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Executive Summary

New Zealand Rugby (NZR) recognise there is a significant difference between the number of Pacific Island rugby players, and the number of Pacific Island people participating in non-playing rugby in Auckland. Through exploring the perspectives of Pacific Island rugby community members, this project aims to help NZR develop a better understanding of this ‘issue’. Key recommendations are proposed for moving forward towards greater awareness and appreciation of the Pacific Island culture.

Eight Pacific Island rugby community members were selected based on their experience, insight and ability to share their perspective and that of their wider community. Individual in-depth interviews were conducted and a breadth of rich, insightful data were collected, allowing for key themes to develop. We learnt that to the Pacific people, this ‘lack’ of participation in non-playing rugby is not necessarily an ‘issue’ and that instead a better understanding of the Pacific Island way is needed. We adopted two lenses that represent the stories and key messages of the interviewees. Firstly, ‘Appreciating Pacific Island Cultural Values’, which encompasses the importance of family, the significance of church and church commitments, and the strong service orientation of the Pacific Island people. The second lens, ‘Perspectives on Leadership’, is strongly underpinned by the Samoan proverb “The pathway to leadership is through service”. We heard that Pacific Island philosophies on leadership encompasses informal, collectivist approaches, focusing on people and relationships which augments titles and roles. It was revealed that Europeans are usually viewed as the authority figures and the systems are often aligned with a more European approach.

An overall theme that developed was the idea of Pacific Island people ‘navigating two worlds’ as they live as a Pacific Island New Zealander. Our recommendations are based around NZR enabling the Pacific people to continue to journey through these two worlds within the rugby community through focusing on two key areas; a) enhancing the understanding of Pacific Island culture within the New Zealand Rugby community and b) creating a shared understanding of leadership between Pakeha and Pacific Island members of the NZR community. These are linked to four recommendations; 1) development of a Pacific Island advisory group, 2) implementation of cultural awareness workshops for decision makers, 3) insights driven implementation and communication, and 4) a targeted leadership initiative for 20-25 Pacific Island rugby community members.

In summary, we acknowledge that this is not a process of fixing an issue but instead an opportunity to engage with and better understand the Pacific Island community within rugby. We believe in turn this will lead to more involvement of Pasifika people in non-playing rugby activities, enhanced playing experiences, and a strengthened New Zealand Rugby community.
Background

It has been identified by New Zealand Rugby (NZR) that there is proportionally more Pacific Islanders actually playing rugby, compared to Pacific Islanders participating in non-playing roles such as coaching, refereeing, administration, and committee/board members within rugby in Auckland. This research leverages off an NZR project that examined the views of Pacific Island families of junior and senior players participating in non-playing roles in rugby within Auckland. Four focus groups (involving close to 40 people) were conducted across the three provincial unions in the Auckland region to determine the barriers and enablers for Pacific Island participation in leadership and administration roles in rugby. Themes that emerged included enablers such as time with family and a passion for rugby, and barriers such as family commitments and competency (see Appendix A for summary report).

The present research project has been designed to help NZR better understand this ‘issue’ and the ideas shared in the initial research, through exploring the perspectives of a number of Pacific Island rugby community members who contribute in a range of non-playing roles. In this report, ‘Pacific Islanders’, ‘Pasifika’ and ‘Pasifika people’ are used interchangeably. We acknowledge there are a number of other ways to refer to the Pacific Island population and the various ways in which these labels can be interpreted.

Pasifika people are generally those living in New Zealand who have migrated from the Pacific Islands or who identify with the Pacific Islands because of ancestry or heritage. Up to 60% of people who identify as Pasifika were actually born in New Zealand (Ministry for Pacific Peoples, n.d.). New Zealand is home to the largest Pacific Island population in the world and this population continues to grow. The Pasifika population in New Zealand is primarily made up of Samoan (49%), Cook Island Maori (22%) and Tongan (19%) peoples. Most Pasifika people live in New Zealand’s large cities – particularly Auckland and Wellington.

