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Abstract

This thesis is an exploratory study of the experiences of policy makers and expert policy advisors of Pacific ethnicity on the attitudes and environmental conditions that contribute to the framing of Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing in government policies. Statistics and government reports indicate that low incomes have an adverse impact on Pacific peoples’ ability to realise economic wellbeing. Such reports imply that economic wellbeing is a construct which relies on individual households having adequate income, earned by the head/s of the household, to spend on consumable goods that help the members of the household to maximise their enjoyment. As a Tongan, raised in a family environment that was heavily influenced by the *anga fakatonga* (the Tongan culture), I have experienced first-hand concepts of economic wellbeing from a Tongan household perspective, which were inclined towards the sharing of money and resources across multiple households out of obligation to our wider family across the world, and also our community of Ma’ufanga in Tonga.

For this study, I wanted to explore the prevalence of mainstream westernised economic logic in government policy making, and its impact on the Pacific peoples who both helped construct and lived by these policies. The methodological framework of phenomenology and *talanoa* was employed in this study, involving individual *talanoa* or key informant interviews with four participants who either held roles as policy making Ministers of the Crown, or as expert policy advisors in government departments in New Zealand between the years of 1998 and 2013. The *talanoa* were conducted in English and recorded.
Findings were that not only was mainstream economic logic prevalent, but that the entire policy-making system represented the normative values of the New Zealand European/Palangi population. Government documents revealed, through extensive use of statistics to justify the positions of mainstream policy makers and their departments, that Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing was typified by material hardship and difficulty in accessing adequate capital for ideal consumption.

Participants revealed that despite their viewpoints clarifying the nature of resource accumulation and distribution among Pacific families, the mainstream agencies’ economic viewpoint endured, as well as the assumptions about ideal economic behaviour that were contained within.

All four participants affirmed the efforts they, and many of their Pacific colleagues, had gone to, in order to affect attitudinal change inside government policy systems, and the challenges entailed in doing so. As this study only addresses a pan-Pacific and economic environment, further research is warranted.
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v Glossary of Terms

- Pasifika/Pacific – Term used to refer to people whose ethnic background is from the Islands of the Pacific Ocean region (including Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Cook Islands, Tuvalu, Tokelau, Niue, Papua New Guinea as well as other smaller nations)
- Palangi/Palagi – Term used to refer to people who are the majority ethnic group in New Zealand, descendants of European migrants who came to New Zealand in the 19th and early 20th centuries.
- Anga fakatonga/fakatonga – The Tongan Way, the cultural construction that determines the protocols and relationship management systems of Tongan peoples
- Fa’asamoa – The Samoan Way, the cultural systems of protocols and relationship systems for Samoan peoples
- Mehikitanga – The eldest sister of father acknowledged in the anga fakatonga
- Fa’e – The eldest sister of mother acknowledged in the anga fakatonga
- Fa’alavelave – The traditional act in Samoan Fa’asamoa of contributing money (or time, effort, labour, other resources) towards a family-group or need related to a specific or significant event, or as part of wider resource-sharing protocols
- Ni Vanuatu – The Vanuatu cultural systems of relationship management.
- Te Inati – A system of culturally-led relationship management and resource allocation for Tokelauan peoples.
- Lotu – One of the commonly used terms among Pacific communities to refer to regular spiritual gatherings and also to the notion of community and strength gathered through shared spiritual values.
- Tautua – Service
- Talanoa – Discussion, conversation, sharing of ideas
- Tokoni – Gift, offering
- ‘Ofa/Faka’ofa – Love, care
- NPM – New Public Management
- MPIA – Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs
- SSC – State Services Commission
- PBT – Pacific Business Trust
- MBIE – Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
- MoJ – Ministry of Justice
- MOH – Ministry of Health
- DBH – Department of Building and Housing
- IRD – Inland Revenue Department
- SNZ – Statistics New Zealand
- BNZ – Bank of New Zealand
Chapter 1  Introduction

“Fangota ki he kato ava” – “[beware of] fishing with a bag that has holes in it”

While one may have skills and attitude, failure will happen if basics are not considered

This study will answer the following research questions:

1. How are representations of Pasifika peoples constructed and framed by New Zealand government policy makers, as seen in government policy documents outcomes that relate to economic wellbeing and/or development?

2. What has been the role of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) in representing Pasifika peoples in policy making processes?

Research Aims

This exploratory study had multiple aims which included:

1. sharing the knowledge held by policy-makers of Pacific ethnicity who have had significant experience in advocating for communities of Pacific peoples in New Zealand;
2. discussing the impact that government policies have on Pacific peoples and the power that policy-making agencies have to influence these people’s day-to-day lives;
3. providing information to Pacific communities about the ways in which government policies are made;
4. informing the on-going development of approaches to policy making related to Pacific peoples in New Zealand.

The Situation of this Research

Between 1900 and 2014 people have migrated from the island nations of the Pacific Ocean [between the Americas and Australia] to settle in New Zealand. Their settlement led to the creation of communities in both metropolitan and provincial centres across the country. These communities have grown in size through the on-
going settlement of new migrants from the Pacific region and through the births of generations of people who identified with both their Pacific heritage and being a New Zealander. An integral part of Pacific identities and also of community life are Pacific values which are centred on the sharing of resources, reciprocity, maintaining relationships between people in family groups, spirituality and the nurturing of these values across generations.

The migration of people from Tonga, Samoa and Fiji to New Zealand was enabled through government policy agendas, originally designed to provide a workforce for the manufacturing sector. From 1964 until a policy review in 1974, migrant workers from the Pacific region were able to take part in a three-month work permit programme run by the Department of Labour. Meanwhile peoples from the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau had open access to New Zealand as citizens of the realm which applied in 1901 (for the Cook Islands and Niue) and 1948 (Tokelau).

The significance of Pacific peoples as a distinct population group was legitimised by the New Zealand government through the creation of spaces in which Pacific peoples’ development could be part of government discourse. In 1984 the Labour Government established an office and ministerial portfolio that directly focussed on the development of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. In 1990 this office became a stand-alone government ministry. In 1998 the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) was required, through its ministerial purchasing agreement, to focus on providing policy advice.

As MPIA began to focus on providing policy advice, other government agencies began to focus more of their attention on the influence of data and evidence on the formation of policy advice and policy agendas. Government agencies used statistics
about average and median wages, housing costs, numbers of people who own or rent houses, rates of unemployment, population projections and educational achievements (see appendix 5 for a selection of government statistics) to inform or justify statements made by Pacific peoples in policy discussions and documents (Stuart et al., 2012). The publishing of *Pacific Progress: A report on the economic status of Pacific peoples in New Zealand* (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002) was a significant event that signalled a tenet of MPIA that in order for policy about Pacific peoples to be considered credible, it had to be linked to statistical evidence. Of interest in this study is the significance placed on relevant evidence by policy makers and the reasons given by policy makers as to why some statistics are relevant, such as median wage growth, whereas discussions about reciprocity, relationship nurturing, faith and service are deemed irrelevant.

At the time of completing this thesis, there were no studies that discussed the economic development of Pacific peoples as a product of the New Zealand government’s policy-making systems. A lack of literature on this topic illustrates the potential for more research to take place.

**Significance of the Study**

The New Zealand government is unique in establishing an agency devoted to the development and success of Pacific peoples. The MPIA was a result of the determination of Pacific communities to be represented in government decision-making, and the recognition by government policy makers that a dedicated entity was a valid way to solve problems facing Pacific peoples. It is also noteworthy that a significant proportion of the staff at the MPIA are of Pacific ethnicity. This means that as a ministry of New Zealand’s government, MPIA creates a space for authentic
Pacific voices and for Pacific values to be a part of policy-making. The mood of the government was noted by former Minister for Maori Affairs, Koro Wetere, when he said “I state clearly that the Government is committed to ongoing support of Pacific Islands [sic] people resident in New Zealand. The existing programmes and services will continue to be used until the future dictates they be replaced with more relevant measures” (Wetere, in NZPD, 1989, 12245).

The continued development of Pacific peoples is a significant issue for the government of New Zealand. However, this study challenges the terms that are used to define Pacific peoples’ development in New Zealand. Pacific values entail behaviours such as the sharing of resources; the nurturing of relationships; recognition of natural, social and spiritual environments; nurturing of values and behaviours; and the provision of social protection which is central to economic wellbeing. Meanwhile, according to government reports (see Chapters 2 and 5) and statistics (see Appendix 5), Pacific peoples are a youthful community whose workforce-aged population will increase at the same time as the current workforce population decreases through retirements and deaths. Other government statistics point to Pacific peoples experiencing lower incomes, inability to purchase housing, greater health challenges and lower educational attainment than other population groups.

The rise of government policies that target Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing and development, from teacher training and housing loan assistance in the 1970s to apprenticeships and business development in the 2000s has created a space for research. However, noticeable in the literature on government policy-making (Treasury, 1987; Boston, et al. 1996; Washington, 1998; Chapman & Davis, 2010) is the absence of recognition of the impact that Pacific cultural values can have on the
economic wellbeing or development of Pacific peoples. Even more interesting has been the suggestion by some government agency-commissioned reports (NZIER, 2005; Anae et al, 2007; Stuart, et al., 2010) that cultural activities, such as intra/inter-family or community-based giving (of money or resources or financial contributions to churches) are potentially harmful to Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing. Such claims have contradicted traditional cultural notions of wellbeing where the collective effort of individuals and families together provides sufficient resources for the current and future needs of the community (Tamasese et al, 2007, 2010; Ratuva, 2010; Regenvanu, 2011; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014).

The few government policy reports that have discussed the influence of Pacific culture have positioned cultural motivations for economic activity as being consumer decisions based on individuals’ extravagance, and victimisation of family members by church leaders and financial services providers (NZIER, 2005; Anae et. al., 2007; Stuart et al., 2010). What was not considered in those reports, but was in another government-commissioned study (Koloto & Sharma, 2005) is the motivational force that cultural social protection provides. In particular Pacific values of concern were for the good of the wider family group in the day-to-day minutiae of preparing and provisioning of time, money and resources. Koloto & Sharma (2005) noted that values of relationship management, social protection and care are central motivating factors in the economic decisions that Pacific women make.

**Research Focus**

The focus of this study is to explore the place of Pacific peoples’ values and cultures in the framing of Pacific peoples’ economic development and economic wellbeing in government policy. As a Tongan who has worked in the area of government policy
analysis, I am aware of differences between what Pacific households and communities, including my own, and government policy-makers believe were the key components of economic wellbeing and development. Broadly these differences relate to the lack of importance given by policy makers to Pacific cultural values in discussions about economic wellbeing and development policy. Also, these differences related to economic development being perceived by policy makers as incompatible with Pacific cultural values.

Commenting on the influence that European values have had on policy makers’ perceptions of Pacific peoples’ cultures and values, Hau’ofa noted:

The idea that the countries of Polynesia and Micronesia are too small, too poor and too isolated to develop any meaningful degree of autonomy is an economistic and geographic deterministic view of a very narrow kind that overlooks history and the contemporary process of what may be called world enlargement that is carried out by tens of thousands of ordinary Pacific Islanders right across the ocean. (1994, p 151).

**About the researcher**

The research questions in this study were inspired by my experience working with policy agendas relating to Pacific peoples, and my values as a person of Tongan origins. I have worked as a policy analyst with the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) as well as with policy teams at Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) and Inland Revenue Department (IRD). I have also worked for the Bank of New Zealand (BNZ) in a capacity where I managed projects involving the use of private sector funds and investments to fund government programmes in which policy outcomes were achieved.

Before working at MPIA, I found that often I was either the sole Pacific person, or one of a few Pacific people, in my working environment. While working with
colleagues from SNZ, IRD, or at the BNZ I found myself defending Pacific peoples’ ways of living and their viewpoints against challenges made by colleagues of European ethnicity. In particular, I most frequently defended traditional practices of intra-family and intra-community giving of money, time or resources.

