

Ahuriri-Driscoll, A., Foote, J., Hepi, M., Rogers-Koroheke, M., Taimona., H. and Broodkoorn, M. (2008)  
A model of hapū development – working paper. Institute of Environmental Science & Research. 18pp.

## **A model of hapū development: working paper.**

Ahuriri-Driscoll, A., Foote, J., Hepi, M., Rogers-Koroheke, M., Taimona., H., & Broodkoorn, M.

## **Overview of marae/hapū/Māori community development.**

### **What is Māori community development?**

In accordance with the broad aims of community development, Māori community development is undertaken primarily to enhance the wellbeing of Māori collectives. Māori community development constitutes both the desired outcome and the processes through which participants' needs and priorities are identified and addressed. Indeed, the ongoing and long-term nature of community development renders the process as important as overall outcomes (Eketone, 2006).

Māori community development operates within a particular context in Aotearoa New Zealand. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 established a constitutionally bicultural nation, with Māori the indigenous partner to a tauīwi government. The Treaty of Waitangi therefore is directly relevant and adds another dimension to community development frameworks and practice (Chile, Munford & Shannon, 2006). In common are principles of participation, equity, partnership and empowerment, inherent in the Treaty's three articles and its focus on Māori self-determination/tino rangatiratanga. Of particular significance for Māori community development, the principles of the Treaty apply equally to decision-makers and state agencies (Chile et al., 2006), inferring a degree of responsibility to support communities to flourish, through resourcing either in time, personnel, strategic alignment or funds.

There are two forms of Māori community development, either in communities of residence, or in the context of tribal communities (Durie, 2001). Hapū and iwi development constitute the latter form, based on structures comprising descendents of a common ancestor, which exercise mana whenua in a particular territory. Hapū/iwi development thus has deeper roots than that concerned with Māori communities in general; hapū and iwi were the units of pre-colonisation indigenous society (Ballara, 1998) and conversely, Māori (meaning ordinary) was the term used to indicate difference to European settlers, emphasising the normality of Māori and the peculiarity of tauīwi/others. And thus, whilst the starting point of Māori community development is with Māori as a marginalised, minority group, the starting point of hapū/iwi development is mana (esteem) and capacity to exercise authority (Winiata, 2006). These two forms of Māori community development are linked by the concept and practice of manaakitanga, notably the obligation mana whenua have to show hospitality towards mātā waka (Māori from another rohe). Indeed, Eketone (2006) cites an example of successful Māori community development, conducted by and for Tainui members, within the Ngāi Tahu rohe.

Eketone (2006) draws his own distinction between types of Māori community development, differentiating between critical theory-informed Māori community development and strengths-based indigenous development, criticising the former for its tendency to focus on colonial oppression, and promoting the latter as an approach which better acknowledges Māori and iwi realities, based on Māori and iwi world views and values. The forms drawn by Eketone closely resemble those discussed by Durie. Although they are distinguishable by their negative/positive orientation, both forms of Māori community development are based on Māori understandings of the world and take the primacy of Māori perspectives for granted. Accordingly, culturally appropriate approaches and settings, those accepted and utilised by Māori communities, are valued for maximising community buy-in and engagement. This includes hui and wānanga, Māori-specific means of communication and learning bound by tikanga Māori, held perhaps within the physical structure of the marae. As a 'hub' or centre of Māori community activity, authority and decision-making, in community development terms the marae is considered a key point of access to the community, and an important stakeholder in initiatives. Furthermore, development initiatives that recognise and utilise the existing processes in place at the marae are more likely to be supported (Collins, 2003).

### **History of Māori community development**

In common with other communities around the world, Māori community development has evolved out of centuries of practice (Chile, 2006; Durie, 2002; Duignan, Casswell, Howden-Chapman, Moewaka Barnes, Allan, Conway & Thornley, 2003). In the case of Māori this was based on the self-determination of whānau, hapū and iwi structures in all aspects of daily life. Although contemporary community development efforts have worked primarily to address adverse impacts of colonisation, Māori community development comprises much more than resistance to colonialism, encompassing "*a process that returns to practices, methods and strategies that focus on the entire functioning of society*" (Chile, 2006, p 423).

Despite being undermined in the first century of colonisation through loss of land, language and culture, Māori community development has endured, in more recent times supported by legislative developments. The 1945 Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act had enormous potential to enhance community-based development through its creation of tribal committee structures, but failed through political interference and strict control of funding that curbed attempts for autonomy. This failure and the impacts of urbanisation saw the development of the 1962 Māori Welfare Act (later renamed the Māori Community Development Act in 1979), which sought to bring together economic, social and cultural development, factors critical to the development of Māori communities (Chile, 2006).

Following World War II, when the focus internationally was upon stimulating community recovery and improvement, community development as a term and practice gained popularity (Christchurch City Council Community Development Team, 2004). Political, economic and social unrest in New Zealand in the 1970s reinforced the relevance of community development as a means of achieving change, through central and local government partnering with those at the 'grass-roots' level (Craig, 1991, pp 45-46 cited in Chile, 2006). In the three decades since, utilisation of community development has increased, the practice valued for its perceived ability to deal with local problems and issues in a more holistic, appropriate and sustainable

way (Simpson, Wood & Daws, 2003, cited in Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004). The connections between community participatory processes and health/wellbeing are highlighted increasingly in both international and local research focused on community development, although such research relating to Māori communities is more limited (Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004). Evaluations of Māori community/hapū development programmes are commissioned frequently by local and central government funders to monitor achievement of contracted outputs, but findings related to efficacy and effectiveness are not often published.