Three key areas have been identified as generally influencing Pasifika involvement in sport and recreation (Gordon et al., 2010):
1) the degree to which activities feel culturally safe and comfortable;
2) the importance of spirituality and the church; and
3) the importance of social interaction.

These factors need to be considered in the context of non-playing participation. Barriers to engagement in these roles within this population are likely both individual and systemic. Different obligations competing for Pasifika people’s time and resource include family, church, remittance back to the islands, funerals and weddings (Sauni, 2009). There is a stereotype or racial bias which is also necessary to consider as it relates to Pasifika involvement in non-playing roles. Stereotypically, Pacific Islanders have been seen as athletes but not leaders and some have suggested that members of the Pasifika community have begun to see themselves that way too. These notions have arguably been perpetuated in the New Zealand sport media.

A recent study by Holland (2012) incorporated a two phase exploration of Maori and Pasifika engagement on the boards of New Zealand’s National Sport Organisations (NSOs). The findings of the first phase suggested that representation on boards from these communities was low. In the second phase, Maori and Pasifika board members themselves provided insight into their experiences through interviews. Key challenges identified (which transfer to the current research context) included ethnocultural expectations concerning age, status and respect; not being fully integrated within the board; stereotyping and expectations; tokenistic appointments and a lack of Pasifika and Maori role models in sport governance roles. An environment to strive for would include respect of differences, flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity/conflict and an orientation towards people instead of tasks (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999).
Research Approach

Most studies of immigrant/minority involvement in sport have been undertaken within the ‘interpretive/constructivist paradigm’ (qualitative method) in order to unearth deeper insights on a specific topic (beyond questionnaires, survey or other forms of numeric-based research not known to capture such depth). Interviews were therefore conducted to explore perceptions of Pacific Island experiences and contribution to non-playing rugby participation in the context of New Zealand’s rugby community. These interviews allowed for us to build rapport with the participants so that we could hear their stories and they could share personal anecdotes. It is important to note that insights derived from a qualitative research approach are not deemed as generalisable compared with survey research, but rather they seek to develop understanding and, in doing so, construct new knowledge.

Eight individuals from the Pacific Island rugby community of Auckland were purposefully selected to take part in the research based on their extensive experience and ability to speak both for themselves and for the wider community. These individuals were a mix of players, coaches, referees and former international players. Many were currently engaged with Pacific Islanders at community rugby and grassroots level at the time of the interviews. The participants included one female and seven males, aged between 21-65. There was also a mix of those born and raised in Samoa and born and raised in New Zealand. It is important to highlight here that although we refer to the general Pacific Island community, it turned out that our participants were all in fact Pacific Islanders of Samoan descent. We therefore acknowledge that the perspectives offered are not necessarily representative of all Pasifika people. At times however, interviewees did offer comments which they noted were on behalf of all Pacific Islanders.

The research team have limited experience in Pacific Island research and therefore had few preconceived ideas. We hope this is interpreted as a strength of the research because the project was undertaken with open minds and hearts. Research team members are not employees of NZR or any other rugby governing structure and therefore offer a level of impartiality. In order to summarise the interview findings, key themes were derived and categorized into sub-themes. In the findings we have sought to differentiate when participants’ voices are being represented and when we offer our own interpretations.

[Note: Ethics was sought and approved from Auckland University of Technology - all research participants signed a consent form.]
Findings & Interpretations

Across the Auckland Region, there are proportionally fewer Pacific Islanders participating in non-playing rugby roles compared to the number who are playing the game. At face value, this situation is potentially an ‘issue’ that needs addressing. However, when asked whether the disproportionate number of Pacific Island people in non-playing roles was an issue, interviewees in this project did not all agree. Some felt that it was not an ‘issue’ as such, and others were wary of framing it as an issue as this might suggest applying a “quota” approach or creating an environment of “tokenism”.

When discussing Pacific Island involvement in non-playing roles, a number of participants indicated that it should be the best person for the role, regardless of ethnicity, and people should not be given the roles just because they are Pasifika. “You still want the best people in there, but we want our people to strive for those positions, as well”, noted one participant.