I noted that the challenges by colleagues of European ethnicity were not made in order to better understand a different economic practice but to demonise the practice as they perceived it. As soon as I had responded to their question about why Pacific people gave money to one another, I was faced with the same question. My answers appeared worthless as my colleagues seemed more interested in asserting the correctness of their point of view, instead of being willing to accept that Pacific families drew on values as a motivational force in making economic decisions.

For me, that experience was set against the context of my upbringing in the Tongan culture which is founded on values that guide the maintenance of relationships between brothers and sisters, grandparents and grandchildren, aunties/uncles and nephews/nieces and also between community leaders [such as village nobles and church ministers] and the community. These values include reciprocity, caring, spirituality and service to others. As I attempted to reconcile the lack of interest shown by my colleagues, I questioned the intentions of the policy-makers, and policy-making systems which favoured western economic ideals when depicting the interactions that take place within Pacific families. In particular, I wanted to see if Pacific people, with knowledge of Pacific values, were able to be influential in policy-making.

As I took these experiences and my queries into a period of work among other policy-making professionals at MPIA, I was interested to understand if other Pacific
values were influential in policy-making systems in the lived experience of my Pacific ethnic colleagues. During my period in the MPIA environment I found that mainstream economic values were more influential in policy thinking, yet the majority of my colleagues appeared to be influenced by the various Pacific values’ systems in their daily lives. Therefore I was interested to understand why, despite MPIA being a place where Pacific values influenced policy-makers lives, mainstream European values were more prominent in policies that related to the economic development of Pacific peoples.

I am approaching this study as a Pacific person. My upbringing was rooted in the Tongan cultural tradition of the anga fakatonga – the Tongan Way. I am undertaking this study as a tokoni/help to policy makers and advisers. I hope that its findings may be of use, and that the study may encourage policy-makers to consider Pacific peoples’ values in policy decision-making. I also hope that Pacific values may eventually influence policies that are related to the economic outcomes of Pacific communities and families. Instead of seeking to critique mainstream European economic logic, in the Pacific community context, using statistics and economic logic, I have approached this study seeking to understand the influence of policy on Pacific peoples’ development through Pacific voices, with Pacific values and on Pacific terms.

**Research Participants**

Eligible participants were people of Pacific ethnic background who held roles as either policy-making government ministers or expert advisors, in any government department, but had an interaction with policies that affected the economic wellbeing of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. All participants were based in New Zealand; one
in Christchurch, one in Wellington and two in Auckland. As 1998 was the year in which MPIA began its focus on policy analysis, I looked for participants who were in policy-making or advisory positions between 1998 and 2013.

**Synopsis of Research Design**

Research data to answer both questions in this qualitative study was drawn from two main sources. The first source of data was a group of Pacific people who have held senior policy-making jobs in the New Zealand government. By employing qualitative modes of inquiry my intention was to illuminate the place and significance of policy-makers’ world views as seen through policy documents or through the recollections of interview participants. The second source of data was a collection of government policy documents, written by people whose job titles were identified in the New Zealand policy process (Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005).

Data sources, including participants, were purposively selected so that the total sample was an appropriate response to the criteria of Pacific ethnicity and employment in government policy-making which was set in the research questions (Mason, 2002; Patton, 2002; Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003). As this study was about understanding how Pacific peoples were framed in government policy, government policy documents that discussed Pacific peoples were selected. Similarly, as the second research question discussed the contributions of MPIA, the experiences of Pacific policy makers involved with the ministry provided a rationale for purposive selection of participants. Interviews were deemed the most appropriate qualitative research method as they enabled each participant to explore their values and viewpoints (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003).
The semi-structured interviews consisted of a few broad question areas from which participants were encouraged to develop their own narrative. I probed to uncover elements of their world view and/or experiences that enhanced the discussion. In preparation for the interviews with participants, I developed a schedule of questions which I piloted with my academic colleagues, supervisors and other Pacific professionals (see appendix 3).

The approach taken in this study was a mixed methodology based on Heideggerian phenomenology (Van Manen, 2007; Wojnak & Swanson, 2007) and enhanced by the Talanoa methodology (Vaioleti, 2006). The study was an important opportunity to advance understanding of how the identities and world views of people from population groups were framed by government policy makers who were not from the same population groups or communities. The complexity of the phenomena being studied required an approach that would connect readers to the heart of participants’ explorations of values, and their world (van Manen, 1990, Savin-Baden & van Niekerk, 2007). It was also vital that the philosophical construct of this study was essentially Pasifika (Vaioleti, 2006). Ethics approval for this study was obtained on 16 September 2013 (see appendix 2).

**Definitions Being Used in this Study**

**Key concepts in Pacific culture**

The Pacific region is rich with a multitude of lands, cultures, experiences, world views as well as a depth of history spanning thousands of years. The terms Pacific and Pasifika relate to the sovereign states and territories, their many languages,

---

1 Including, but not limited to: Tonga, Samoa, Fiji, Cook Islands, Tokelau, Niue, Tuvalu, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, and Vanuatu.
dialects, cultures and world views that originate in the Pacific Ocean. The peoples of the Pacific region have survived, motivated by values and skills that evolved through histories of maritime navigation, group efforts, leadership and service. I approach this study wishing to pay respect to the many ethnic and cultural groups of the Pacific region, and while my base is in theanga fakatonga, I hope the findings of this study can be put to service for other Pacific ethnic groups. Hall and Kauanui (1994) noted “‘Pacific’ is a compromise category, fully satisfying and offending no one, that is utilised both to recognise the historic similarities between its constituent groups and consolidate their collective power” (p. 75)

Across the many cultures of the Pacific, emphasis is placed on the power that people hold in being able to shape and influence the lives of those around them, and the responsibility individuals have to maintain relationships that surround them (Hau‘ofa, 1994; Tamasese et. al, 2007; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). People of Pacific ethnicities are never counted as individuals. The westernised social paradigms that normalise individuals as separate from one another is the antithesis of being a Pacific person. I occupy the spaces of a middle son, eldest-born son, eldest grandchild, middle grandchild, cousin, uncle and father. In my culture (theanga fakatonga) each of these roles brings with it certain responsibilities and rules of engaging with other people in my wider family. Also it is important to note that these rules of engagement and responsibilities extend to govern the ways in which I interact with other people in Tongan communities (for more on the protocols of Tongan social interactions, see Fehoko (2015), p.63-65).

At the heart of Pacific cultures are values that underpin the essence of being a Pacific person. The notion that an individual engages to be of service to others, their family and the community at large is a widely-supported value which is central to the
experience of being a Pacific person (Hau’ofa, 1994; Helu-Thaman, 1998; Koloto & Sharma, 2005; Vailoeti, 2006; Tamasese et. al, 2007; 2010; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). However, the value in that service extends beyond the utility experienced by the person who is served to the underlying motivations in the appreciation given to those of service to one another. Those who are of service represent generations before and after them in a sacred relationship with those they are serving, and are most likely reciprocating an act of service to them or their family before; they know that the reciprocity will continue in the future. Alongside the value of service, or Tautua as it is known in the Samoan language, other values include respect for the rank or status of others, acknowledging a spiritual dimension to life, respecting the history that is embedded in the physical and social environments and ensuring that the needs of all in the community are met.

**Key concepts in Pacific economic wellbeing**

The behaviours discussed above are central to economic wellbeing in Pacific contexts. While the sharing of resources between family members embodies significant cultural contexts, sharing also ensures that people across family groups have a reasonable quality of life. It is important to note that the appreciation that Pacific peoples have for sharing, service, the sacredness of relationships, spirituality and reciprocity are central to the creation of value in Pacific economic contexts. Fairbairn-Dunlop (2014) defined the values that motivate production and usage behaviours in Pacific families and communities in this way:

> Pacific values and beliefs are not solely motivated by economic (cash) returns but by a consideration for the spiritual, social, cultural and physical - the holistic view. Maintaining harmonious relationships between the creator God, people and the natural environment is the priority and the spiritual is acknowledged in every action. Second, the extended family is the main institution in Pacific
communities and the source of identity and social and economic participation. The shared use of resources to ensure the family ‘good’ is at odds with concepts of individual rights and economic growth models (Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014, p120)

Fairbairn-Dunlop’s (2014) definition was presented first as it illustrated activity within a Pacific ethnic context, which is relevant to this study. As a definition of economics Waring (1999) explained “Xenophon coined the word ‘oikonomikos’ to describe the management or rule of a house or household. Meanwhile, Roget’s Thesaurus lists as synonymous the words management, order, careful administration, frugality, austerity, prudence, thrift, providence, care and retrenchment” (1999, p15).

While Fairbairn-Dunlop (2014) and Waring (1999) related economics to the lives of people who were grouped in collectives, other scholars believed that economics was the domain of market-mediated transfers of money for goods. Salter (1932) claimed “supply is adjusted to demand, and production and consumption, by a process that is automatic, elastic and responsive” (1932, p387). Coase (1937) wrote that an economy was an organism whose growth and development relied on automatic and elastic responses to the problems of supply and demand.

The problem with Salter’s (1932) concept of an economy was that it separated the public and its consumption or production from the economy. To Salter and Coase, the economy was a special phenomenon, removed from the day-to-day activities of people. Therefore the definitions given by Waring (1999) and Fairbairn-Dunlop (2014) which prioritised the relationships between people, and the actions taken to maintain relationships, over the transfers of cash were more relevant to this study, as the Pacific economic experience is firmly entrenched in the relationships between people.
Key processes in New Zealand government policy making

A survey of literature shows that the period of government reforms between 1984 and 1998 was an influential period in the development of policy-making systems in New Zealand. Authors have noted that the reform of the New Zealand State Sector and public service under The New Public Management Model (NPM) led to the creation of policy systems that were used between 1998 and 2013 (Boston et al., 1996; Schick, 2001; Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002; Duncan & Chapman, 2010). Duncan and Chapman (2010) noted “The legislative framework for these dramatic changes had been constructed by the fourth Labour government (1984-1990) in the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986, the State Sector Act 1988 and the Public Finance Act 1989” (p. 302).

Many studies have discussed the impact of NPM on the setting of policy agendas in New Zealand (Boston et al., 1996; Washington, 1998; Schick, 2001; Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002; Whitcombe, 2008, 2008a). Whitcombe (2008) wrote “The theories which initially underpinned NPM, public choice theory and agency theory, and transaction-cost analysis had their origin in the discipline of economics” (p. 8). Public policy authors have argued that the design of New Zealand’s system of accountability for policy-making government departments and ministries, including the reporting practices adopted, was heavily influenced by the economic focus of NPM (Boston et al., 1996; Pallot, 1998; Washington, 1998; Schick, 2001; Duncan & Chapman, 2010).

In considering the impact of policy-making systems on the framing of Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing outcomes in this study, I chose to focus on particular principles of NPM, to ensure that the scope of the arguments about policy-making systems remained appropriate to the research questions. These principles included:
The separation of the policy advice and operational management departments in the government sector. Duncan and Chapman (2010) explained that separation was necessary to ensure that policy advice to policy-making ministers was contestable.

The creation of specialised policy agencies which were designed to give decision-makers expert policy advice (Pallot, 1998).


It is important to note that the 1984-1998 State Sector reforms, based on the NPM model, were wider ranging that the principles listed above. Other reforms, which were not in the scope of this study, included the corporatisation and privatisation of crown enterprises and the use of accrual accounting (Boston et al., 1996; Duncan & Chapman, 2010).

A further scan of policy-making literature shows that the systems in use during the period covered in this study (1998-2013) were enabled due to the NPM-influenced public sector reforms, although important legislation, such as the Official Information Act 1982, predated the reforms. Kibblewhite and Ussher (2002) wrote “When ministers have agreed the outputs to be supplied and the parameters they should be supplied within, with departments and other providers, the departments and other providers have freedom to manage the resources allowed” (p. 85). Shaw and Eichbaum (2005) noted that, in the policy-making process, expert advice provided to policy-making government ministers by departmental advisors, academics, consultants and lobbyists was seen as a resource supplied to aid the achievement of agreed outputs.