Today there is considerable evidence of Māori community/hapū development/action being undertaken, but this is not widely documented in academic literature. Of the Māori community action and development initiatives written about (Ratima, Fox, Fox, Te Karu, Gemmell, Slater, D'Souza & Pearce, 1999; Voyle & Simmons, 1999; Moewaka Barnes, 2000; Simmons and Voyle, 2003; Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004; Eketone, 2006; Greenaway & Witten, 2006) the focus is on a range of issues, from those specific to health based on need (for example, smoking cessation, nutrition and physical activity, interventions for diabetes), to broader community outcomes based on community priorities (for example, community revitalisation, employment and crime rates). From these examples, and literature relating to community action/development in general, some common 'success features' emerge.

### **Models of community development: what does the literature tell us about what constitutes good community development practice?**

Within the community development literature a number of domains are identified as both factors in and products of community development processes. These include community empowerment (Laverack, 2006), community participation (Rifkin, Muller, Bichmann, 1998), community competence (Eng & Parker, 1994), community capacity (Goodman, Speers, McLeroy, Fawcett, Kegler, Parker, Rathgeb Smith, Sterling & Wallerstein, 1998) and capacity-building (Hawe, King, Noort, Jordens & Lloyd, 2000) (cited in Duignan et al., 2003). There is considerable overlap between each domain in terms of common dimensions/elements; participation, leadership, social and organisational networks, resource mobilisation and access, problem assessment, critical reflection, conflict management, collaboration and sustainability. When these elements are brought together, with an underlying theory of intervention and a particular aim in mind (for example, community empowerment or capacity-building), they constitute models of community development.

Three such models, developed in the New Zealand context to indicate community change include one emergent from a meta-analysis of ten community action projects (Greenaway & Witten, 2006), the Community Projects Indicator Framework (Duignan et al., 2003), and a framework for bicultural community development (Munford & Walsh-Tapiata, 2006). The first model was constructed around three common phases of development within community projects – the activation phase, the consolidation phase and the transition/completion phase (Greenaway & Witten, 2006), with key processes/activities within each. Of these, strong relationships between individuals, groups and organisations, developmental practices adopted, and

knowledge built through critical reflection were identified as particularly important factors in enhancing community projects and enabling community change<sup>1</sup>.

In terms of Māori-specific community action, Greenaway and Witten's meta-analysis found that priorities and form differed more than types of processes. Whilst clarity of purpose and common understanding of project actions and objectives were critical success factors across all projects, the Māori projects drew on a broader range of contextual factors (cultural values and tikanga in addition to local context and experiences) to strengthen shared identity and purpose. Critical reflection within the Māori-specific projects was also uniquely holistic, encompassing spiritual, cultural, mental and physical aspects of a project, and considerably broader in terms of context, reflecting on the effects of colonisation, the results of powerlessness, and general alienation from inherent cultural strengths (Greenaway & Witten, 2006, p 155).

The second model, the Community Projects Indicator Framework, is a tool developed to monitor and track the progress of community projects from the planning stage to implementation and evaluation (Duignan et al., 2003). The authors identified eleven headings considered to be important when planning a community development project, building on general-focused community development indicators/elements noted above with additional elements unique to the New Zealand context. Meeting Treaty of Waitangi obligations is one such element, reflecting the Treaty's importance as the basis of non-Māori settlement in Aotearoa and current day bicultural society, and thereby in the practice of contemporary community development. Enabling Māori input in project development and implementation, creating culturally safe environments, assessing/monitoring Māori involvement and outcomes, and developing Māori-specific indicators are noted by Duignan et al as ways in which the Treaty of Waitangi might be applied in community action/development (p7).

Chile, Munford and Shannon (2006), in their consideration of community development in the context of New Zealand society identify the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi in two key areas: upholding Māori self-determination, and considering the application of Treaty principles in everyday decision-making by state agencies and community organisations. While Duignan et al acknowledge the necessity of generic projects to meet Treaty obligations, they also recognise the value of Māori-focused community development through 'by Māori for Māori' projects and recommend that these take place concomitantly. Duignan et al also reflect on the contribution of agencies to community development/action projects in their role as funders, compiling a list of best practice principles. These include the willingness of funding agencies to negotiate the terms and activities of a project; a commitment to working 'honestly' with power imbalances between themselves as funders, and community providers/groups; and supporting Māori capacity-building and processes in projects where appropriate.

Greenaway and Witten make an important observation in relation to the role of institutions and organisational learning in community development, in terms of

---

<sup>1</sup> Greenaway and Witten identified several other factors for effective community action: building skilled leadership, accessing adequate resourcing, enabling infrastructural development, creating committed strategic support and advocacy from both government agencies and community organisations, enabling effective coordination, vision building, skilled facilitation of people and processes, networking to build relationships, communication and knowledge, accessing mentors and effective planning.

needing to develop their own institutional capacity to support and respond to community self-determination. They found that where power dynamics between stakeholders were acknowledged and addressed, and government and non-governmental agencies had strong and effective relationships and worked together on particular issues, major enhancement was evident for community action projects. Facilitating tino rangatiratanga and holding central and local government to account for Māori community outcomes constitute two major challenges for Māori community development moving forward. These are considered in-depth within the third model from New Zealand literature, Munford & Walsh-Tapiata's framework of bicultural community development.

