

IAOS SATELLITE MEETING

SMALL AND INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS

MĀORI DEVELOPMENT:
TRENDS AND INDICATORS

Mason Durie
Massey University

MĀORI DEVELOPMENT: TRENDS AND INDICATORS

Mason Durie

Māori Development

In 1984 ‘Māori development’ was coined as a catchphrase to highlight a fresh direction for Māori. It signalled a new approach to advancement in economic, social and cultural areas and was in sharp contrast to policies of state dependency and a focus on ‘negative spending’ (by the state on behalf of Māori) that had characterised past policies. Although the concept of ‘development’ has since been criticised because of its frequent association with multi-national investments in third world countries at the expense of local control and local priorities, it was nonetheless greeted by Māori as a welcome way of defining Māori aspirations for economic self sufficiency and social equity. Its use also coincided with a world-wide indigenous resolve to throw off the shackles of colonisation and pursue pathways towards greater independence and self determination. Within New Zealand, Māori development was also a product of free market policies that were accompanied by a rapid downsizing of the state, devolution of state functions to the private sector, and a removal of government subsidies to industries that had sheltered under government patronage. It emerged at a time when the Treaty of Waitangi was being rehabilitated as a founding document of New Zealand that had implications for Crown policies and programmes, legislation, and the position of Māori within society.

Hui Taumata

The decade of Māori development launched at the 1984 Hui Taumata heralded major transformations in approaches to Māori social, cultural and economic advancement. Four broad themes became evident: reinvigorated iwi (tribal) capacity; greater Māori participation in the delivery of services; revitalisation of Māori language and custom; increased Māori participation in commercial activities including asset development. As part of the transformative process, a Māori developmental agenda was incorporated into government strategies and policies.

The 2005 Hui Taumata held in March 2005 built on those themes and added new emphases. It focussed on economic development through the lens of ‘people, assets

and enterprise'. But in contrast to the 1984 Hui, there was minimal reference to the Treaty of Waitangi, and much less preoccupation with the state, either as a partner in development or as a funder of choice. Further, although many of the developmental themes that arose during the Decade of Māori Development had acted as catalysts for positive development, several of them were now seen as imposing constraints. The constraints reflected changing times and different priorities but they also signalled greater Māori readiness address new challenges.

Seven major directional shifts emerged during the 2005 Hui Taumata:

- a focus on the future more than the past;
- concern for whānau as well as iwi;
- engagement in collaborative networks;
- multiple partners;
- innovation and enterprise;
- governance and leadership;
- greater attention to results - outcomes - (rather than processes).

In addition the previous emphasis on te reo Māori and Māori culture was seen as critical for the years ahead.

A Futures Orientation

Both Māori and the Crown made considerable progress in addressing Treaty of Waitangi claims during the decades of Māori development. Direct negotiations between Māori and the Crown, sometimes on the basis of a Waitangi Tribunal report, sometimes simply on agreement that an injustice occurred, have led to several momentous settlements. Most have been the result of individual tribal claims but at least in respect of the fisheries settlement, the Sealords agreement was 'ultimately for the benefit of all Māori'. Settlements were seen as necessary steps before both parties could 'move on.' However, the process of negotiation, coupled with a rehearsal of past events tended to reinforce an adversarial colonial relationship between Māori and the Crown and trapped mental energies into a historic landscape. While grievances needed to be settled, sometimes both Māori and the Crown implied that the essence of Māori development lay with the settlement of claims. Positive development, however, requires less of a focus on the past and greater attention to the future. In a

rapidly changing world with new values, new technologies and global communication, Māori will need to actively plan for the future and to commit greater effort into medium and longer term planning, rather than having time and intellect diverted to rediscovering the past.

Increased Whānau Capacities

While iwi and hapū development had been a major developmental platform during the decade of Māori development, the tribal focus turned out not to be a panacea for all Māori. Instead, many whānau were left quite untouched by iwi economic gains, not because they were unaware of tribal links or affiliations but because tribal priorities lay outside the parameters of whānau need. For the most part the tools necessary for building Iwi capacities are not the same tools required for developing whānau capacities such as caring for the young and the old, transmitting culture, creating wealth, planning, and the wise management of whānau estates. To that end whānau-specific strategies need to be shaped so that the day to day lives of Māori can be enriched and both cultural and economic goals pursued at family levels. Because whānau members are part of a system that includes cultural values, a distinctive heritage, and multiple networks, realising potential implies more than achieving success in science or music or sport; it also means gaining access to te ao Māori. The whānau is the gateway. While not all Māori are able to affiliate to hapū, or iwi, or a Māori organisation, all are members of a whānau. Whānau development is therefore seen as a priority for the full realisation of Māori talent over the next twenty-five years.

Engagement in Collaborative Networks

Reference has already been made to increases in the number of Māori providers during the decades of Māori development, operating either from a tribal base or from communities of interest. But some aspects of provider development also warrant closer examination. Within a framework of commercial contestability, provider organisations prized their independence and were correspondingly suspicious of their neighbours. The resulting proliferation of independent, semi-autonomous Māori organisations counted against collaboration, shared infrastructure, and economies of scale. And in some cases it inadvertently locked Māori consumers in to situations that

did not allow for choice. Engagement in collaborative networks does not require any loss of independence but does encourage better utilisation of expertise and resources so that business opportunities and expanded service delivery can occur.