As the researcher for this study, I cannot take for granted that the organisation and development of the State Sector agencies present between 1998 and 2013 will have been influenced by the economically driven ideologies of the 1984 to 1998 reform period. The ideologies behind the NPM-styled reforms have influenced the policy
systems and assumptions about evidence as discussed by Shaw and Eichbaum (2005). This study questions the appropriateness of those ideologies, and the influences they might have had on government departments, that contribute to economic wellbeing policies directed at Pacific peoples. Schick (2001) wrote of the NPM approach to public management that “the new system brought accountability at the expense of responsibility, contestability was more ideal than reality, strategic capability was under-developed” (p.2).

Some studies have questioned the economically driven focus of policy-making systems that have focussed on measurability and contestability or rigour, where Pacific peoples have been involved. Fairbairn-Dunlop, Nanai & Ahio (2014) discussed the challenges of conducting Pacific values-based research into Pacific peoples’ health, which contributes to health policy. They noted that researchers and their participants enter into research processes with their own values. Finau (2006) challenged the belief that scientific research, devoid of values, was appropriate for the setting of health-delivery policy. He proposed a model where Pacific health-care services could be provisioned and delivered to the public using Pacific values as the logic behind decision-making, service delivery and information gathering.

**Organisation of this thesis**

The overall structure of this study takes the form of seven chapters, including this introductory section. Chapter two outlines the dimensions of this research project through reviewing literature and data. The third chapter is a discussion of the design and methodology used in this study. The fourth chapter analyses the results of semi-structured interviews given by four purposively selected former and current government policy makers who are of Pacific ethnicity. Chapter five is an analysis of
four purposively selected government policy documents. The sixth chapter draws together the results of data gathered in this study and discusses the ways in which Pacific peoples have been framed in government documents. Interview participants’ experiences are analysed in this chapter. The final section of the study brings all of the strands of the study together and includes a discussion about the conclusions formed, following the discussion of research data. Finally, areas for further research are suggested.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

“Si'i pe kae hā” – “We are a small island, and we are still great”

The isolation and size of Pacific islands have no bearing on the innovation of their peoples

This chapter is a critique of research papers and related sources of information that are pivotal to this study. The literature reviewed is organised into one of two sections which directly relate to each of the research questions.

Research Question 1: How are representations of Pasifika peoples constructed and framed by New Zealand government policy makers as seen in government policy documents outcomes that relate to economic wellbeing and/or development?

Introduction

To date, little evidence has been found associating the cultural values of Pacific peoples’ with economic development policy in New Zealand. This lack of association has occurred despite economic realities as shown through government statistics, for example, the New Zealand Income Survey which displays Pacific peoples’ average and median weekly incomes from 1998 onwards up until the time of writing in 2014, (see appendix 5) (Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

The first section of this chapter presents literature relating to the institutions and cultural factors that contribute to the representation of Pacific peoples in New Zealand government policy. The literature reviewed in this section looks at the terms, scenarios and notions used to frame Pacific values of economic wellbeing, by Pacific peoples and also by government policy makers from the mainstream ethnic groups. My search of the literature involved using support staff from the AUT libraries,
academic colleagues and Pacific policy advisers in government agencies as well as online searches of journal databases and library collections. The following section of the chapter is a review of the literature that explores the public management and policy-making systems of New Zealand.

**The framing of Pacific economic wellbeing**

A search to find studies that discuss the framing of Pacific peoples in policy documents returned little literature from which to base a critical review. Therefore it is necessary to construct a review from literature that explains values that underpin Pacific economic wellbeing and the values that have guided the construction of policy-making systems in New Zealand. Studies of Pacific cultural values have noted that central to the achievement of wellbeing is the concept of relationships and the ability of people in families and communities to be of service to one another, guided by the values nurtured in relationship maintenance. Tu‘itahi (2005) noted that people who hold positions of community and family leadership are trusted due to their service towards others and that communal wellbeing is the direct result of well nurtured interpersonal relationships which are the foundations of traditional culture (Tamasese et al, 2010).

A research report commissioned by the Ministry for Women’s Affairs (Koloto & Sharma, 2005) explored the economic wellbeing of Pacific women in New Zealand. Participants in their study reported that acts of service were central to the practicalities behind Pacific experiences of economic wellbeing. Koloto and Sharma (2005) explained the terms used to define acts of service which included cash transfers from their earned income, taking over the debt obligations of family members, and purchasing large or small goods for others in the family network.
Koloto and Sharma (2005) found that despite living in New Zealand’s individualistic, choice-oriented consumer society, Pacific women made economic contributions motivated by values such as the fa’asamoa (traditional Samoan culture) or theanga fakatonga (the Tongan Way). Koloto wrote:

> Whilst a mehikitanga [father’s eldest sister] will be acknowledged and presented with the top tier of her nieces or nephews 21st birthday cake, it is the fa’e’s [mother’s eldest sister] responsibility to prepare the cake, mats, tapa and any other goods that go with such a special presentation. Because of her fahu [highest female rank requiring respect and acknowledgement] status, a person’s mehikitanga does not make a significant economic contribution to the 21st birthday, for it is her turn to be acknowledged and receive gifts. (Koloto, in Koloto and Sharma, 2005, p 26)

A discussion paper from the Treasury, written as a guide to inform the development of policy-making systems in New Zealand, promoted an economic notion that individuals acted on choice and not as a result of social positions or values of service (Treasury, 1987). The paper framed the idea of service as altruism and such acts were the result of chosen value systems. Treasury noted

> The ability to undertake sophisticated communication has brought with it the requirement to justify our actions to others. This means that a moral justification for an action cannot be that it suits me. Instead, a moral response to the question ‘why should this be done’ must be a response which is acceptable to the group as a whole (1987, p. 410)

Treasury (1987) was acknowledged as being an influential guide to an ideal state of NPM-based public management and policy philosophy (Boston et al, 1996).

Discussion of the determinants of wellbeing for people from collectivist backgrounds, in this case families or tribal groups, focussed its attention on defining the determinants of wellbeing of a collective through an individualistic lens. The Treasury report noted “Families and tribes are not organic entities with mortality, rationality or
senses; they cannot feel pleasure or pain. They cannot make decisions or form preferences other than through the actions of their members” (1987, p. 410).

A section on Social Policy in the report by Treasury (1987) took the viewpoint that despite the existence of collective groups in society, wellbeing in mainstream society was a consequence of an individual’s utility-maximisation which resulted in an individual being happy for receiving goods or cash (p. 400). An individualistic determination of wellbeing was followed by the Ministry of Social Development in the introduction to its 2006 Social Report (Ministry of Social Development, 2006). In its introductory discussion of the determinants of wellbeing, the report noted that wellbeing outcomes for Māori would be different from that of other population groups. The discussion concluded that the report would focus on the wellbeing outcomes of majority groups. The Ministry of Social Development wrote:

The needs and aspirations of different people and communities will also vary in important ways. For example, for people who get comfort and strength from their religion, an important outcome could be spiritual wellbeing, and this might mean having access to a place of worship. The social report focusses on those aspects most people hold in common (Ministry of Social Development, 2006, p. 4)

In contrast to the individualistic ideology that was promoted by Treasury (1987) and the Ministry of Social Development (2006), a small field of research (Byers, 2003) and government-commissioned policy discussion (Koloto & Sharma, 2005) explained the link between cultural values and economic decision-making.

The concept of giving

Studies and government-funded reports have presented different viewpoints of the economic activities undertaken by representatives of Pacific families in New Zealand. Stuart et al. (2012) proposed that women were forced into positions of making financial contributions to family members, community or church groups by
their male partners or spouses. Their findings, which implied that women were victimised by their male relatives, contrasted with those of other studies (Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005) which noted that while parents, aunts, uncles and spouses were influential in women’s decision making, the women involved had the right to make a final decision to determine the value of financial contributions, and often took traditional customary viewpoints and household realities into consideration. In further contrast to implied claims of intergenerational victimisation, one of Byers’ (2003) participants explained that she and her mother freely debated decisions about balancing giving to family versus church.

I said to my mother, the church, like God, you give, but you don’t have to give all, you know, you [have] got kids to look after, you give a little bit, you don’t give all. It’s like a competition that is what’s happened. People show off, you give to show off, but after you show off, you have no money left. (p. 200)

Studies commissioned or sponsored by government entities explored the church environment as a space where Pacific peoples engaged in consumer spending behaviours, consumer finance and events based around family or community (Anae, et al., 2007; Stuart et al., 2012). Stuart et al. (2012) reported that their participants had felt they were in competition with other parishioners to appear economically successful, which was achieved by giving the largest church offering while also driving the latest model vehicles. In reality, there was scarce money to adequately feed their families (Stuart et al., 2012, p.11). Meanwhile, notions of churchgoers’ being image-conscious were expressed to Byers (2003) as a consequence of not being adjusted to the New Zealand consumer market, and was quickly overcome once community or family members shared their experience of making such adjustments with newcomers.
Stuart et al. (2012) saw ideal economic behaviours as avoiding unnecessary consumption-based expenditure. This ideal was based on a budget where the income-earning heads-of-the-household (ideally the mother and father) restricted the flow of money to their own household. The report noted that the ideal economic behaviours involved refusal to give funds when requested (p. 15) or to give services and time as an alternative to giving money (p. 16). The report’s ‘either-or’ approach implied that monies that left the boundaries of the household were demanded and that demands made only considered the immediate consumption of goods and services at a specific event. This implication was incompatible with the evidence gathered by Byers (2003) and Koloto & Sharma (2005) of Pacific families distributing resources according to Pacific cultural values. The values that underpinned resource distribution reflected wellbeing constructs noted by Hau’ofa (1994), Tamasese et al. (2012) and Fairbairn-Dunlop (2014) which encompassed the needs of everyone in the distribution of available resources, and that maintaining relationships was more important than the accumulation of wealth by an individual. Hau’ofa (1994) noted that such inferences in government-level economic reports were not new and imposed negative images upon Pacific communities in general.

... Islanders in their homelands are not the parasites on their relatives abroad that misinterpreters of ‘remittances’ would have us believe. Economists do not take account of the social centrality of the ancient practice of reciprocity, the core of all Oceanic cultures. They overlook the fact that for everything they receive, homelands reciprocate with goods they themselves produce, and they maintain ancestral roots and lands for everyone, homes with warmed hearts for travellers to return to at the end of the day, or to restrengthen their bonds, their souls and their identities before they move on again. This is not dependence, it is interdependence, which is purportedly the essence of the global system (Hau’ofa, 1994, p. 12-13).
Mainstream framing of Pacific remittance activity

Studies into the money transfers between Pacific peoples in westernised economies and their relatives in the Island homelands have exposed a paradox between indigenous and western viewpoints of investment motive (Hau’ofa, 1993; World Bank, 1996; Asian Development Bank, 2009; International Monetary Fund, 2012; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). Reports by development agencies discussed funds remitted by diaspora as investments made by off-shore contributors to national-level income. However, the development agency reports have neglected to discuss the decision-making powers of local villages, leaders and families in determining investment needs and strategies, outside of government controls.

Studies by Pacific scholars provided an alternative view to development organisations’ reports about investment decision making and strategy. (Hau’ofa, 1993; Regenvanu, 2011; Ratuva, 2012; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). Hau’ofa (1993) explained that development agency reports displayed a lack of knowledge by writers about the traditional forms of economic decision-making and investment strategy. He noted that as reports were disseminated widely to government agencies and other interested stakeholders, the image of Pacific peoples in the homelands became one that was demanding of diaspora to support an increasingly consumption-based lifestyle.

Studies by non-Pacific scholars of Pacific remitters’ investment motivations were entrenched in ideologies of customer utility theory and national accounting (Brown, 1994; Brown & Ahlburg, 1999; Brown, Leeves & Pryaga, 2014). Some studies (Brown, 1994; Brown & Ahlburg, 1999) used aid agency data to underpin claims that monies remitted to the Pacific region were a form of investment in the formal
economies of Pacific Island states. Brown, Leeves and Pryaga (2014) noted that it was pressure by people in the homelands that led to their New Zealand-based families remitting funds to people who not easily associated [in Palangi terms of genealogy] with the immediate family unit for consumption purposes.