The model developed by Munford and Walsh-Tapiata (2006) encompasses seven key principles; 1) having a vision for the future and for what can be achieved; 2) understanding local contexts; 3) locating oneself within community; 4) working within power relations; 5) achieving self-determination; 6) bringing about positive social change for all communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand; and 7) action and reflection. The activities/processes implicit in these key principles overlap significantly with Greenaway and Witten's phases of/factors for effective community action. Most significant for the medium-term future of Māori community development are principles 4 and 5, which represent the crux of bicultural working, requiring a shift in power from existing institutions to those who have been traditionally marginalised in effecting structural change; both Māori and communities. A transformation such as this lays a foundation for new forms of community development, and the realisation of empowering, enduring and sustainable change.

### **Key aspects of successful Māori community development initiatives**

Following on from the conceptual work of Greenaway and Witten, Duignan et al., and Munford and Walsh-Tapiata, several aspects of successful Māori community development initiatives are discussed in health promotion and community development literature (Ratima et al., 1999; Voyle & Simmons, 1999; Moewaka-Barnes, 2000; Simmons and Voyle, 2003; Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004; Eketone, 2006). These roughly equate to 'right time, right place, right person' and draw upon both Kaupapa Māori and community development principles; the former set of principles provides guidance about how to work appropriately in te ao Māori, and the latter offer generic guidance about facilitating positive social change.

#### *Location: Marae/other Māori setting*

Labonte (1998) has referred to the significance of location, in terms of community development work needing to "*start where the people are*". Although Labonte does not elaborate on this point, it can be inferred that a starting point or physical basis in the community of focus/interest grounds a community action/development project in the community, requiring outsiders (funders, community development practitioners or evaluators) to enter the community's world/reality, very clearly establishing community ownership.

In a Māori context, where sense of place (tūrangawaewae) is integral to Māori identity and culture<sup>2</sup>, location is of central importance within Māori community development.

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the concept of mana whenua, where a kinship group (iwi, hapū) and in some cases, mandated organisation has the authority to speak and act in respect of land and geographical territories, is tied to physical location.

As Durie (2001) notes, marae have always been closely linked to Māori community life, providing a space for the conduct of tribal business, fulfilment of cultural and community obligations and exercise of encounters and values that are distinctly Māori. Thus, basing community development work at a marae will render it subject to Māori cultural norms and frameworks, requiring those involved to engage with Māori, on Māori terms. Calling a meeting or hui at a marae invokes the traditions and customs of the Māori world, establishing a Māori way to meet and discuss an issue, enabling the kaupapa of the project to be approached in a Māori way (Irwin, 1994). In addition to setting the tone of a community development relationship/initiative and laying a Māori-focused foundation for moving forward, this also goes some way towards shifting the balance of power to Māori communities.

The importance of marae extends beyond providing ‘culturally appropriate’ venues however. As the prevailing centre of Māori communities (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1999 cited in Durie, 2001) upholding the integrity of Māori culture and strengthening kinship-based networks, marae serve several important community development functions in themselves. As Broodkoorn (2006) notes, marae meet Labonte and Laverack’s description of “*organisational elements that represent the ways in which people come together in order to socialise and address their concerns and problems*” (2000, p 119). Marae maintain the capacity to facilitate connections with those in the wider community, through designated kaumātua or leaders/representatives who are the main points of contact within a larger takiwā (regional network), thus providing a strength of leadership when it comes to mobilising effort in response to community issues (Broodkorn, 2006, p124).

#### *Project basis/mandate*

Community development is not only about going to where the people are, but working with community in an appropriate way and from an appropriate basis. A starting point for many community development/action projects is the desire to meet a community need. Within the field of health promotion reference is made to two main approaches to issue/problem assessment; a top-down approach and less often used bottom-up approach (Laverack & Labonte, 2000 cited in Broodkoorn, 2006). The latter approach, in accordance with the principle of participatory democracy (that people have the right to participate in decisions that have an effect on their well-being) advocates that the problem, issues, solutions and actions are lead by the community. This increases the likelihood that an initiative will contribute meaningfully to positive and sustainable health or social outcomes, through firstly, being focused on an issue of importance to community, and secondly through community ownership of and participation in the potential solutions. Thinking through issues of concern and potential causes and solutions may also encourage communities’ critical awareness. This process of conscientisation lies at the heart of a Freirean concept of transformation, ultimately effecting self-determining behaviour and sustainable social change (Broodkoorn, 2006).

The ability of a community to define their own issues also marks a step towards the devolution of power which Voyle and Simmons (1999) identify as critical in the development of successful partnerships/coalitions. The notion of partnership is an especially important one for Māori community development, indicating a sharing of power and decision-making originally embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi.

### *Processes and activities*

The aforementioned models of community development identify key processes and activities to be undertaken in order to achieve community development goals. These are implemented in various ways and to varying degrees within specific Māori community development projects, based on the communities and issues involved.