A first generation male Samoan with 30 years’ involvement in non-playing activities in rugby commented, “It’s a process that’s evolved … and just needs to be refined to just keep growing”, implying that it is an area that needs attention but one that is making progress. Another stated that they are “confident things are changing”. In contrast, another male Samoan deeply immersed within the rugby system on and off-field, asserted that there is a need for Pacific Island representation in these roles, to encourage participation and to ensure that the Pacific Island ‘voice’ is heard.

“Answers to the issues of the Pacific lie within the Pacific people.”

As the stories unfolded, it became evident that in order to better understand Pacific Island perspectives, in relation to participation in non-playing rugby, greater understanding and appreciation of cultural values was a precursor. As was expressed by one participant, this is developed through listening to the Pacific Island voice and learning the Pacific Island way. Another offered, “answers to the issues of the Pacific lie within the Pacific people”.

Through the research project, we began to re-frame the ‘issue’ of a ‘lack’ of Pacific Island people in non-playing rugby roles. From the stories we were hearing, we adopted two lenses that appeared to represent this narrative: Appreciating Pacific Island Cultural Values; and Perspectives on Leadership.
As expressed by participants, Pacific Island culture is underpinned by strong cultural values. Values underpin behaviour and it is by understanding these values that we can better understand the Pacific Island way. Interviewees noted that, individualism is less of a focus, but rather family is front and center as the key principle. “When you start to think about yourself, you start losing your focus”, noted one participant. Core to this value is the importance placed on a collective orientation and community approach. For example, when it comes to making a decision, such as whether or not to coach a team, family are included in the decision making process. It is more than the individual deciding they would like to take on this role, they need to consider how this will affect the wider family, other commitments and responsibilities etc. As we heard, in some cases the consultation will go beyond the immediate family and include discussion with the extended family.

We also heard that although individuals and families are consulted in a community or village setting in Samoa, decisions are generally made by the ‘elders’ or ‘chiefs’ (a group of chiefs representing the families within the village). From our European perspective, we surmised this to be a collective approach to consultation and discussion embedded within a hierarchical approach to decision making.

Another strong value within the Pacific Island culture that emerged from the interviews, was that of spirituality and religion. All interviewees made reference to the church and church commitments and the impact this can have on time, decisions, finances and participation in non-playing roles in rugby. The church was also suggested as an avenue to reach the Pacific Island community, for example, using the church as a facility (i.e., for meetings, workshops) or the church elder as a vehicle of communication to the community. We heard that with this commitment to family and the church comes expectations, obligations and responsibilities that impact non-playing involvement in rugby.

‘Involvement’ and ‘contribution’ reflect what we refer to as a third cultural value - a service orientation. This surfaced consistently, as stories were told about the participants’ experiences in rugby (playing and non-playing). For example, the sentiment about needing the best person for the role, regardless of ethnicity, appeared to be grounded in a motivation to serve. Another example of service orientation came from a participant who currently works within the rugby system and has contributed heavily to coaching rugby within Auckland. In reference to his upbringing and in particular his mother, he explained:

She always told me that … the only reason why you would look down on someone is to pick them up … So that’s always been the attitude growing up. I think that’s what I do with my trainees; because there’s always going to be someone else that’s going to be a lot worse [than] in your position…

In sharing his perspectives about Samoan values, another participant explained the challenge of a service orientation for himself and in his observation of others:

You end up giving too much … where you run out of time to do everything, and sometimes it looks unreliable; when you realise how much they say, yes, yes, yes - they’re taking on too much, and it gets to the point, where you can’t be everywhere at once. … I love the way it’s through service, but Pacific Island people have a real thing about saying, no; it’s hard to do.

As we considered these values and how such underpinning beliefs might play into Pacific Island experiences and contribution to non-playing rugby roles, we drew the connection between these values and perspectives on leadership.
Perspectives on Leadership

“What does leadership mean to you” was the first question asked of each interviewee. Without exception, each interviewee referenced a service orientation of helping others that did not necessarily involve a formal position, but emphasised developing people. This seemed highly congruent with the cultural values outlined in the previous section. This perspective on leadership came through clearly from stories about upbringings and the values and behaviours set by parents. For example, one participant shared “It’s a Samoan proverb; the pathway to leadership is through service. It resonates really well with me, because when I see, especially our Pacific Islanders, they do that … they do that a lot, which is awesome”.