A study which included Pacific scholars presented a Pacific interpretation of investment motivations which they saw employed by Pacific peoples when remitting funds to their homelands. Marsters, Lewis and Friesen (2006) explained that remittances from places such as New Zealand were a demonstration of networks coming together to invest, in support of cultural practices of relationship maintenance in the traditional homelands. The study noted that village elders, in constant conversation with community leaders in New Zealand, determined the need for resources in the homeland and worked out the best strategies to ensure financial and goods transfer in a manner that ensured the sustainability of people both in the remitting and receiving environments (Marsters, et al., 2006, p. 42-43).

**Framing of ‘others’ in policy documents**

I wanted to understand the influence of Pacific values of collectivism and relationships in government policy discussion. This question was made more urgent following a review of various government-funded reports that have influenced policy discussions relating to Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing. While one report presented Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing from a Pacific-values and relationship-based perspective (Koloto and Sharma, 2005) other reports resonated with individual consumer-choice logic (Stuart et al, 2012) and notions of wealth transfer (NZIER, 2005). It is important to note at this point that the reports by the NZIER and Stuart et al. had input from authors of Pacific ethnicity. Therefore, the
question of Pacific peoples’ influence in the framing of Pacific peoples is significant as possible answers could provide perspectives into the challenges faced by those Pacific peoples engaged in policy making.

The framing of Pacific peoples in New Zealand government policy is an area of social science that has not had a significant amount of attention. My search for literature on the subject revealed a small number of studies (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009) which focussed on the influence of Pacific cultural values in Pacific peoples’ success in operating policy-making systems in New Zealand government departments. These studies were significant contributors to my research, and will be discussed, later in this chapter, as a critical analysis of literature that has described the setting of policy by New Zealand governments.

The next section focusses on the ways in which policy-making systems enable Pacific peoples to be represented in policy discussions and outcomes. It includes a review of literature into the establishment of policy-making institutions and practices during state sector reforms between 1984 and 2008 and the establishment of a New Public Management (NPM) model in New Zealand. The literature emphasises that policy making in New Zealand is not the result of ad hoc events by a community of policy makers who choose various policy agendas and programmes. Instead, policy making in New Zealand is a complex environment of rules, systems, practices and relationships.

**Policy-making in New Zealand – New Public Management (NPM) and State Sector Reforms**

It is necessary to identify the origins of policy-making institutions and practices in New Zealand, as the systems of protocols and relationships in place between 1998
and 2013, the period covered by this study, were the result of public sector reforms, significant events in New Zealand political history and purposeful design. Boston et al., (1996) wrote that “as in many other advanced industrialised democracies, public indebtedness, fiscal imperatives and the resultant need for a much more efficient public sector were decisive influences” (p.16).

Between 1990 and 2010 there was a significant amount of literature on the public sector reforms in New Zealand and the NPM model. The reforms, which began under the fourth Labour Government between 1984 and 1990, included the passing of the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986, State Services Act 1988 and the Public Finance Act 1989 (Boston et al., 1996; Duncan & Chapman, 2010). The passage of these Acts were milestones that signalled the philosophical intentions of the government, and the practical implications that followed.

Several studies have noted that the NPM-styled reforms of the 1980s and 1990s were influenced by Public Choice Theory, Agency Theory and Transaction-Cost Economics (Boston et al, 1996; Nagel, 1997, Duncan & Chapman, 2010; Goldfinch & Roberts, 2013). Boston et al. (1996) wrote “The central tenet of the public choice approach is that all human behaviour is dominated by self-interest” (p. 17). The prominence of an individualistic and self-interest-oriented motive underpinning the reforms could be seen in the application of incentive structures for departmental managers facing budget constraints (McLean, 1986) and the notion that policy users could be seen as consumers (Self, 1985).

Boston et al. (1996) noted that as economic theories became influential in the NPM-based state sector reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, ministries with financial responsibilities, such as the Treasury, became prominent in policy agenda and
setting processes (Duncan & Chapman, 2010). The Public Finance Act 1989 required government departments and ministries to organise their appropriations by outputs, such as policy advice. Under the Public Finance Act 1989, departments were also required to set out a series of tangible outcomes, referred to as Strategic Result Areas, or Key Result Areas (Boston et al., 1996) or Ministerial Priorities and Outcomes (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2013).

**Policy-making in the New Zealand NPM environment**

Studies have reported that the NPM environment has influenced the policy agenda and policy advice systems in the three decades following the state sector reforms (Boston et al., 1996; Nagel, 1997; Duncan & Chapman, 2010). For my particular study it was important to explore the various aspects of the relationship between NPM and policy making that influenced either the steps taken in the policy-making process or the environment policy-making occurs in. Of particular interest in this study were:

- The separation of agencies that advised government ministers on policy from those agencies responsible for the delivery of services to the public. Duncan & Chapman (2010) noted that separation was needed so that advisers could be accountable to ministers through having advice that was seen to be contestable;

- The creation of specialised policy agencies which were designed to give decision makers expert policy advice (Pallot, 1998);

- The creation of government strategies and related measurable outcomes in the Budget Policy Statement, as a result of the Fiscal Responsibility Act (1994) (Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002);
The act of government ministers purchasing advice from ministries via output classes in Estimates of Appropriations – which required quality control monitoring mechanisms such as the Statement of Service Performance (Boston et al., 1996).

**The role of evidence in the policy environment**

A review of policy sector literature revealed that statistics became increasingly important to policy makers, as a means to justify the need for a particular policy agenda (Treasury, 1987; Boston et al., 1996; Schick, 2001; Cheyne, O’Brien & Belgrave, 2005; Tenbensel, 2004; Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005). However few authors have explicitly discussed the origins of statistical and other evidence being necessary in setting policy agenda. Shaw and Eichbaum (2005) noted: “The new direction is keeping with the embrace, internationally, of an evidence-based approach to policy, characterised by the systematic collection of evidence and its incorporation in the design and delivery of policy” (2005, p.31). The rise of evidence-based policy-making in the health sector, however, was met by scepticism from clinicians, concerned that the complexities of treatments and patient support would be lost. Tenbsensel (2004) noted: “some clinicians have been dismissive of the evidence-based medicine movement, regarding it as an approach that fosters ‘cookbook medicine’ and constitutes a threat to clinical autonomy” (p. 194).

Another viewpoint on the origins of evidence-based policy making in New Zealand is that an emphasis on measurable outcomes and accountability is a consequence of ministers needing to be seen to be a part of a wider strategic policy goal (Pallot, 1998; Schick, 2001). The relationship between budget appropriations and wider government strategies is a consequence of rules contained in the Public Finance Act
1989. The Act required ministers to compel agencies to prove that outcomes were achieved and that those outcomes were associated with government-wide strategies (Boston et al., 1996). Kibblewhite and Ussher (2002) noted that government-wide strategic goals have been used as a tool to prioritise the allocation of funds to competing outcomes and government departments during annual budget appropriation rounds. Schick (2001) argued that between 1989 and 1998 there was tension between the needs of ministers to solve problems inside government strategic parameters and policy advice agencies attempting to remain within budget and accountability constraints. Schick wrote: “While [State Sector] managers focus on the minutiae of internal operations, ministers are interested in how to use their authority and resources to shape New Zealand’s future. The connection between the political and managerial world is impaired if each side remains absorbed in its own narrow concerns” (p. 5).

In my literature review, I also found that the values of policy-makers and policy-analysts were influential in the advancement of evidence-based policy-making in New Zealand. Marston & Watts (2003) noted “The concept of evidence-based policy has an intuitive common sense logic, which partly explains how it has become so naturalised in a diverse range of policy settings” (p. 144). However, St John & Dale (2012) argued “statistical methods designed for an idealised world may rely on some assumptions that make the results questionable” (p. 40). They went on to note that policy processes, which included a reliance on evidence, were likely to have been influenced by the normative values of both policy makers and policy analysts.
The role of policy agents and relationships in policy making

Studies (Boston et al., 1996; Nagel, 1997; Washington, 1998; Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005) have suggested that as a result of the institutions, conventions and behaviours created during the New Zealand State Sector reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, policy making has relied on agents in strategic positions, such as advisers, lobbyists, agency managers, consultants and ministers, and the relationships between those agents. The need for agents and relationships emerged as a response to the creation of policy-focussed departments, purchase agreements and performance management mechanisms, such as Statements of Service Performance, Annual Reports and Pre-Budget Briefings (Boston et al, 1996; Nagel, 1997; Washington, 1998; Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002; Duncan & Chapman, 2010). Nagel (1997) explained that in the 1980s, Treasury was one of the few departments to have a policy advisory capability and had provided a significant amount of advice during a fiscal crisis in the early days of the fourth Labour government term in 1984. In retrospect, the advice given by Treasury policy advisers was seen by authors (Nagel, 1997; Duncan & Chapman, 2010) as a catalyst for the establishment of a policy advice system in the New Zealand State Sector.

Literature indicated that government ministers held a significant amount of power in New Zealand’s policy-making system. Aside from the power entrusted to government ministers through the Public Finance Act 1989, Boston et al. (1996) noted that the State Sector Act 1988 gave ministers greater involvement in the recruiting of public service chief executives and their performance management. Boston et al. (1996) also noted that as a result of the NPM model, ministers were able to call on different experts to provide policy advice including policy advisers, think tanks, academics,
community leaders and lobby groups. Shaw and Eichbaum (2005) noted the parties available to policy makers were utilised at various stages of policy-making process.

Table 2-1 The Policy cycle: Stages, Activities, and Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Policy Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda-setting</td>
<td>• Identifying political values</td>
<td>• Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deciding which issues demand government attention</td>
<td>• MPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ranking policy priorities</td>
<td>• Public servants/advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing the agenda</td>
<td>• Judges (judicial review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responding to new issues</td>
<td>• Interest groups/citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employer/employee groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating policy</td>
<td>• Researching policy issues</td>
<td>• Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consulting with interests</td>
<td>• Public servants/advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying policy goals</td>
<td>• Caucus committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying possible actions</td>
<td>• Select committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessing costs and benefits of alternatives</td>
<td>• Policy consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interest groups/citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employer/employee groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions</td>
<td>• Sifting through the options</td>
<td>• Ministers in Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action or non-action?</td>
<td>• Public servants/advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>• Choosing policy instruments</td>
<td>• MPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drafting/passing legislation</td>
<td>• Government Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allocating resources</td>
<td>• State sector providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Designing programmes</td>
<td>• Non-state providers (e.g. iwi/voluntary agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicising programmes</td>
<td>• Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivering services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>• Is policy achieving goals?</td>
<td>• Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it cost efficient?</td>
<td>• Caucus Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it fair/equitable?</td>
<td>• Select Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it be improved?</td>
<td>• Public Servants/Advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should it be changed?</td>
<td>• Employer/employee groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interest groups/citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Shaw and Eichbaum, 2005, p16)

The role of cultural and normative values in the creation of a New Zealand policy-making system

Despite the literature describing the recognised policy-making systems in New Zealand, which discuss the impact of knowledge experts, writers like Boston et al.
(1996), Washington (1998) and Shaw & Eichbaum (2005) have not linked policy systems or experts to the possibility that, as was the case with Pacific peoples’, cultural values were a driver of economic wellbeing or development behaviours.

I was also unable to find literature that discussed the possibility that cultural values, in particular Pacific values, could be influential in the policy making or analysis processes. Boston et al. (1996) noted that through entities devoted to the advancement of population groups, the policy-making systems of New Zealand were designed to accommodate the viewpoints of groups in society, such as Pacific peoples. However, as previously noted, the normative values of policy makers in large and influential departments have been influential in determining the acceptability of some logic and values systems over others (see; Waring, 1999; p.182; St. John & Dale, 2012, p. 41). Therefore it is important to explore if the policy system worked as the design had intended. A search for literature that directly critiqued the establishment of policy-making systems in New Zealand during the 1984-1998 reform era from a population group policy perspective proved fruitless. There has, however, been a small and valuable group of authors, whose writings have given me helpful insights to aid in the critique of policy system architects’ and agents’ intentions.