#### Recruitment via community networking

The method of recruiting community members to a community development initiative determines the breadth and depth of community involvement, and whether the 'right people' participate. For Māori communities, optimal results are achieved by working through Māori community networks and structures, - marae, whānau, hapū, iwi, kaumātua. Recruitment lead by community minimises difficulties (i.e, resistance, gate-keeping) that may be encountered by outsiders. This step is also important in obtaining community buy-in and credibility to the initiative overall.

#### Organisational support/collaboration

A crucial but often overlooked aspect of community development is that of the support that organisations can provide. Acknowledging the strengths (social capital, self-determination) within communities does not preclude organisations from assisting in their growth and development. The ability of communities to access the personnel and financial resources available within governmental and non-governmental organisations can enhance community development outcomes considerably. This requires organisations to shoulder some responsibility in initiating contact with communities and facilitating community access to their services; in some cases this may require a significant change in focus/reorientation.

#### Māori-specific methods and personnel

Tailoring approaches/methods to the local context is well-established in community development practice as a means of enhancing the appropriateness, relevance, responsiveness and hence acceptability of projects/initiatives to communities. In several Māori community development projects reported in the literature, optimal outcomes have been achieved when the Kaupapa Māori mantra 'for, by and with Māori' has been followed. This has included the utilisation of Māori personnel who possess the knowledge and expertise to facilitate Māori-specific processes/methods. The key to the success of these individuals has not been in having specific content/issue knowledge, or necessarily being affiliated by kin, but in belonging to and having the support of local community networks (Moewaka-Barnes, 2000).

Tikanga Māori, through its direction as to what is right and appropriate in a given Māori context/situation, provides useful guidance in Māori community development processes, also bringing greater 'buy-in' from Māori communities (Eketone, 2006). Kaupapa Māori processes include consulting with kaumātua, receiving the benefit of their wisdom and expertise, and the buy-in and access they can obtain from other Māori organisations; communicating kanohi ki te kanohi, thereby spending time establishing whakawhanaungatanga; and conducting hui at marae (as mentioned above).

#### Relationship/trust-building

A natural extension of networking within communities and collaborating with organisations is the development of relationships and trust-building. Greenaway and Witten's meta-analysis of New Zealand community action projects found that the building of transformative relationships was fundamental across each. These were relationships that "*enabled existing ways of working to be challenged and the trialling/adoption of new ones*" (p 152). This requires project partners and stakeholders to trust both one another and the process/es that they're engaged in. Henwood and Ngatiwai (2004) consider that the notion of connectedness within te ao Māori, based on whakapapa links and whānau, hapū and iwi groupings, provides for extensive networks and strong relationships based on a high level of trust, reciprocity and support. This strength/capacity for social capital is a valuable asset for Māori community development.

#### Resourcing

Adequate resourcing of community development initiatives is a key component of overall success and effectiveness. This refers not only to financial and economic resources, but also human and social capital. While economic development is emphasised by some writers as critical to long-term sustainability in community development (Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004), capacity-building and strengthened community/agency networks contribute equally to community development goals. Although communities may possess wealth in the form of social and human capital, they must also possess the ability to access and mobilise these existing, internal resources. Being capable in this respect can have a positive impact in itself, through building and "*improving the self/social esteem of community members*" (Labonte & Laverack, 2000 cited in Broodkoorn, 2006). Casswell (2001) cautions that capacity-building should not be thought of as a cheap option for development, highlighting the problem of this type of resourcing not being factored into community projects because it is assumed to be a community responsibility. Communities must thus, also be able to work with local, regional and national agencies to access resources, financial and otherwise.

#### Community leadership, control and ownership

Leadership and autonomy is closely linked to partnership within community development (Casswell, 2001). Further to the agreement of partners/stakeholders to work together toward a community development goal, is the necessity for the 'right people' to lead the initiative, from both/all parties. Durie (1999) identifies community leadership as one facet of leadership in a health promotion/community development initiative, alongside health leadership, tribal leadership, communication, and alliances between leaders and groups. The involvement of a community leader is crucial to success, indeed Durie states that without local leadership it is unlikely that a health promotional/community development effort will take shape and/or bear fruit. In Māori terms, a community leader will need to possess mana and standing sufficient to have the respect and trust of their people, which may or may not accompany some form of tribal leadership. Community leadership will also strengthen the likelihood of successful and sustainable outcomes, linked as it is to a community's sense of control and ownership of the issue and the mechanisms to address it.

#### Common basis for cohesion: tikanga, shared identity, vision

In each of the Māori community development initiatives reviewed, having a common basis for cohesion constituted a key success factor. This varied from project to project, and mostly occurred incidentally, although in one case (Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004)

was engineered explicitly. Cohesive factors included residing in the same geographical community and having a similar stake in a particular health issue (Ratima et al., 1999; Moewaka Barnes, 2000), sharing tikanga, context (Moewaka Barnes, 2000; Eketone, 2006) and tribal identity (Eketone, 2006), and working through and developing a shared vision (Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004).

### *Outcomes*

The broad outcomes outlined in the following section are those that contribute to the larger community development goal of social change. In community development literature these are discussed both as factors in and by-products of the development of communities. Beyond smaller scale outcomes specific to a health issue or location, these were common across the Māori community development initiatives reviewed.