O le ala le pule o le tautua “The pathway to leadership is through service.”

It also emerged from the interviews that Pacific Island leadership embraces an informal, relational, collectivist approach. “If it is leadership then it is about people” offered one Samoan male emphasising the relational component of leadership. Another explained, “I think sometimes with leadership it is basically working with people for a common cause and not so much to be the controller; it is working like one people really. Sometimes it could be they need direction or some sort of purpose. It is not individual; it is more like a collaborative sort of thing.” In this, the perspectives that were shared did not necessarily see positions and role assignment as the only way to contribute, instead it was clear that informal contribution, such as team support was just as significant. This type of approach does not necessarily fit with the typical or traditional rugby structures which can be perceived as placing emphasis on roles and formal positions.

This philosophy on leadership embraces an informal, relational, collectivist approach.

Indeed, we wondered if we had interviewed eight European rugby community members whether we would have derived the same sentiment about leadership. This is because our participants’ views contrast with what has historically been a Euro-centric view of leadership which has valued leader-centered perspectives. This approach has emphasised the individual’s characteristics and behaviours, as well as being concerned with the formal position they might hold (Jackson & Parry, 2011).

Another perspective came from a younger Samoan with extensive family involvement in rugby:

From a PI perspective I think you see leadership within rugby as a very high respected role but also I think that it’s unreachable at times…like it’s a bit out of our league so we leave it up to those that are capable of doing it… Like your typical white male men who have been involved in rugby for a long time and who have a bigger and deeper understanding of the game. Whereas with Pacific Islanders, this is just a generalisation, the majority may have been brought up with rugby but might not necessarily know the ins and outs of rugby; like have a deep understanding of it. Like we might have played it all our lives but we really don’t know say the governance side of it.
While older participants may not have expressed this sentiment so overtly, there was a common response that Pacific Island people do not necessarily see themselves with non-playing titles, or aspire to dominant leadership positions in rugby. A range of different reasons were offered, including reference to the collectivist approach, and the sentiment that these roles are intimidating and accompany a fear of failure. A first generation Samoan stated, “…there is that shyness that they have and they sort of bow their head. It’s always difficult to get them to put their hand up”. Interestingly our participant, in this instance, talks in third person. Another explained, “It is a shyness and reluctance. It is only because I think growing up with European rules…it’s that authority thing. I don’t know whether that’s a throwback from the Islands back in the ’30s when the Islands were [taken over] by the Europeans; either Germans, Americans or the British.”

This sentiment appears to reflect a perspective that sees Europeans as authority figures when it comes to formal positions of leadership in rugby. We also heard that Pacific Islanders may be more inclined to take on these positions if they are shoulder tapped and directly asked to, rather than putting themselves forward for these roles.

This sentiment appears to reflect a perspective that sees Europeans as authority figures when it comes to formal positions of leadership in rugby.

Closely associated with this idea was a reasoning that there are less Pacific Islanders in non-playing roles in rugby because “…the system is orientated towards a more European approach”, (which could be described as structured and role orientated). One important message came from a former All Black and Super Rugby player with extensive experience both on and off the field. Reflecting on his own experiences in relation to boards and committee processes he shared his frustrations and questions around how to navigate this system. “I don’t know what the processes are in terms of coming through that process…and that’s mainly part of the issue too, is that, what is the pathway?” Others talked of the need for “transparency” around these processes for appointments and elections in relation to coaching, referring and board contributions.

“… the system is orientated towards a more European approach”.

A longstanding and experienced member of a historically strong rugby club stated that “to me providing more information, providing guidance in the system and how to go about joining, being a coach or having… information available …”, was needed. From this, we gleaned that several participants operating at a high level and with extensive experience in the rugby system, still struggle to personally navigate their way. This also appeared to hold true for those they sought to assist into leadership roles.