Durie (2004) proposed that the policy systems used in the New Zealand Government included a culture where ruling elites could act out their feelings of superiority over people from other ethnic groups. He explained that the formation of New Zealand statutes by the first government reflected the English Laws Act 1854 which extended British laws to New Zealand and which established the concept of common law in New Zealand. Durie (2004) noted that due to the desired objectives of the Crown, the establishment of the British legal system overrode the traditional forms of
governance established among Māori tribal groups at the time. In a speech, Salmond (2013) noted that, in her work as an academic and educationalist, she had encountered government decisions and policy-making that reflected a normative culture where political elites felt entitled to rule over Māori and Pacific populations. Salmond likened the impact of such cultures on policy and decision-making to the Order of Relations. She believed that a prolonged focus on racial difference would lead policy makers to ignore the commonalities formed in society at large.

Rather than seeing Maori and Pakeha, or Maori and Pasifika, or for that matter, Kiwi and Asian, as binary opposites with some kind of Berlin Wall between them, these are increasingly understood as linked across the middle ground – the pae (2013, no page reference)

The viewpoints of Durie and Salmond illuminated cultural marginalisation in policy-advice systems at the time of their writing. However, for this study, it is important to explore the normative cultural assumptions made by the architects of New Zealand’s policy-making systems in the critical reform period of 1984 to 1998. I was unable to find studies that made direct reference to purposeful marginalisation of population groups’ economic wellbeing policy needs or aspirations. I have relied on the writings of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and Marilyn Waring (1999) to support a critique of mainstream normative cultures, and the economic assumptions they influence. The two studies I have referenced are of cultural ignorance towards Māori indigenous knowledge in academic research (Smith, 1999), a patriarchal basis for assumptions made in policy arguments and the ignorance of the economic value of unpaid work undertaken by women supporting families and communities as reported [or not] in national accounting systems (Waring, 1999).

Smith (1999) noted that in educational research, normative mainstream values, such as the need for dominant theories, ownership of information and authority of
legitimate scholarship was needed to make research acceptable in a mainstream sense.

This form of global knowledge is generally referred to as ‘universal knowledge’, available to all and not really ‘owned’ by anyone, that is, until non-Western scholars make claims to it. When claims like that are made, history is revised (again) so that the story of civilisation remains the story of the West. (p. 64).

Waring explored the significance of patriarchal assumptions and superiority as she discussed an experience she had had when she asked a former Australian government statistician, Ron Fergie, to comment on a paper she had prepared for a presentation (1999, p. 76 - 89). Her paper addressed the invisibility of women’s work as an input to national economies, the invisibility of women as beneficiaries of an economy’s success and the patriarchal ideology that created the economic invisibility of women. Waring’s paper was based on her experience of meeting, talking and working with women from different places (and economies), including Papua New Guinea and Canada. Waring (1999) wrote “To Fergie, my observations of facts are not, apparently, academic, though views informed by a patriarchal ideology apparently are, and such views are also, of course, scientific” (p. 78).

Waring found that when she challenged the architects and operators of the United Nations System of National Accounts (UNSNA) over their inability to reflect the economic realities of women, the defences she received highlighted the sense of entitlement enjoyed by the authors of the UNSNA.

Reasons given by men for their failure to account for women’s work are (1) conceptual problems and (2) the practical difficulties of collecting data. It does not seem to occur to them that if you have a conceptual problem about the activity of half the human species, you then have a conceptual problem about the whole. As a result, the categories for work for which information is collected are ill-defined and biased towards market activity (p.65)
The findings by Smith (1999) and Waring (1999) were valuable in forming viewpoints through which government policy documents could be analysed in this study. The possibility that the framing of Pacific peoples in policy documents and outcomes are the result of systems, processes and opinions engineered by people who are ignorant, either wilfully or otherwise, of others’ economic reality is significant.

**Pacific peoples inside policy-making systems**

As discussed earlier in this chapter, literature about the New Zealand policy-making and government management system has claimed that informed policy discussion, carried out with the input of subject-matter experts, is a significant factor in the success of policy making, especially for policies directed at population groups. Boston et al. (1996) noted that as part of the State Sector reforms of the 1980s and 1990s the policy and service-delivery functions of government departments were separated, to ensure that policy advice could be specific and accurate enough to meet strategic goals. It was in that spirit that the MPIA was established as a stand-alone entity in 1990 and then as a policy-focused entity in 1998 (which is discussed further on pages 42-55). The presence of a specific policy advice department, reporting to a policy-making minister meant that a space for Pacific policy making was legitimised – and leaders hoped that Pacific people would be key in delivering policy advice (McCarthy, 2001). However, the participation of Pacific peoples in the recognised process or system has been limited to a small proportion of Pacific policy makers, and an even small number of Pacific policy managers and politicians (State Services Commission, 2004; 2013a).

In 2003, 7% of the 30,000 people who worked in the public sector identified as Pacific peoples. This figure had risen from 3.3% in 1986 to 5.4% in 2001. Of the total
Pacific public sector workforce, 18% were listed as being case workers, 7% were social workers, and 7% were prison officers (State Services Commission, 2004). The SSC found that people of Pacific ethnicity were more likely to be employed by a service-delivery focussed organisation, and less likely to work for organisations that focussed on policy. In fact 60% of the Pacific workforce in the public sector was employed by The Ministry of Social Development, The Department of Corrections, The Department for Child Youth and Family and the Inland Revenue Department.

Pacific peoples were noticeably absent from the managerial ranks of the New Zealand public service. While management accounted for approximately 10% of the public service in 2003, less than 1.4% of the people in that management layer were Pacific peoples. The representation of Pacific peoples at management levels in the public sector had dropped from 1.6% in 1999 to 1.4% in 2003 (State Services Commission, 2004). The proportion of Pacific peoples in senior management positions remained less than 2% between 2009 and 2013 (State Services Commission, 2013a). The State Services Commission pointed to a gradual decrease in the numbers of senior managers, related to the size of the total public sector, between 2009 and 2013. Therefore an increase in the percentage of Pacific senior managers from 1.5 in 2009 to 1.8 in 2013 would only have been achievable due to Pacific peoples’ retaining or attaining roles when others were disestablished (State Services Commission, 2013a).

For this study, it is important to understand the impacts of policy-making systems, and the parties who were able to be involved, from the perspective of Pacific peoples as a population group identified in policy documents, and as a subject of policy agendas. A literature review into the impact of the systems on representation found that the underlying premises of the NPM-based policy system and resulting
assumptions in policy-system design, which involved ideologies and philosophies, both implied and intentional, were a significant contributor to the representation of Pacific peoples in policy documents.

Despite numerous studies into policy making in the State Sector reforms in New Zealand’s government system, and an increasing realm of scholarship into government policies and Pasifika peoples in New Zealand, there have been no studies linking the underlying assumptions of government policy making to Pacific world views and related identities. The chasm between the world views of the architects of the NPM-led policy-making system and the world views of Pacific peoples is first seen by comparing the economic theoretical basis that underpins NPM and the cultural commonalities expressed by Pacific scholars. Self wrote (1985) “political parties have become entrepreneurs who offer competing packages of services and taxes in exchange for votes” (p 51). However, the experiences of Pacific politicians have presented an alternative viewpoint about the diversity of policies and the presence of politicians. Former Member of Parliament Arthur Anae wrote that his campaigning for a seat in parliament was an extension of the traditional Samoan culture of service. He noted “God gives us the talents to live in this world and encourages us to use them to the fullest. I was cognisant of the Samoan saying ‘O le ala i le pule, o le tautua’ – ‘the path to leadership is through service’” (Anae, in Macpherson, Spoonley & Anae, 2001, p. 274).

Anae and Macpherson (2008) and Makisi (2009) found that Pacific policy makers utilised the Pacific values of networking and relationship building in their efforts to create relevant spaces within policy-making processes. Macpherson & Anae (2008) explained:
This type of good-faith, no-surprises partnership with other ministries and agencies has resulted in institutional development in the agencies which in turn has allowed all to agree on objectives, timetables and on the means of monitoring progress, in ways which were not formerly possible (p. 52-53)

Research Question 2: What has been the role of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) in representing Pasifika peoples in policy-making processes?

The establishment of government activities supporting Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing

Few studies have been carried out as critical analyses of the influence and impact of Pacific peoples in New Zealand Government policy-making spaces. In 2008 and 2009, two studies explored the influence of relationships, underpinned by Pacific values, on the advancement of Pacific peoples’ policy making (Macpherson & Anae, 2008) and the establishment of a specifically Pacific policy agenda (Makisi, 2009). Analytically, it is important to explore the various government policies and agendas which were intentionally designed to influence Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing. I searched for literature about various government approaches to Pacific peoples’ advancement between the 1960s and 2010s, with the assistance of librarians, as well as through searches of catalogues, newspaper articles and the reference lists of other academic studies.

Government policies directed towards Pacific peoples emerged in 1975 when the National Party pledged, in its election campaign, to introduce English language tuition for Pacific migrants to New Zealand (McCluskey, 2008, p.119). Meanwhile, in 1976, the National Government promised to support Pacific peoples’ access to loans to build or purchase houses through a programme delivered by the Maori Affairs
department. The programme was open to Pacific peoples who had been legitimately resident for the previous five years (New Zealand Government, 1968; McCluskey, 2008, p. 147).

**Building a base for Pacific policy 1960-1980**

The Third Labour Government between 1972 and 1975, and the Third National Government between 1975 and 1978, set a foundation for constructing policy that was relevant to Pacific peoples by extending the provisions made by governments which sat in the 1960s (McCluskey, 2008). The Second National Government (1960 to 1972) passed the Maori and Island Affairs Department Act in 1968 (New Zealand Government, 1968) which created a central liaison point between New Zealand and its Pacific Island territories, which were the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau. The 1968 legislation also provided an authorised central location for government administration of Pacific peoples resident in New Zealand. By 1974 the Maori and Island Affairs department had been restructured and, in doing so, removed all references to its obligations to Pacific peoples both in the islands and in New Zealand (New Zealand Government, 1974). The *Maori Affairs Amendment Act (1974)* was enacted following the transfer of government responsibilities for Pacific region relationships to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministry of Justice, 2000). The amendment act also removed its overt links to support for Pacific peoples who were residents of New Zealand. Governments continued to call upon the Department of Maori Affairs to deliver the home loan and community support programmes that it had pledged to offer (Rata, in Department of Maori Affairs, 1975; McCluskey, 2008).
Emerging to a specifically Pacific policy space 1984-1997

In 1984, a newly elected Labour Government appointed the first Minister of Pacific Island Affairs, and in 1985 it established the Pacific Island Affairs Unit which was dedicated to policy development within the Department of Internal Affairs. Alongside the Department of Internal Affairs office was an Advisory Council of Pacific leaders and experts established to support the Minister of Pacific Island Affairs. Between 1984 and 1990, the Pacific Island Affairs Unit drafted reports and papers, and the Minister was given information by the unit’s Chief Executive and the Advisory Council, from which decisions were made. Public programmes were subsequently delivered by the Department for Maori Affairs (Macpherson & Anae, 2008).

By 1989, the Maori Affairs Restructuring Act (1989) (New Zealand Government, 1989) had created a new environment for the development of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. The Department of Māori Affairs moved the delivery of its contracted social and development services to tribally based groups, known in New Zealand as Iwi Authorities. As Pacific peoples did not fall under tribal registries, the Department of Māori Affairs opened offices in four separate locations to ensure that services the government had pledged were able to be delivered (Ministry of Justice, 2000).

MPIA was created in 1990 and took over the four offices and government programmes. The creation of a separate Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, outside of another government unit or department, signalled that the government wanted to move away from influencing the lives of Pacific peoples through ad-hoc actions. McCarthy (2001) believed that the government of the day wanted to be influential through policy that was carefully considered and outcomes that were delivered systematically.
In 1996, MPIA was threatened with closure following a government-wide review of units’ and departments’ performance. The ongoing operation of the Ministry was finally secured in 1997 when statistical evidence pointed to Pacific peoples’ social and economic deprivation which required policy solutions. It was then decided that the Ministry’s public-facing programmes would become the responsibility of other government departments, and MPIA transformed into an agency solely devoted to developing relevant policy (Macpherson & Anae, 2008).