#### Capacity-building

Community capacity is both a resource for, and positive result of community development processes. Community development builds from a community's abilities and skills to effect action, and seeks to further improve this capacity (Duignan et al., 2003). Hawe et al (1999, cited in Duignan et al, 2003) specify three aspects of capacity-building: infrastructure building, creating sustainability through partnerships and supportive organisational environments, and creating problem-solving capability. Capacity-building was the outcome most frequently cited within the Māori community development initiatives. Henwood and Ngatiwai (2004) saw local capacity strengthened through community participation and up-skilling, Ratima et al (1999) and Eketone (2006) saw capacity bolstered through strengthened community structures, Moewaka Barnes (2000) noted the enhanced capacity of the Māori researchers and community workers in their respective roles and their continuation in similar work beyond the project, and Voyle and Simmons (1999) observed capacity-building through establishment of a marae-based infrastructure to deliver similar health promotion programmes into the future.

#### Empowerment

Empowerment, the ability of communities to determine their own destinies, is considered a fundamental component of community development. It includes but is not limited to capacity-building, extending into the political sphere with a focus on the removal of social barriers and the increase of environmental supports and resources (Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004). Laverack (2006, p 4) discusses nine 'empowerment domains', "*areas of influence that allow individuals and groups to better organise and mobilise themselves towards social and political change*"; these encompass the aforementioned community development success factors: improves participation, develops local leadership, increases problem assessment capacities, enhances the ability to 'ask why', builds empowering organisational structures, improves resource mobilisation, strengthens links to other organisations and people, creates an equitable relationship with outside agents, and increases control over programme management.

Two of the Māori community development initiatives reviewed mentioned empowerment explicitly as a focus/means and outcome/end. Both Moewaka Barnes (2000) and Voyle and Simmons (1999) linked the concept of empowerment to Māori aspirations for self-determination and addressing inequities in health. Voyle and Simmons noted the training of volunteers undertaken within their particular initiative

as a strategy for community and individual empowerment, strengthened through the potential to yield long-term benefits such as promoting programme sustainability.

#### Sustainability

The concept of sustainability is a more recent feature of community development literature. Due to the magnitude of desired community development outcomes however, the field and practice has always had a long-term focus. Numerous challenges to the achievement of sustainability within a community development project/process have been identified: maintaining sufficient momentum within projects, the length of time taken to bring about social and institutional change, the issue of raising community expectations without being able to guarantee the duration of a project in order to meet these adequately, the difficulty in maintaining consistent funding streams, and the need for community members involved in a project to broaden their skills sufficiently to reduce reliance on key individuals. In spite of these concerns, work has been undertaken in the local context to see sustainability incorporated as a community development/action evaluation measure (Duignan et al., 2003).

In light of the difficulties associated with community development sustainability, several of the Māori community development examples could not cite this as an outcome. These tended to have a more limited, health promotion/issue-specific focus. However, three of the initiatives achieved a degree of sustainability. This was a specific aim of the South Auckland Diabetes Project evaluated by Simmons & Voyle (2003), where once funding expired for the short-term project, the marae involved subsequently established its own health programme, introduced low fat/high fibre catering, weekly line-dancing sessions and obtained independent funding for its activities. This indicates extension of the marae's internal resources and simultaneous success in capacity-building and empowerment. Relationships and knowledge built up over the course of the Māori-focused drink-driving initiatives described by Moewaka Barnes (2000) resulted in the continued involvement of one of the community Trusts in other community prevention initiatives.

Henwood & Ngatiwai (2004) linked sustainability to a forward-thinking, future-focused orientation in the Moerewa-based project. This was embodied in the adult participants' tendency to focus their concerns on young people residing in the town. This resembles a Māori focus on the generations to come, and intergenerational transmission/transfer of resources. Future planning was a specific activity within the Moerewa project, and emphasis was placed on addressing the causes of community problems rather than the symptoms; both of these measures enabled the project to maintain a long-term focus, subsequently leading to the continuation of the project drawing on different funding streams, for some time after the initial pilot.

#### **Implications for Māori community development**

Throughout the discussion of community development models and features, references have been made consistently to potential for application within Māori community development. While the various synergies between community development and Māori self-determination are of note, care needs to be taken not to apply community development principles blindly to Māori issues, contexts and settings. Broodkoorn (2006, citing Kotze, 1987) notes the origins of community development theory from a strong western cultural perspective and ethnocentric bias

as cause for caution. These are points raised and further developed in the work of Māori community development practitioners, who debate the relative merits of community development in te ao Māori, and through practice seek to develop Māori-specific frameworks. One such framework is discussed in the following section.

## **Te Riu o Hokianga: Māori community and hapū development to improve environmental health**

### **Community-development focused objectives**

The rationale for, and implementation of, Te Riu o Hokianga was grounded firmly in community development aims and principles. One of the primary objectives was to develop a model of Māori community action/development for environmental health, taking account of regulatory, institutional, cultural and community interactions. This objective was comprised of several components:

- Determining implementation issues for inter-sectoral initiatives;
- Identifying the impact of problems, tensions and success factors on hapū and iwi participation and effectiveness in tackling the root causes of failing marae onsite wastewater systems;
- Exploring the utilisation of problems/tensions as a springboard to develop innovative tools and inter-sectoral working arrangements; and
- Identifying the applicability of this model to other Māori/New Zealand communities, with regard to related environmental health issues.