In summary the key message is: in order to understand Pacific Island perspectives, it is necessary to first have an awareness and appreciation for Pacific Island culture, which in turn, has significant implications for understanding perspectives of leadership. We offer that understanding Pacific Island philosophies to leadership sits at the core of actions that might be take in relation to considering Pacific Island contribution to non-playing rugby activities. Next we summarise the key findings, establish our overarching theme, and from that, provide a series of recommendations for change.
Conclusions & Recommendations

An overarching theme that emerged from the interviews is the idea of the Pasifika people constantly “navigate two worlds” as they journey through life as a Pacific Island New Zealander. One participant summarised this as living a life with “Pacific Island principles and Kiwi practices”. The essence of our recommendations is that New Zealand Rugby continue to enable the process of Pacific Islanders “Navigating two worlds”.

In summary, two foci are linked to four specific recommendations which we put forth for the purpose of ultimately increasing Pacific Island engagement in rugby coaching, refereeing, administration and committees/boards.

Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) To enhance the understanding of Pacific Island culture within the NZR community | 1) Pacific Island advisory group  
2) Decision maker’s workshops  
3) Insights driven implementation and communication |
| B) To create a shared understanding of leadership between Pakeha and Pacific Island members of the NZR community | 4) Targeted leadership initiative for 20-25 Pacific Island rugby community members |
Focus & Recommendations

A: Pacific Island Culture

Focus area A) is an enhanced understanding of Pacific Island culture. This includes an appreciation of the importance of family, church and community service. Recommendations for A) are:

1) Pacific Island advisory group
   Ongoing consultation with the Pacific Island community is key to the success of this project going forward. It is therefore recommended that a Pacific Island advisory group is established to support and advise NZR on this initiative. It is essential that this is a diverse group including a mix of gender, age, status, experience and Pacific Island heritage.

2) Decision makers’ workshops
   It is recommended that a pilot program to facilitate Pacific Island cultural awareness among those responsible for leading and facilitating rugby in Auckland, North Harbour, and Counties Manukau Rugby areas, be established. Based on our findings, we consider that those who train and supervise referees, manage and liaise with coaches regularly and operate at board level will benefit from an enhanced understanding of the Pacific Island culture. Ideally, this enhanced understanding will improve decision making, strategy planning, and rugby development in general.

3) Insights driven implementation and communication
   It is important to acknowledge the importance of family, church, service, and the obligations and conflicts associated with these commitments. When scheduling workshops for non-playing roles e.g. coach/referee workshops, this needs to be considered in order to not conflict with related commitments. Furthermore, recognising the ‘service-orientation’ of Pasifika people, communication related to rugby leadership should be framed as opportunities to “serve the community” rather than further one’s own interests, career or professional development.

B: Shared Understanding of Leadership

Focus area B) is a shared understanding of leadership. European models of leadership are known to emphasise structure, formal positions, and leader-centered thinking (Jackson & Parry, 2011). In contrast, Pacific Island approaches to leadership is more encompassing of informal and collective philosophies (Gordon et al., 2010). For example, those espousing a European culture may aspire to attain the title of “Head Coach”, “Director of Rugby” or “Head Referee”, whereas our findings demonstrate that in the Pacific Island community the emphasis and status is not necessarily placed on the title but instead on the service contribution. Our recommendations for B) is therefore:

1) Targeted leadership initiative 2017
   In order to ensure deliberate changes are being implemented to encourage more Pacific Island participation in non-playing roles, we recommend that NZR establish a pilot programme in the Auckland region in which 20-25 Pacific Island members of the rugby community are identified and mentored through the process of developing leadership skills and taking on roles in their clubs/regions. This process is designed to assist Pacific Island members better navigate the formal and informal processes of the New Zealand rugby system. The careful identification of the individuals themselves, the clubs, and the mentors will determine the success of such an initiative. This initiative is recommended in the context of Focus A) recommendations which drive at a reciprocal appreciation for Pacific Island cultural and approaches to leadership.
Overall, we recognise that this is not an exercise of ‘fixing a problem’, it is a broader process of engaging with and understanding the Pacific Island community. Attempts to address the outcome without addressing the systemic issues that seem to be in place are likely to be unsuccessful. We suggest that a “quota” approach to implementation and evaluation of this initiative is not applied, as this may result in perceptions of “tokenism” and undermine the potential for genuine progression in this space.