**Government focus on Pacific economic development 1985-2010**

The focus of government to see Pacific peoples take on business opportunities was seen when the Minister of Pacific Island Affairs in the Fourth Labour government, Richard Prebble, established an entity to provide business training and mentoring to Pacific entrepreneurs. This was known as The Pacific Islands Business Development Trust, later known as the Pacific Business Trust (PBT), in 1985. The PBT was required by government to deliver business development seminars and courses to people from Pacific communities. It was also required to maintain relationships with government departments which were involved in the business development sector (Pacific Business Trust, 2011). PBT also acted as a funding provider, offering business start-up or development loans of up to $100,000 (Pacific Business Trust 2006), However, according to its 2008 annual reports, the PBT placed lending activities on hold (Pacific Business Trust, 2008). Loan fees and interest did not feature in the PBT annual report’s Statement of Comprehensive Income in 2011 (Pacific Business Trust, 2011).

In return for its funding, which was allocated through government budget appropriations (Treasury, 1999; Treasury, 2000, Treasury, 2001; Treasury 2005),
PBT was required under the Public Finance Act (State Services Commission, 2013) to keep government updated on its progress. Progress was measured through targets that the Trust had to achieve to increase the numbers of people attending its seminars and training courses. PBT was also required to report on its involvement in events in Pacific business communities (Treasury, 2009; Pacific Business Trust, 2011). In 2013, PBT achieved 41 of its 49 agreed outputs.

There has been little research into the effectiveness of the PBT, or the impact of the trust, on the commercial success of Pacific-owned businesses and their combined contribution to Pacific peoples’ economic development. Studies into Tongan-owned businesses in New Zealand (Prescott, 2009; Finau, 2011) have noted that PBT played a welcome role for some business owners by providing access to government grants, loan funding, education and advice.

The small amount of research into the efficacy of the PBT noted that Tongan-business owners’ viewpoints on sustainability and business management have differed from those promoted by the Trust’s education programmes. Prescott (2009) explained that businesses often completed business plans, as advised by the Trust, as a means to secure lending from PBT, only to abandon those plans after receiving funds, which ultimately led to the demise of the business. Prescott (2009) also noted that business failure statistics for PBT-funded or incubated businesses were unclear. He explained that some businesses cut off contact with PBT after receiving loans or grants.

**MPIA and evidence-based policy**

A scan of policy-making literature reveals that the contributions made by MPIA to evidence-based policy, inside recognised policy-making systems and spaces, has
not been reflected in academic discourse. The lack of literature on the subjects of evidence-based policy making, by and for Pacific people, restricted my ability to conduct a critical review of the information available. However government documents have provided evidence for use in policy-making processes (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002; NZIER, 2005, Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2010), as has literature discussing the role of Pacific world views in spaces related to the delivery of health policy programmes for Pacific peoples in New Zealand (Tamasese et al, 2010; Fairbairn-Dunlop, Nanai & Ahio, 2014).

In producing policies, New Zealand’s policy makers from mainstream departments have relied on statistical information to inform their viewpoint of the Pacific population, its needs and its behaviours. The relevance of policy makers’ reliance on statistics, and the assumptions made during construction and interrogation of data, was significant to this study. An MPIA and Statistics New Zealand report (2002) noted estimated population data trends. The preparation of the Pacific Progress report (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002) was a direct response to a perceived need for more comprehensive and accurate evidence to inform government policy analysts whose role was to provide policy advice on the economic status of Pacific peoples. “It is expected that this report will provide valuable information for the work of government agencies as they develop policies, programmes and services to address the social and economic inequalities that hinder Pacific peoples’ ability to build on the already significant contribution they are making to New Zealand” (p. ii)

In 2005, MPIA contracted a consultancy agency, the New Zealand Institute for Economic Research (NZIER), to compile updated economic indicator data and
provide analysis of Pacific peoples’ economic position. The Economic Participation Report (NZIER, 2005) was significant in that it represented an intention by MPIA to engage in the mainstream policy system using a recognised economic expert agency, and by advocating for strategic outcomes for Pacific peoples using recognised data sources. The report was also significant in that it proposed the notion that Pacific peoples’ lower-than-average incomes could present risks to the budgets of future governments if wages and incomes were not lifted to being equal with other parts of society (NZIER, 2005, p. iii).

In 2008, MPIA contracted another consultancy agency, Martin Jenkins, to prepare a framework that described outcomes related to the economic wellbeing of Pacific families in New Zealand (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2008a). The outcomes framework was different from the Pacific Prosperity Report (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, 2010a, 2010b) and the Economic Participation Report (NZIER, 2005) in that the focus was taken away from statistical information alone and directed towards the collation of government strategy statements on the determinants of wellbeing. The report acknowledged a hybrid space between Pacific values and a utility maximisation perspective that was expressed by MPIA staff involved in setting the report’s research parameters. The report noted:

Financial priorities for many Pacific people centre on maintaining relationships, meeting immediate family needs, donations to the church, and contributions to immediate and extended family. Having a higher income may be seen as a way of improving the ability to distribute more wealth through the family and community. These actions may be regarded as a form of savings and investment – for the community good, and for the individual (through reciprocity later in life). (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2008a, p. 8)
In 2010, MPIA produced two more reports under the Pacific Progress brand, which it began with Statistics New Zealand in 2002. The reports on educational attainment (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2010a) and demography (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2010b) contained statistical information from the Ministry of Education and Statistics New Zealand respectively. As stated in the prefaces, the two 2010 reports remained focused on providing policy makers with accurate information regarding the progression of Pacific peoples as recorded in officially sanctioned data. The introductions to the two reports also noted that MPIA had, by 2010, taken a role of monitoring the effectiveness of other agencies’ policy advice and programme delivery. It was unclear from the reports whether or not that monitoring had become a formalised function of MPIA. However the 2010 Estimates of Appropriations for MPIA pointed to a significant achievement for Pacific peoples’ policy as MPIA was recognised as a formal part of the process, as its output classes included an expense line for Policy and Monitoring (Treasury, 2010).

The series of reports from MPIA raises questions as to the ministry’s impact inside the design of the New Zealand policy system, its purchase agreements and also the impact of Pacific policy advisers within. These reports emerged during the State Sector reform era in which policy-focused agencies were tasked with providing accurate advice on specialised and strategic policy issues (Boston et al., 1996; Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002; Chapman & Davis, 2010). Boston et al. (1996) noted that the intentions of the State Sector reforms were for a policy system which included policy-specific agencies that represented the interests of particular population groups, and that those agencies would be staffed by advisers with expert knowledge of the population groups being represented.
With the design intentions in mind, there are two points to note: MPIA contracted the services of consultants who were not Pacific in ethnicity, and consultants produced reports using statistics that were representative of Palangi constructs. Pacific values were present, in reports such as those from the NZIER (NZIER, 2005) and Martin Jenkins (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2008) where the authors acknowledged that Pacific peoples on their project teams, although not their main researchers, had raised issues of Pacific values related to relationships, spirituality and service. Those events, however, did not appear to have a wide-ranging influence on the final reports, as the final reports remained rooted in notions of utility maximisation and transaction-cost theories.

**MPIA and policy agenda setting**

A search for literature with established viewpoints on the role of MPIA in the setting of, or influence in, cross-government policy agendas resulted in no references. The literature on the establishment of policy systems in New Zealand (Boston, et al., 1996; Washington, 1998; Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005; Duncan & Chapman, 2010) and the motivations of MPIA policy advisers in creating relationship management and navigating policy agenda settings (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009) together illustrates the experiences and contexts that shaped the efforts of MPIA policy advisers.

Studies have noted that in the 15 years after the 1984 State Sector reforms, the New Zealand government faced challenges between the interpretations of policy-making ministers and public sector policy managers of strategic outcomes about driving government policy and delivery activities (Boston et al., 1996; Washington, 1998; Duncan & Chapman, 2010). Makisi (2009) proposed that following a review of MPIA
which was conducted by the State Services Commission in 1997, leading to the closure of the Ministry’s operational division, MPIA was faced with criticism of its efficacy as a policy ministry. In addition, community groups had been hurt by the removal of an MPIA presence in the urban centres of Porirua, Christchurch and Hamilton and provincial centres of Nelson, Hastings and Tokoroa (2009, p. 32-35).

Makisi (2009) proposed that MPIA took incremental steps in its transformation towards being focussed on policy advice, based on what it believed was logical, from examining the mood of the community, the state sector, its minister and its staff. He explained that in the context of the State Services Commission review outcome, the Ministry had to first divest itself of its delivery functions which were transferred to other organisations, its local offices and the Pacific Island Employment and Social Development Advisory board. After this, a group of Pacific-ethnic policy analysts was recruited to MPIA from across the public sector.

By 1998, when Fuimaono Les McCarthy was recruited as the chief executive of MPIA, staff at the Ministry began to create a proactive strategic vision for the goals of Pacific communities (Macpherson & Anae, 2008). Both Macpherson and Anae (2008) and Makisi (2009) noted that previous criticisms made towards the efficacy of the Ministry as a policy adviser, and the State Services Commission review, were of significant concern to the senior policy staff and the chief executive of MPIA. McCarthy explained: “Initially, while the Ministry was called upon by mainstream agencies to render comments on policy at a draft stage, it was effectively excluded from participating in mainstream policy at the development stage” (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2000, p2). Macpherson and Anae (2008) wrote that senior policy staff at MPIA believed the way to being seen as effective by policy agency peers was to
develop a “comprehensive policy programme of its own into which other agencies could buy” (p. 39).

Both studies that have provided details enabling me to map the strategic policy agenda setting by MPIA noted that it was a spirit of developing a proactive strategy which guided the actions of Ministry staff in the period between 1998 and 2000 (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009). In 1998, staff from the Ministry held consultation meetings with community leaders and local government agencies in 11 regional and provincial centres including Invercargill, Dunedin, Christchurch, Nelson, Wellington, Hastings, Tokoroa, Hamilton and Auckland. The purpose of the meetings was to re-establish relationships with local government officials and community leaders who had been separated from Ministry contact following the demise of the Ministry’s regional presence the previous year. Makisi (2009) also noted that the meetings gauged the mood of local Pacific communities about the key issues facing Pacific peoples in different regions and the various viewpoints about government intervention. He also explained that the meetings gave the opportunity to take stock of initiatives running in local communities that addressed development or economic wellbeing issues, with a view to knowledge about those local programmes informing potential future policy discussions.

Makisi (2009) explained that senior policy staff at MPIA decided to evolve their position to a cohesive proactive strategic-policy approach by taking three steps. The first was to outline the problems that policy would solve by producing a series of data-driven information reports. The second was to crowdssource the viewpoints of business, academic and political leaders, senior public servants, Pacific community leaders and young people on the key strategic goals of Pacific communities and the possible solutions either underway or in the future. The third stage was to combine
the data, viewpoints and a plan of action into a strategic document for endorsement by government. The first step, the Pacific Vision report, was produced in early 1999. The Pacific Vision report was used to inform delegates who were invited to attend the Pacific Vision conference in Auckland, in July 1999. By October 1999, the data from the reports and feedback from conference delegates had been synthesised into a draft version of the Pacific Directions Framework report. Makisi (2009) noted that staff from MPIA presented the report to Pacific politicians who were standing for electorate and party seats in the General Election, which took place in November 1999. The Pacific Directions Framework was formally signed off on the 15th December 1999, five days after the establishment of the incoming government (Macpherson & Anae, 2008), and included the following key strategic areas (Makisi, 2009, p. 41):

- Achieving social prosperity
- Fostering economic strength
- Building leaders
- Making progress

The period between the formation of the Fifth Labour Government in early December 1999 and the reading of the budget in May 2000 was a time when MPIA leadership and policy staff were required to rapidly produce a comprehensive approach to strategic policy for government endorsement. Makisi (2009) explained that the MPIA chief executive established the Chief Executives Steering Group, the Pacific Strategy Senior Officials Group and the Pacific Reference Group from the delegates of the Pacific Vision conference. The Chief Executives Steering Group and Pacific Strategy Senior Officials Group were made up of representatives from the Ministries of Health, Commerce, Foreign Affairs and Trade, Justice, Education, Social Policy (which later became the Ministry of Social Development), the Department of Labour, Statistics New Zealand, the Education Review Office, the State Services
Commission, Housing New Zealand and the Tertiary Education Commission. The Pacific Reference Group was made up of Pacific community leaders and representatives. The role of the two groups that represented government agencies was to formalise their buy-in to the strategic goals and to assist in the design of policy interventions that would help achieve those goals. The role of the Pacific Reference Group was to maintain communications with Pacific community leaders to ensure that policy interventions and strategic goals remained aligned to the communities’ goals.