The second objective, seeking to further promote local community benefit and bolster the research conducted, was to build Māori capacity and capability in Māori community development research. This included, in support of Hauora Hokianga's long-term vision of establishing its own research unit:

- Supporting a Māori community researcher in studying for public health research qualification, and the
- Development and training of other Māori community researchers.

Thus, Te Riu o Hokianga utilised a variety of community development mechanisms/processes at two levels: with marae communities/hapū around the issue of septic tanks, and within the research team itself. Overall the aims were to promote participant empowerment, build hapū capacity to engage with central and local government, increase social capital, self-sufficiency and through minimisation of exposure to pathogens as a result of septic tank improvements, enhance the capacity of hapū in being able to exercise manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga.

### **Ngā Ngaru e Toru**

Ngā Ngaru e Toru (the three waves) emerged from the implementation of Te Riu o Hokianga. The wave metaphor is based on a Hokianga whakatauki derived from the story of Kupe and his voyages between Hawaiiiki and Aotearoa<sup>1</sup>. It is relevant to the physical environment of the Hokianga harbour, and reflects the dynamic and continuous process of development. The research project did not adopt an uncritical approach to community development, but rather utilised the broad principles where appropriate or tika. What resulted could be described as a kaupapa Māori, locally specific model of community action.

### **Ngaru nui**

Ngaru nui (the large wave) refers to an initial idea, and surge of enthusiasm that prompts the beginning of a particular kaupapa. In community development terms, this encompasses the identification of an issue of need or concern to community members, and preliminary efforts to mobilise funding/organisational support to address it. Greenaway and Witten (2006) refer to this as the **activation** phase of a project, which

encompasses activities designed to raise consciousness/awareness of need and explore the scope of the issue with community and other stakeholders. These may include stakeholder and needs analyses/assessment, community profiling, visioning, strategic and action planning, formation of partnerships or networks, identification of opportunities for collaboration, and application for funding. In this phase attention is given to identifying and stimulating common underlying values and interests, and aligning participant purposes in order to create a supportive environment for action (Ministry of Health, 2005).

In kaupapa Māori terms, tikanga dictate that rituals of encounter are followed in the beginnings of a project/kaupapa (Irwin, 1994). This is linked to a belief that adherence to tikanga, and following due process will lead to optimal outcomes. The karanga is the call from the marae or hau kāinga (local people), indicating readiness for, and inviting engagement with, outsiders in relation to a particular issue. Following the calling of a hui, a pōwhiri or mihi whakatau (welcoming) process is invoked, establishing the beginning of relationship-building:

- The hapū community will create a warm and hospitable setting/atmosphere in order to pave the way for discussion and meaningful participation;
- Formal hui allow collaborators/partners to align with local leaders and kaumātua in the first instance, as a basis for further work with the wider community;
- Open debate and deliberation in these initial marae-based meetings requires humility on the behalf of visitors, and ensures that community members have a place in the project and that there is strong community participation;
- In summary, making these approaches ‘correctly’ accords respect to mana whenua, hapū and Māori communities and facilitates the building of trust (Taimona, 2006). This establishes firm foundations upon which the community development mahi (work) can be conducted.

### **Ngaru roa**

Ngaru roa (the long wave) entails the substantive part of a kaupapa, where activities are organised and undertaken, and necessary resources (financial and personnel) are sought and mobilised. In the first instance this requires affirmation of the agreed vision, and a commitment by all parties to seeing this through. A joint plan of action may be developed, focused on concrete action, specific, visible and achievable deliverables, with clear connections between chosen actions and outcomes to be addressed (MoH, 2005). This is referred to as the **consolidation** phase by Greenaway and Witten (2006), who note the following activities as critical: shoulder-tapping ‘movers and shakers’ to obtain their involvement, planning communication pathways, forming subgroups or work-streams, clarifying tasks and roles, involving funding organisations in ongoing planning, utilising organisational networks to share information, involving local talent to raise the project profile, and locating and engaging mentors, advocates and training opportunities. These activities ensure that relationships enabling action are defined and developed, and ultimately that capacity exists to carry through planned actions, an identified success factor for inter-sectoral initiatives (MoH, 2005).

In relation to iwi and hapū Māori communities and kaupapa Māori approaches, ngaru roa touches on a number of key points:

- Capacity-building is a particularly important aspect of community benefit. In ethical terms, if there is the possibility of a community benefiting from a project,

all efforts should be made to ensure that it occurs (Taimona, 2006). Given the inability of being able to guarantee long-term health and social outcomes as a result of 'stand alone' programmes or initiatives, building in mechanisms for workforce and community capacity-building in the short-medium term is an important measure.