We recommend success be perceived as facilitating a smoother pathway for Pacific Island members of the New Zealand rugby community into non-playing roles than what currently exists. We also recommend that success is assessed on the basis that Pacific Island appreciation for informal and collective leadership plays a role in influencing the New Zealand rugby system. This is because we see this as a helpful enhancement to current, more formal leadership approaches, thus allowing greater access and leadership contribution throughout rugby in New Zealand.
References


Appendix A: Pacific Island Non-Playing Participation Study – Chantelle Huch (available upon request).

About the Authors

Lesley Ferkins (PhD) is Associate Professor in Sport Leadership and Governance at Auckland University of Technology (AUT) and co-leads AUT’s Rugby Codes Research Group. She is also the Director of the AUT Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand based at AUT Millennium.

Katie Dee (MBus) is Research Officer within the AUT Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand, with a focus on projects encompassing sport leadership. She is also a key member of the AUT Rugby Codes Research Group.

Mike Naylor (PhD) is Senior Lecturer in Sport Marketing at AUT. His focus encompasses motivation for participation in sport and has contributed to projects for the AUT Rugby Codes Research Group.

Gaye Bryham (MA Applied) is Deputy Head, School of Sport and Recreation at AUT. Gaye’s focus is sport leadership, high performance sport, athlete-life management and cooperative education. Gaye is also active in projects for the AUT Rugby Codes Research Group.

https://sprinz.aut.ac.nz/areas-of-expertise/interdisciplinary-research/rugby-codes

[Note: Ethics was sought and approved from Auckland University of Technology - all research participants signed a consent form.]
Examine the reason (cultural differences) as to why there are a high number of Pacific Island players, but relatively low number of Pacific Island volunteers in coaching, refereeing and administration of rugby within the Auckland region.

**Research Aim:**
To examine the barriers and enablers for Pacific Island participation in leadership and administration roles in rugby.

**Research Objectives:**
- To identify the cultural obligations and values that affect the involvement of Pacific people taking on coaching, refereeing and administration roles within rugby.
- To identify the meanings and values Pacific Island people attach to leadership/administration roles in rugby within Wider Auckland.
- To explore what motivates Pacific Island people to engage in leadership/administration roles in rugby within Wider Auckland.
- To explore ways to increase the number of Pacific Island people involved in leadership/administration roles; in rugby within Wider Auckland.

**Project: (With Future Scope)**
- Collect data from all 3 provincial unions within Auckland (Auckland, North Harbour, Counties Manukau).
- AUT researchers will undergo further research which probes the experiences of the facilitators and meanings attached to leadership in the context of non playing participation in rugby by Pacific Island people.
- Implement initiatives

**Importance of Diversity:**
- Diverse organisations exhibit great flexibility in terms of communication lines and decision making, therefore many different personnel at various levels within the organisation are involved in important communications and decisions.
- To prevent privileges afforded to certain groups at the exclusion of others.
- Having a diverse governing body in an organisation will offer varying viewpoints which provides a larger pool of ideas and experiences which can only benefit the organisation.
- Broader service range: An organisation with a diverse collection of skills and experiences such as languages and cultural understandings, allows the organisation to provide services and cater to a wider range of communities. This also promotes sustainability and growth over time as the Auckland population changes.

