ki tēnā, ki tēnā, ia rā, ia rā

Haumi e, hui e, taiki e!

---

**WAIATA**

*Ritual of Coalescence*

---

## **WAIATA**

### ***Te Tatau***

Te tatau hei tiki Pounamu  
Te taura here o ngā waka  
Te mana Māori Motuhake  
Te Arikinui, Te Atairangikaahu

Kotahi anō te kohao o te ngira e  
E kuhuna ai  
Te miro ma, te miro whero  
Te miro pango  
I muri ake, kia tau ki te whakapono  
Te tūmanako me te ture

Na Potatau, Tawhiao ēnei  
Te mana, te tapu, te wehi, te ihi  
Te wana (hi aue hi)!! Te mauri

Tekau mā rua ngā tau manu  
Ngā taura whiri  
Kia hora te marino  
Kia whakapapa pounamu te moana  
Kia tere te karohirohi (hi aue)!  
Te Runanga o Kirikiriroa

*A ha na Potatau, Tawhiao ēnei*

# The Whānau Development – Māori Collective Intervention Project