- Working through community-based leadership is a key aspect of community development, with one cautionary note. Various reports within the practice-based literature indicate that autocratic leaders may not be so effective within a community development project, and excessive 'directive-ness' can defeat the purpose of empowerment (Broodkoorn, 2006).
- The adage of 'good things take time' is of great relevance to community development. Where the community is directly involved in the problem-posing and problem-solving processes, as much time as is necessary for community engagement and meaningful participation should be made available. Lindsey, Stajduhar and McGuinness (2001, cited in Broodkoorn, 2006) note the time constraints involved, describing a community participative process as 'slow, incremental, continuous and always evolving'. This requires considerable commitment to both process and outcomes (Broodkoorn, 2006). Importance placed by Māori communities on 'he kanohi kitea' (a face seen is welcomed) and building of trusting relationships through direct, face to face contact/communication adds to the time required for community action implementation.

### **Ngaru paewhenua**

The term ngaru paewhenua (shore-ward wave, safe landing) refers to the successful completion of a kaupapa and its transferability to or sustainability in other areas or issues, thus paving the way for a further wave of development or growth. This is by no means a small accomplishment; perhaps the most difficult aspect of a community development process to achieve. In community action terms this relates to the **completion/transition** phase of a project/initiative, entailing review or evaluation of outcomes and planning for closure or transition well ahead of time to manage the implications of eventual exit or reduction of external support to the community (MoH, 2005; Greenaway & Witten, 2006).

Where individual community development workers or agencies have entered a community via a process of pōwhiri, they must exit via a process of poroporoaki, a formal farewell and acknowledgement of the return of mana to the host people/community. In some situations the community may require ongoing commitment and continuing external support from one project to another in order to realise community development aims fully. In others the ability of community members to exercise rangatiratanga and assume responsibility for their development through improved political legitimacy, ability to mobilise internal and external resources, and capacities to act upon a broad range of issues of importance to their members beyond the bounds of a project/initiative is a strong indicator of success (Broodkoorn, 2006). In either event, maximising community buy-in and ownership of a kaupapa in ngaru nui and ngaru roa will increase the sustainability of a community development initiative.

**Table 1: Dimensions of successful Māori community-development initiatives**

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Dimensions</b>		
	<b>Ratima et al., 1999</b>	<b>Moewaka-Barnes, 2000</b>	<b>Voyle &amp; Simmons, 1999</b> <b>Simmons &amp; Voyle, 2003</b>
<b>Location</b>	Marae-based	Marae-based Other Māori setting-based	Marae-based
<b>Basis</b>	Needs-based Community-identified need Partnership	Needs-based Community-defined need Partnership	Needs-based Community need Partnership
<b>Processes &amp; activities</b>	Recruitment via community networks	Extensive networking	Recruitment by community
	Organisational support	Agency & organisational support	Organisational support
	Māori community workers + other health professionals Māori processes followed throughout	Māori community workers & researchers  Māori protocols, structures & delivery	Marae committee; Māori liaison worker, health professionals & researchers Te reo, culturally sensitive approaches
			Trust building
			Self-sufficient resourcing
	Community credibility	Community buy-in Community leadership, control & ownership	
Shared stake in community and health issue	Shared stake in community and health issue Shared tikanga, context		
<b>Outcomes</b>	Extended dissemination of information Affirmation of Māori beliefs, values & practices	Increased Māori knowledge, awareness	
	Strengthened community structures	Capacity building Empowerment	Capacity building
		Sustainability	Sustainability
	Health/wider benefits		Health service access increased Declared 'smokefree' marae Weekly marae-based exercise programme

Domains	Dimensions		
	Henwood & Ngatiwai, 2004	Eketone, 2006	Te Riu o Hokianga, 2008
<b>Location</b>	Town-based (larger scale) Māori community trust	Other Māori setting-based	Marae-based
<b>Basis</b>	Needs-based Community-identified need Partnership	Needs-based  Partnership	Needs-based Hapū-defined need Partnership
<b>Processes &amp; activities</b>	Recruitment via community networks	Extensive networking	Extensive networking
	Organisational support	Organisational support, use of experts	Agency & organisational support, use of experts
	Project team, Māori community trustees + community members Māori process models	Māori organising group  Māori-specific processes	Kaiwhakakōkiri (negotiators) & researchers  Māori-specific processes
	Relationship-building	Relationship-building	Relationship, trust-building
	Access to resources, investment, catalyst for economic development	Resourcing: time and costs	Resourcing: facilitated access
	Community credibility Community ownership	Community buy-in	Community buy-in Community ownership & leadership
	Visioning – agreed vision, kaupapa	Shared tikanga, context, tribal identity	
<b>Outcomes</b>		Increased knowledge, impact on attitudes	Increased hapū knowledge Affirmed marae as central to community development
	Strengthened community structures Local capacity strengthened through participation and upskilling	Strengthened community structures  Māori development/advancement	Strengthened community structures Capacity building  Empowerment
	Sustainability		Sustained community-based research
	Change in community wellbeing More positive profile for town Crime rates dropped Increased community participation in town issues		Improved sewerage infrastructure for participating marae