Multiple Partners

By 2005, the rights-based approach that dominated Māori development between 1984 and 2004 and which depended on a Treaty of Waitangi-driven relationship between Māori and the Crown, appeared to be giving way to greater confidence in Māori to chart their own course and to seek other business partners. The Crown partnership, though not insignificant, may have been imbued with aspects of an older colonial relationship, locking Māori into a type of state dependency while at the same time appearing to foster autonomy and independence. Although as a consequence of devolution and iwi development some iwi have been able to engage in a raft of social and economic initiatives, for many the only income stream was by way of Government contracts. Having contested the notion of state dependency and welfare benefits at the Hui Taumata in 1984, there was concern that a total reliance on the state for tribal funding tribal could be problematic and subject the tribe to political pressure. Investments might also come from the private sector, from Māori interests, from Treaty settlements, from indigenous groups, or from overseas investors. There is a need to review the options for developmental investment, not at the expense of Government contributions, but across a wider framework and geared towards positioning Māori individuals and Māori organisations to move with confidence into markets that will have some currency in the future.

Innovation and Enterprise

Although fishing assets have added significantly to the Māori resource base, land development and even the development of fisheries and forests, will not by themselves create a strong Māori economy, given the rapidly increasing Māori population and changes in the dependency ratio which will see proportionately more young and old people and fewer in the working age. Energies should also be committed to accessing the rapidly expanding technological advances and harnessing them for Māori wealth creation. Increasingly knowledge based industries and economies will displace primary industries as foundations for New Zealand's wealth.

But with new technologies, combined with innovation and enterprise, there are significant opportunities for adding value to primary products.

Governance and Leadership

Another impact of provider proliferation was the steep learning curve that Māori community workers experienced. The rapid growth of organisations in size and number required workers to learn new skills and to straddle several positions often without formal training. Workers from the primary sectors, suddenly out of work, found new callings as cultural advisors, health workers, community aids and liaison officers. Sometimes there were additional unrealistic expectations of senior leadership responsibilities. While twenty years ago there had been an acute shortage of front line workers who could bring a Māori perspective to service delivery, or to business, there was now a shortage of skilled people who could offer sound governance advice, provide strategic direction, and deliver wise counsel that would be to the advantage of an enterprise and its beneficiaries.

Outcomes

By 2005, as competition in a global market became an increasing reality for more Māori, the call for high achievement and high standards was heard more often. Over the preceding two decades too much emphasis had been placed on processes and not enough on outcomes – results. Between 1984 and 2004 participation and access were important goals. There were spectacular increases in the levels of active participation in education, health care, Māori language learning, business, sport, music, film and television, and information technology. However, while access to education and other endeavours will remain important goals for Māori, access by itself will not necessarily translate to quality outcomes. Increasingly the emphasis will shift from regarding access and participation as satisfactory end points, to focussing on the best possible outcomes and high achievement so that there can be competitiveness with other groups, either within New Zealand or abroad.

Te Reo Māori and Māori Culture

At the 2005 Hui Taumata there was no less emphasis on the significance of te reo Māori and tikanga, culture. However, there was a shift in emphasis. Whereas the issue in 1984 had essentially been one of access to te reo Māori and the acceptance of

Māori language as a recognised language of New Zealand, by 2005 there was a greater attention to language quality and multiple domains of usage. There was also interest in extending the reach of tikanga and Māori values into the lives of whānau on a day to day basis, and as a guide to healthy lifestyles and healthy living. And, in contrast to 1984 where Māori culture and Māori knowledge were presented largely as ageless elements of te ao Māori, at the 2005 Hui Taumata there was particular interest in the ongoing development of mātauranga Māori rather than simply its transmission in unchanging form. An implication was that the commercialisation of knowledge was not confined to western or scientific knowledge but was also applicable to Māori knowledge and Māori language. Moreover, the advent of new types of information and communication technology had opened up options for Māori culture to be exported to other countries for a global audience.

Measuring Progress

In order to quantify and monitor Māori development, new types of indicators will be necessary. Over the past two decades Māori development indicators relied heavily on comparisons with non-Māori: disparities have formed the basis for assessing gains in health, education and other social policy areas.

Second, while there was a strong focus on the characteristics of individuals there was a relative lack of data that could measure the nature of relationships that individuals have with groups (such as whānau) and the nature of collectives themselves. Third, levels of participation were frequently used as indicators of progress; the number of Māori providers of health services for example has frequently been used as a proxy measure for gains in health; and the number of land trusts established has sometimes been used as an indicator of sustainable land-based economies.

Disparities or Distinctiveness

Although there have been some recent attempts to measure Māori progress independently of non-Māori, attention has more often focussed on the disparity approach so that Māori development has been reported in relationship to other groups. The resulting analysis based on disparities or gaps, has provided useful data relating to equity and social justice but has done less to identify indicators that can measure the significance of being Māori and the advancement of Māori people as Māori.