**Statistics:**
Clubs within the Auckland Provincial Union with the highest number of registered Pacific Island players in 2015:
- Papatoetoe (478)
- Marist Brothers (451)
- Otahuhu (378)
- Ponsonby (355)
- Manukau Rovers (347)
- Waitemata (300)
- Suburbs (258)

**North Harbour:**
- Massey (132)

**Counties Manukau:**
- Manurewa (251)
Selected Host Clubs for Focus Groups:
(Based on the clubs with the highest number of registered Pacific Island players)

Auckland P.U:
• Papatoetoe Rugby Club
• Ponsonby Rugby Club
*Ponsonby was chosen as a more central club to host a focus group – more accessible for central/west clubs

North Harbour P.U:
• Massey Rugby Club

Counties Manukau P.U:
• Manurewa Rugby Club

Target group:
Pacific Island community in rugby (Parents/family members/supporters/players etc.)

Methodology:
In this study, there is a need to use qualitative approaches to capture more specifically what it means to be a Pacific Island individual engaging in these roles in rugby from the position of the participant, and how sport volunteering is experienced in their lives.
The selected method of data collection for the Pacific Island Non Playing Participation Study was Focus Groups. The benefit of using focus groups is that it allows groups of peers to share and express their perspectives openly in a safe environment. This is relevant to the Pacific Island community which this research is targeting as they will feel more comfortable expressing their views when in a supportive group environment, rather than a one on one interview where they may feel intimidated or afraid their views will be frowned upon. Having the security of being among others who share many of their feelings and experiences, the participants possess a basis for sharing their views.

What we want to find out:
• The cultural obligations and values that affect their involvement in coaching, refereeing and administration roles in rugby
• The meanings and values they attach to these roles
• What motivates or would motivate them to get engaged in these roles
• Motivators for taking on these roles in the future (after playing)
• Other barriers that may affect their involvement

Facilitators
• Keven Mealamu (NZ RUGBY, Former All Black)
• Kevin Senio (NZRPA Player Advisor, Former All Black)
• Rob Ah Kuoi (ARU Referee)
• Danny Gautusa (ARU Pro Sport)
• Jack Huch (Ponsonby RFC Committee Member/Coach)
• Gina Cocker (College Rifles Administrator)
• Katie Tahana (NZR Rugby & Touch Development Manager) – *Note taker
• Chantelle Huch (NZR Intern) *Note taker

The facilitators are of Pacific Island decent and play a variety of roles within rugby (administrators, coaches, referee, professional players, committee members). The facilitators helped guide the study design and facilitated the discussions amongst the Pacific Island community that attended the focus groups. They also drew on their own experiences to help stimulate ideas and discussion.
It was important to have Pacific Island people within the rugby community guide the study and facilitate these discussions as it creates a comfortable environment for the Pacific Island community to freely express their views and opinions amongst familiar people. Pacific Island facilitators are also more likely to understand the perspectives being offered and more naturally relate to the participants.
ENABLERS:

- Passion for rugby
- ‘Pay It Forward’ – Give back to the rugby community
- Spend more time with children if coaching/managing their team
- Encouragement from other parents to take on roles
- Been involved in rugby their whole life
- Necessity – ‘If I don’t do it, who else will?’

MOTIVATORS:

- Run coaching workshops within clubs specific to Pacific Islanders (familiar environment – a place you know with people you know)
- Have a mentor/guide for new coaches/managers etc. (on field mentors to give visuals and live experiences rather than just reading booklets)
- Players Perspective: If they cannot continue to play rugby they would love to give back to the sport by coaching
- Shared responsibility will lighten the burden
- The more organised the club is, the more likely you are to volunteer and stay

BARRIERS:

- Family commitments e.g. family time, extended family functions
- Family Structure – More than one child playing rugby/sport so cannot commit to a coaching or managing role
- Transport – Family only has 1 vehicle
- Responsibility is intimidating – Big commitment/pressure/expectation
- Lack of knowledge/confidence/experience
- Language Barrier – English is their second language
- Fear of failure and embarrassment
- Perception that volunteering is too time consuming
- Current coaching courses do not accommodate to our Pacific Island community
- Lack of communication within club – If the governing body within the club is unorganised, they are less likely to get involved
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**Project Leader:** Chantelle Huch (AUT Cooperative Education Student)

**Project Supervisor:** Simon Devoy