## References

- Ballara, A. (1998). *Iwi: the dynamics of Māori tribal organisations from c. 1769 to c. 1945*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Broodkoorn, M. (2006). *He puawaitanga nō ngā ao e rua: the best of both worlds? An exploration of the relationship between Kaupapa Māori and participatory action research methodologies in supporting Māori community development*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Casswell, S. (2001). Community capacity building and social policy – what can be achieved? *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 17: 22-35.
- Chile, L., Munford, R., & Shannon, P. (2006). Editorial: community development in a bicultural context, Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Development Journal* 41(4): 400-406.
- Chile, L. (2006). The historical context of community development in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Development Journal* 41(4): 407-425.
- Christchurch City Council Research & Policy Unit. (2004). *Evaluation guide*. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council.
- Collins, A. (2003). *Marae development processes*. A poster presentation at the Social Policy Research and Evaluation Conference, Wellington. Accessed January 15, 2008: [http://www.mdrc.co.nz/product\\_info.php?cPath=449\\_458\\_461&products\\_id=135](http://www.mdrc.co.nz/product_info.php?cPath=449_458_461&products_id=135)
- Duignan, P., Casswell, S., Howden-Chapman, P., Moewaka Barnes, H., Allan, B., Conway, K., & Thornley, C. (2003). *Community project indicators framework (CPIF) – its use in community projects*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.
- Durie, M.H. (1999). Te Pae Mahutonga: a model for Māori health promotion. *Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand Newsletter* 49, 2-5 December.
- Durie, M.H. (2001). *Mauri ora: the dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M.H. (2002). The parameters of Māori development. Paper presented at the DevNet Conference – Pathways to Better Practice. Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Eketone, A. (2006). Tapuwae: a vehicle for community change. *Community Development Journal* 41: 467-480.
- Greenaway, A., & Witten, K. (2006). Meta-analysing community action projects in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Development Journal* 41: 143 – 159.
- Henwood, W., & Ngawati, D. (2004). *Moerewa in focus: community development projects evaluation report*.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori research methods and practices. *Sites*, Autumn 28: 27.

Labonte, R. (1998). *Principles of community development*. Presentation to the Health Funding Authority, Wellington.

Laverack, G. (2006). Using a 'domains' approach to build community empowerment. *Community Development Journal* 41(1): 4-12.

Ministry of Health. (2005). *New Zealand inter-sectoral initiatives for improving the health of local communities, 2005: an updated literature review examining the ingredients for success*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Moewaka Barnes, H. (2000). Collaboration in community action: a successful partnership between indigenous communities and researchers. *Health Promotion International*, 15, 17-25.

Munford, R., & Walsh-Tapiata, W. (2006). Community development: working in the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Development Journal* 41(4): 426 – 442.

Ratima, M.M., Fox, C., Fox, B., Te Karu, H., Gemmell, T., Slater, T., D'Souza, W.J., & Pearce, N.E. (1999). Long-term benefits for Māori of an asthma self-management program in a Māori community which takes a partnership approach. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 23(6): pp 601-605.

Simmons, D., & Voyle, J.A. (2003). Reaching hard-to-reach, high-risk populations: piloting a health promotion and diabetes disease prevention programme on an urban marae in New Zealand. *Health Promotion International* 18(1): pp 41-49.

Taimona, H. (2006). *Personal communication*, 3 July.

Voyle, J.A., & Simmons, D. (1999). Community development through partnership: promoting health in an urban indigenous community in New Zealand. *Social Science and Medicine* 49: 1035 – 1050.

Winiata, W. (2006). *Measuring well-being of communities, hapū, iwi, regions and nations: mana a hapū*. Paper presented at Meeting on Measuring Wellbeing of Communities: the Genuine Progress Index, Takapuwhāhia Marae (18-19 May), Porirua, NZ.

---

<sup>i</sup> **The Three Waves**

by Whirinaki Māori School

**Te Ao Hou, No. 18 (May 1957)**

A MOST FASCINATING sight is to watch the rollers come eternally tumbling in over the bar at the entrance of the Hokianga Harbour. The following story is the key to their origin.

Kupe's destination was Hawaiiiki. He had cruised the east and west coasts of Aotearoa and had many things to report to the Polynesians when he arrived back at Hawaiiiki. Aotearoa was indeed the land to migrate to. There were forests teeming with bird-life, rivers alive with fish; in all it was indeed a land of plenty. Before his departure from Aotearoa he had to make his

---

canoe Tokimataowhaorua seaworthy, and what better place to do it than on the shores of the Hokianga Harbour (at this time he had not named the harbour).

In Kupe's haste to return to Hawaiiiki, he left his dog and fishing net on the shores of the Southern Hokianga Harbour at a place called Onoke. The dog fretted in his master's absence, so as time marched on he willed himself to change into stone, so if by chance one day his master were to return, he would be awaiting him right where he had been left. He is still there today. And because of this "Hokianga" was the name that Kupe gave to our harbour—meaning of course "Returning". Kupe departed from Aotearoa at this point.

On his way out over the bar he commanded three waves to guard the entrance to this harbour. The wave nearest the shore he named "Ngarupae ki uta", meaning "safe landing". The middle wave he named "Ngaruroa" meaning "the long wave." Lastly the largest of the three waves he called "Ngarunui" and as the name suggests it means gigantic wave.

Although it is hundreds of years since Kupe's departure from our shores, these waves are still at the entrance of our harbour. It was Kupe who commanded them to stand guard. If by chance some of you may happen to pass through Opononi one day, you should make a point of going out to the Hokianga Heads. There you will see the mighty rollers coming in in groups, one, two, three—Ngarupae ki uta, Ngaruroa and Ngarunui—just as Kupe left them away back in the dim past.