Macpherson and Anae (2008) noted that the establishment of the Pacific Directions Framework report as policy was influenced by political processes and the intentions of the in-coming Fifth Labour Government. The creation of the Cabinet Committee on Closing the Gaps (CCCG) by the Prime Minister, and the committee’s concern for the economic outcomes’ improvement of Maori and Pacific peoples, created a “ready-made foundation” (Macpherson & Anae, 2008, p. 45) upon which the government and Ministry could discuss the strategic goals set out in the Pacific Directions Framework report. Makisi (2009) explained that following the endorsement of the Pacific Directions Framework report, MPIA was directed by Cabinet to lead a pilot programme that related to Pacific Capacity Building (PCB). Treasury (2000) noted that MPIA was funded under an output class to contract out to local providers the establishment of PCB Groups in Wellington, Auckland, Hamilton and Christchurch and report to the CCCG on progress. Makisi (2009) wrote that cabinet intended the PCB system to encourage Pacific communities to “identify their aspirations and priorities and, in collaboration with government agencies, develop action plans to address these” (p. 44). However, in the view of Macpherson and
Anae (2008), the Labour government associated the Pacific Directions Framework report with the previous National government.

Macpherson and Anae (2008) wrote that MPIA reframed the Pacific Directions Framework report into eight regional plans of action, in consultation with local community leaders. The creation of the regional plans of action for Auckland City, Waitakere City, Manukau City, North Shore City, Hamilton, Hutt Valley, Porirua and Christchurch included the establishment of Community Reference Groups in each centre where a plan of action had been created to address issues of economic development, justice, governance and social development. According to Macpherson & Anae (2008), staff from MPIA travelled to the eight regions to present draft local action plans and consult on local approaches. Makisi (2009) noted that the regional plan-of-action process was a part of the PCB project, in which information from the Pacific Directions Framework report was replayed to local groups who were tasked with determining their own needs and aspirations for synthesis into a plan of action.

The establishment of the regional plans of action, the PCB programme and the formation of Community Reference Groups (the Pacific Reference Group, the Chief Executives Steering Group and the Pacific Strategy Senior Officials Group) marked a turning point in the reputation MPIA had as being a quality provider of policy advice. Both Macpherson & Anae (2008) and Makisi (2009) noted that the management of the policy portfolio from 2000 to 2005 contained periods of evaluating the number and scope of reference groups, and mediating between those groups and other agencies. MPIA demonstrated that it was possible to establish a strategic direction for Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing policy within the policy constructs in which the ministry was established in 1990.
Chapter 3 Research Design and Methods

“Ala ‘i Sia, Ala ‘i Kolonga” – “Skillful at the Sia, Skillful at the Kolonga”

In the snaring of Pigeons (the heu lupe), the trapper was honoured for their skills of trapping (at the Sia – the trapping place) and cooking (at the Kolonga – the cooking place). This proverb is in honour of the trapper.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section discusses the research design of this qualitative phenomenological study. The second section outlines the research design and processes, including the selection of participants, data collection and analysis, as well as ethical considerations. A method of semi-structured interview, known in traditional Pacific terms as Talanoa, was used to collect interview data from a purposively sampled group of participants.

Qualitative Research

The aim of this research project was to explore the lived realities of people from Pacific ethnic groups who worked as policy makers and policy advisers. I wanted to ensure that a Pacific voice, motivated by Pacific values of service, care and reciprocity was present in the data as I believed it would help to understand the conditions that foster the representation of Pacific peoples in policy documents and outcomes. With the aim of the study in mind, I chose to pursue a qualitative approach. This choice of approach was influenced by previous studies by respected Pacific scholars. Qualitative research by Pacific scholars presented credible role models of research design and research purposes that were aligned to Pacific values and ways of sharing knowledge (Anae, 1998; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1998, 1999; Halapua, 2000; Koloto & Sharma, 2005; Tu’itahi, 2005; Vaioleti, 2006; Tamasese et al., 2010). Qualitative research methods have also been embraced by academics...
and practitioners in the fields of anthropology, education, psychology, nursing, sociology and marketing in order to address questions about the ways people interact with the world (Neuman, 2011).

I began an investigation into qualitative research through introductory texts about research methods. The texts emphasised the need for researchers to understand the philosophical approach that is critical to identifying and clarifying designs appropriate to particular topics (Davidson & Tolich, 1999; Cohen et al., 2007). Through the literature investigated I was able to determine the value of a qualitative approach to my study. Davidson and Tolich (1999) found “To qualitative researchers, the world they wish to explore is not awash with discrete, measurable variables but is a whole that must first be experienced, by standing – as it were – in the shoes of those being studied” (p. 97).

Data collection was in two phases. Phase one was a series of semi-structured talanoa interviews with four senior public servants of Pacific ethnicity. Phase two was the examination of a selection of government documents chosen for their relevance to policies of economic development for Pacific peoples in New Zealand. The rationale for undertaking this research in two sections was to ensure that key concepts explored in semi-structured talanoa interviews were a lens through which government documents could be analysed.

**Methodology**

For this study I chose Heideggerian phenomenology and the Talanoa methodology (Vaioleti, 2006). This combination of methodologies reflected the reality that Pacific voices had seldom been heard in New Zealand economic policy-making forums, and
also that the essence of lived experience is at the heart of Pacific communications systems.

**Phenomenology**

Phenomenology seeks the essence of experience through the lived experiences of research participants. This particular study examines the lived experiences of Pacific participants working in the arena of policy-making. They are also experts in the maintenance of culture and relationships within different Pacific cultural contexts.

In the early years of the 21st century, research spaces concerned with the lived experiences of people became an increasingly prominent methodological consideration among nursing and health-care researchers (Lopez & Wills, 2004; Reiners, 2012). The concept of phenomenology extended back to the writings of Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) and Martin Heidegger (1889–1976). Their work rose out of the positivist and naturalistic paradigmatic movements of the 19th century. The naturalistic paradigm, as a counterpoint to the ordered, logical structured view of reality, saw reality constructed out of various experiences of an individual’s realities, and the realities of other individuals (Reiners, 2012).

In the Husserlian tradition of descriptive phenomenology, knowledge was to be created, through examination of the human experience, to describe states of pure consciousness. (Moran, 2000). Moran noted that a feature of Edmund Husserl’s approach was to see researchers overcome their personal biases, which were a barrier to achieving the desired level of consciousness. In discussions of the Husserlian approach (van Manen, 1990; Lopez and Wills, 2004; Wainwright, 2011 Reiners, 2012) the act of overcoming personal bias led to the term ‘bracketing out’. To bracket out requires a researcher to keep their own values or experiences out of
the study. Therefore a Husserlian phenomenological study would isolate a phenomenon from the world around it, understand how that phenomenon was structured and analyse it on its own terms without including suppositions from outside influences, such as communities or authority figures (Wojnak & Swanson, 2007).

By contrast, the Heideggerian tradition of interpretive phenomenology focused a researcher on understanding what ‘being’ meant. Draucker (1999) discussed Heidegger’s belief that people were naturally interpretive and wanted to understand what it meant to be *them*. In contrast to Husserl’s belief that people were sufficiently powerful to influence their environment (Deutscher, 2001), Heidegger believed that context was central to understanding the essence of experience (van Manen 1990; Wojnak & Swanson, 2007). Van Manen’s (1990) description of Heideggerian phenomenology went to the heart of its validity for use in this research project. He explained that to study through a phenomenological lens, was to take “into account the sociocultural and historical traditions that have given meaning to our ways of being in the world” (van Manen, 1990, p12).

Lopez and Wills (2004) described phenomenology as both a descriptive and an interpretive way to conceptualise study. A study conducted inside the phenomenological tradition and process was where the worldview and experiences of participants were central to knowledge creation. According to Lopez and Wills (2004), participants were experts and research data was as an essence, or a concentrated form, with layers, textures and richness that demonstrated an experience. Context was prominent in Heidegger’s phenomenological practice; the distinctive feature of Heideggerian study has been the negation of ‘bracketing’ (Bowie, 2003). To van Manen (2007) the combination of participant, researcher and
reader was central to meaningful phenomenological research. That combination of viewpoints, world views and experiences was, to Van Manen (2007), the space where knowledge transitioned to become an entity that embodied strength for those involved. He saw the final product - the essence of experience - and its transfer to the reader as a process that also embodied great strength for all parties involved.

The notion that inside, and surrounding, the research process is a community of people was also supported by Wojnak and Swanson (2007). They saw phenomenology as being a methodology supportive of those seeking to understand wholeness (p. 172). In its recognition of research illustrating reality from the experiences of a community, phenomenology became methodological space worthy of being explored alongside an indigenous methodology.

**Talanoa Methodology**

Lives are influenced by culture, context, history and society, and mine is no exception. As a researcher, I continue to practise my world views from my own lived experience. The talanoa methodology is about the specifically Pacific cultural art of communication and knowledge creation.

Talanoa methodology incorporates traditional communication methods which may appear similar to Western methods of semi-structured interviews, focus groups and case studies or narratives in their data collection (Finau, 2011). But in the talanoa methodology, lived experience is central to the learning in research. It is a uniquely Pacific methodology of learning through exposing ideas and disclosing information between the researcher and participant (Halapua, 2000, 2003; Vailoeti, 2006).

Vaioleti (2006) explained the process of informal and fluid conversation between two parties. The act of *talanoa* was a means to discuss actions, reactions, needs,
offerings and plans. The talanoa was the communication method used when an issue of local and national importance needed to be aired, contributed to, debated, tested, critiqued and formally acted upon via policy (Morrison, Vaioleti & Veramu, 2002).

From his experiences as a researcher with Pacific diaspora in New Zealand, Vaioleti (2006) saw talanoa as a methodology for collecting knowledge and the strength of the *talanoa* was that it was the sum of its parts, namely *tala* and *noa*. The concept of the *noa* was described by Vaioleti (2006) as *fluid* conversation. Vaioleti (2006) explained that as two people engaged in *noa* they were creating a space between them in which experiences were valued, values were important, differences were welcomed and where all shared knowledge was valued. He explained that the way in which parties engaged in *noa*, and created the spaces and value, was in the *tala*, by talking openly and with confidence, respect and humility.

Vaioleti (2006) explained that the talanoa was a concept that had both a surface meaning and a deeper meaning. On the surface, the talanoa led to a data set and research discussion. However Vaioleti (2006) was more concerned with the richness of research outputs from talanoa-inspired studies. He explained knowledge was created, not from the discussion, but from the sharing of spirit and care that two parties who engaged in *tala* and *noa* would have experienced. He saw a study grounded in the talanoa as one where analysis was active, contextual and more complex than a study that was observant and distanced from its participants (Vaioleti, 2006, p26).

evolution and thousands of people spread across hundreds of islands. He placed prominence on the Pacific cultural values of relationship building and interpersonal care, and explained that these were central to how Pacific peoples operated. As a result of relationships and care Vaioleti reported that space was created for participants to either legitimise, or challenge, inputs and responses if they deemed it necessary.

**Research Methods**

As this study required a Pacific voice to give space to values of care, service and reciprocity I believed that a qualitative interview approach was important in providing and supporting this space. In the early stages of planning for this study, I consulted with academic supervisors, university and business colleagues to gain perspective on the most meaningful ways to embrace the rich information that would inevitably come from Pacific interview participants.