Using the class-based deficit approach, Māori progress becomes a function of other groups – non-Māori, Pacific, Asian, Pākehā. Distinctiveness is measured by difference from other populations. Moreover the focus on disparities has contextualised the debate to infer that Māori progress is primarily an issue of deficit, ‘catch-up’. However, whether or not they have become more like other New Zealanders may not be the most pertinent analysis that interests Māori. Instead, insofar as Māori wish ‘to live as Māori’, there will be increasing Māori interest in measuring progress by the level of access to, and participation in, te ao Māori (the Māori world).

Two broad facets of contemporary Māori development therefore need to be taken into account: an aspect that recognises Māori interest in being part of a wider society and enjoying similar standards of living to other groups within society, and an aspect that recognises Māori as an indigenous population. The first aspect can be labelled a universal dimension since the indicators are not dissimilar to other populations and are used on a universal basis. The second aspect hinges on the indigeneity factor – being indigenous – and is specific to Māori.

Indigenous peoples have different histories and live in very different circumstances, but they also share a number of commonalities. Although conforming to wider society is not irrelevant, the primary aim of indigenous peoples is to regain indigenous values and language and to exercise a degree of autonomy. Most indigenous peoples believe that the fundamental element of indigeneity is a strong sense of unity with the environment. Arising from the close and enduring relationship with defined territories, land, and the natural world, and exemplified by the pattern of Maori adaptation to Aotearoa, it is possible to identify five secondary characteristics of indigeneity: a relationship with the environment that has endured over centuries; culture and custom; a system of knowledge and a distinctive environmental ethic; environmental sustainability; and a language not spoken as a first language in other parts of the world. (see table 1)

The first secondary characteristic reflects the dimension of time and a relationship with the environment that has endured over centuries; the second, also derived from

the environmental relationship, is about culture, human identity, and group structures and processes that celebrate the human-ecological union. The third characteristic is a system of knowledge that integrates indigenous world-views, values, and experience, and generates a framework for a distinctive environmental ethic. Application of that ethic to natural resources provides a basis for the fourth characteristic, economic growth balanced against environmental sustainability. Finally, indigeneity is also characterised by a language so strongly influenced by the environment that it is not spoken as a first language in other parts of the world.

Table 1 Characteristics of Indigeneity

<i>Features</i>	<i>Key Element</i>
<p>Primary Characteristic:</p> <p>An enduring relationship between populations, their territories, and the natural environment.</p>	An ecological context for human endeavours
<p>Secondary Characteristics (derived from the relationship with the environment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relationship endures over centuries • the relationship is celebrated in custom and group interaction • the relationship gives rise to a system of knowledge, distinctive methodologies, and an environmental ethic • the relationship facilitates balanced economic growth • the relationship contributes to the evolution and use of a unique language. 	<p>Time</p> <p>Identity</p> <p>Knowledge</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Language</p>

Measuring Outcomes for Māori

Increasingly there is interest in employing outcome measures to assess progress in Māori development. However, outcome measures need to take into account the dual aspirations of Māori: to enjoy similar rights, standards of living, and opportunities as other New Zealanders and to enjoy the benefits of te ao Māori.

Three broad goals of Māori development have been identified during the 1984 and 2005 Hui Taumata: full participation in society, education and the economy (the participatory goal); certainty of access to Māori culture, networks and resources (the

indigeneity goal); and fairness between members of society (the equity goal). Three groups of indicators are relevant to those goals: individual indicators (measure the circumstances of individuals), collective indicators (measure large populations such as Māori, or smaller populations such as whānau), and comparative indicators (compare one population with another).

The goals and indicators provide the basis for a framework for considering the measurement of Māori development (Table 2). For individual indicators and collective indicators both universal and Māori specific indicators are relevant and comparative indicators include both inter-population comparisons as well as intra-population comparisons.

Table 2 Goals and Indicators

	Individual Indicators		Collective Indicators		Comparative Indicators	
	<i>Universal</i>	<i>Specific</i>	<i>Universal</i>	<i>Specific</i>	Inter-population	Intra-population
Participatory Goal						
Indigeneity Goal						
Equity Goal						

In practice indicators tend to be based on aggregated individual measures and often use the Pākehā population as a benchmark for inter-ethnic comparisons. However, three shortcomings arise from those approaches. First, while many indicators such as life expectancy have universal application, others are able to be specific to particular populations or groups. Health outcome measures for example should not only reflect clinical indicators, but also the health perspectives arising from specific ethnic world views. Land values should not only be based on market values and economic returns but also on the cultural investments made by successive generations.

Second while measurements based on individual circumstances such as educational experience are in common use, less use has been made of collective measures whether they are linked to groups such as whānau or to whole ethnic populations. Third, comparisons between Māori and non-Māori populations may not be the most useful set of measures. Instead comparisons over time or comparisons between urban migrants and rural Māori communities may be more informative.

In short, indicators should be able capture both the individual and the group; they should include universal measures and Māori-specific measures; and where they are employed, comparative indicators should be capable of reflecting the significance of ethnicity.

MHD

14 April 2005