Originally, I considered case studies based on previous community projects I had worked on with Pacific youth and policy advisers. This proposal was challenged by a senior figure (of Palangi ethnicity) of the university faculty, as she did not think the sample I proposed, due to the location being in Christchurch, as opposed to Auckland where the majority Pacific populations reside, would present what she thought was an accurate snap shot of Pacific peoples. This reaction led me to reconsider both the sample and the research method.

Following further consultation with colleagues and supervisors, I decided upon individual semi-structured talanoa-styled interviews with a small group of Pacific people who had been involved in the process of policy making. It was anticipated that individual interviews conducted with traditional Pacific values as a guide would
present a space where positive rapport would be built between participant and researcher. Finau (2011) explained “Talanoa has always involved two participants in the process of talking and listening, and they must be simultaneously going together” (p.27). An interview schedule was designed and aimed at opening up topics for discussion (see appendix 3). The interview schedule was pilot tested with colleagues (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001) to ensure that the questions were comprehensible and appropriate to the experiences of participants in general. Small amendments were made following the pilot.

Sample

As this research was exploratory in nature, I decided that a small highly-experienced Pacific sample group would provide in-depth information. A number of key factors were considered in the selection of participants, their involvement in the New Zealand policy-making process and whether or not they fit the profiles identified in the literature (Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005) or were involved in activities identified in the literature (Boston et al., 1996; Washington, 1998). As this study was concerned with policy outcomes and documents that related to Pacific peoples, it was important that people from Pacific ethnic groups were recruited in this study.

Purposive Sampling of Participants

Key informants were purposively selected during recruitment to ensure that a high level of cultural knowledge and professional experience was present in the sample. Tongco (2007) found that purposive sampling was frequently used in anthropology. She explained “Key informants are observant, reflective members of the community of interest who know much about the culture(s) and are both willing and able to share their knowledge” (2007, p 147). Other studies also found that, where
purposive sampling was a factor in the research design, the assistance of a wider community of knowledge was helpful in selecting participants with expert knowledge (Bah, Dialo, Demb’el’e & Paulsen, 2006; Silva & Andrande, 2006). My research participants were selected following consultations with Pacific academic leaders, community leaders and government colleagues.

**Recruitment**

*Stage 1 – Recruitment of Interview Participants*

I drew up a list of possible research participants after considering the policy-making or adviser colleagues I had either worked with, or reported to, during my employment as an adviser at MPIA between 2004 and 2007 and again between 2009 and 2011. This list consisted of senior policy advisers, policy managers, chief executives and Ministers of Pacific Island Affairs. I also considered a list of Pacific community leaders and representatives of Pacific community interest groups that I had encountered both during my employment as a policy adviser and during my tenure on the board of the Tongan Trust of Southland and as a governance adviser to the Canterbury Tongan Society. The criterion for including names on this list was the level of engagement each had in policy design or development. This list was discussed with Pacific colleagues as well as my academic supervisors.

Research participants were contacted by email in November 2013 to inform them of the study and to invite them to participate. Attached to the invitation emails was an information sheet that outlined the study (see appendix 1a), its objectives and relevant contact details so that participants could discuss the study with me or an academic supervisor. Each participant was invited to a 60-minute semi-structured talanoa interview. The invitation noted that the interview would be recorded for the
purposes of data collection in this study. Participants were invited to nominate the
time, date and location of the interview; it was intended that the location and timing
nominated would be convenient to the participant.

A consent form was also attached to the email (see appendix 1b). This consent form
indicated that the names and designations of participants would be published in this
thesis. The decision to disclose the information was reiterated to each participant
verbally, before the beginning of each interview. The publishing of participants’
names reflected the reality that the Pacific policy-making community was so small
that participants were likely to be identified through discussion of their terms in
parliament, policy portfolios they had contributed to or a particular policy agenda.

Two research participants responded to the first email, indicated their interest in
participating and offered potential dates for their interview. One research participant
responded in person, at a dinner event that we had both attended, indicating his/her
interest. Subsequent emails were exchanged to confirm the date, time and location
of the interview. The last research participant responded to a follow-up email to
organise times and interview locations.

Table 3-1 Research Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participant</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Interview Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>Karanina Sumeo</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Development, (formerly; Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Tertiary Education Commission)</td>
<td>Participant’s home – North Shore, Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2</td>
<td>Luamanuva Winnie Laban</td>
<td>Victoria University Wellington,</td>
<td>Pasifika Advancement Office – Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stage 2 – Selection of Policy documents**

Government documents were selected as a source of research data for this study, in order to address the first research question concerning the framing of Pacific peoples in such policy documents as well as in wider statements of policy outcomes. I consulted with colleagues, supervisors and peers on the various issues of economic wellbeing faced by Pacific communities between 1998 and 2013, and ascertained, from them, the policy outcomes and interventions discussed by the governments of that period. Therefore the search for policy documents, which was informed by consultation and reference to literature, had a scope that included investigations into policies relating to health, social development, government wealth transfers and benefits, housing, education and taxation.
It was also important that I consider the types of document considered to be part of policy-making processes during the period 1998 to 2013, for inclusion in this study. The literature (Boston et al, 1996; Kibblewhite & Ussher, 2002; Duncan & Chapman, 2010) explained that a wide range of documents were included in the various processes of policy making including briefing notes, statistical reports and discussion papers. Shaw & Eichbaum (2005) also noted that as public consultation became a more important part of policy processes, so did public-facing documents such as speeches, media releases, guides and commentaries. It was therefore important that my consideration of policy documents reflected the diversity of policy documentation present in the various processes. Appendix Four has the full list of documents that had the required characteristics. From the full list I selected four documents which were purposively chosen (Miles & Huberman, 1994) following a search of available government documents.

Table 3-2 Government Document Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Agency Represented</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keynote Speech: Pacific Vision Conference</td>
<td>The National Government by Minister of Finance, Hon Bill English</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Progress</td>
<td>Statistics New Zealand and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs</td>
<td>Statistical Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Analysis Framework</td>
<td>Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs</td>
<td>Policy Analysis Guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection from Participants

The interviews with the four participants took place in January and February 2014. While each interview was scheduled to take 60 minutes, the discussions proved to be interesting to every participant, leading to their allowing me to extend each interview to ensure that all topics in the interview schedule were covered. The shortest interview lasted 90 minutes while the longest interview lasted for two and a half hours. The interview style was modified to reflect the setting and my relationship to the participant. Personally, and as a reflection of traditional Pacific values, it was important that time was set aside to re-establish bonds with each participant. This re-establishment was valuable to me as it enabled me to catch up with friends and colleagues. Reciprocity was evident, judging by the number of questions I was asked about my children, partner and house. Catching up is a natural part of the talanoa process (Vaioleti, 2006) and a recognition of the relationship systems that maintain Pacific peoples who are separated by time and distance (Hau‘ofa, 1994). As a result, the total time taken to conduct each interview completely ranged from 90 minutes to three hours.

All four interviews took place at different locations, and each location was chosen by the participant. It was important that food was shared at each talanoa and I attended each appointment with a gift of food to be shared. Two of the four participants also brought food with them. Another participant and I met in a café where we purchased
various food items for each another as the talanoa progressed. Three of the four participants opted to have me offer a lotu or blessing on the food and the talanoa, which is a typical interaction in many Pacific cultures. Each lotu was short and of neutral denomination; it was focused on the tokoni/gifts and the ‘ofa/love/care that each brought to the talanoa and also my gratitude to the participant for their involvement.

Each talanoa was recorded with a digital voice recorder and I took notes.

**Ethical Considerations**

The application for ethics approval for this study was granted on 16 September 2013, (see appendix 2). Ensuring that ethical concerns are addressed is a significant part of conducting research among any group of people, regardless of their location, age, ethnicity, work-force status or religion (Denscombe, 2010). Participant information sheets (Appendix 1a) and consent forms (Appendix 1b) were emailed to potential participants as part of the recruitment process. The documents were also explained before and after each talanoa session and were in sight of participants at all times. Participants had the right to withdraw from the talanoa at any time. They were given a copy of the form to sign, demonstrating their willingness to participate and their understanding of the agreement.

As seen in table 3-1, all participants in this study were identified by their names and designations. The decision to openly identify participants was viewed as being unorthodox when compared with other research underway by my colleagues. Smith (1999) noted that participants’ consent to be involved in research was a matter of trust that deserved the reciprocity of the researcher. In the case of this study, I considered that anonymity would not be achieved by withholding the names of senior
political figures in New Zealand who, by the nature of democratic elections and the public-facing nature of their roles, would be easily identifiable anyway. I therefore decided to use the names of the participants in this study. This was outlined in the participant information sheet and consent forms.

**Data Analysis**

Two sets of data from semi-structured talanoa participant interviews and the government documents were analysed by looking at the lived experience supported by the Talanoa methodology.

Audio recordings of the interviews were made and stored digitally on my computer. I transcribed each recording for data analysis. Following consultation with my peers and academic supervisors, the use of coding and data analysis software was deemed to be inappropriate and not congruent with the cultural values around communication and meaning as defined in the process of talanoa (Vaioleti, 2006). Data analysis involved a detailed examination of the lived experience of participants as well as the essence of Pacific values in government documents. Smith (2008) noted that understanding participants’ lived experience requires the researcher to read texts with a view to interpreting the information held within. I took this approach by reading and re-reading interview transcripts, and the selected government documents, to find and connect themes found with other themes from the texts.

I read the government documents and transcripts many times. Each time I read a text, I noted themes that appeared. Following these readings, I turned to the themes noted and looked at quotes or sections of documents or transcripts which contributed to the themes. I also analysed the similarities between themes in the context of the two research questions. I constructed a list of quotes from the texts that represented
the main themes which emerged. Rubin and Rubin (1995) noted that the analysis process was often a source of excitement to researchers, due to the discovery of themes embedded in interview data.

I then began putting the data into thematic order. Data from participant interviews was organised into the key themes identified from the readings. Quotes were organised inside theme headings to achieve a clear explanation of the theme and its relevance to the research questions. Data from government documents was organised against the context of relevant policy activities and milestones in the closest parliamentary period to each document's publication date. Using policy activities and parliamentary periods as a contextual organisation system for government document data was an acknowledgement of the complexities of the New Zealand policy system and the many dependencies that are involved in the policy-making process (Boston et al., 1996; Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005).

This chapter has shown how my research project was designed, why the phenomenological, talanoa and document analysis methodologies were deemed appropriate to this study, how participants were recruited and the process of data analysis. In Chapter Four the results of data collection from participant interviews is reported.
Chapter 4  Research Findings – Participant Interviews

“Fai’aki e ‘ilo ‘oua ‘e fai’aki e fanogno” – “Do by knowing, not by hearing”

Beware the risk of acting in haste without knowing a situation fully

Introduction

This study had two components: interviews with expert policy makers of Pacific ethnicity and a review of government documents.

The rationale for undertaking this research with a key-informant interview phase was to ensure that authentic Pasifika voices were able to explain the policy-making process, their place in the process, and intended outcomes of policies from Pasifika perspectives. Participants were purposively selected for their cultural knowledge and professional expertise. Data in this chapter was organised into themes that reflect the working, cultural, community, family and political environments that Pasifika policy makers inhabit and create.

What does ‘working in government’ mean to Pacific professionals?

Service embedded in cultural values was at the heart of the experiences of Luamanuvao Winnie Laban. Her enduring Samoan cultural traditions of service, leadership, reciprocity and humility were the foundations of her experiences as a Member of Parliament.

Pacific people come from a lineage of leadership and behind that word leadership are values. And the first value is: it’s not about me it’s about we, and the second is the importance of working for the wellbeing of the collective … that manifests itself in the way our people are engaged with community activities, whether they be cultural, church, women, cultural groups … servant leadership is one I really love – and it brings our values together not only culturally but
spiritually. Not serving in terms of master/servant but serving in that it’s all reciprocal (Laban, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche spoke about his navigation of traditional Samoan values and his career choices in the mainstream New Zealand world. He explained that traditional Samoan values were influential in his choice of vocation.

I had the opportunity to go into the private sector as a consultant many years ago. It never attracted me. I look at my school mates who were mostly Palangi in those days, that’s where they went. You analyse why, after many years, you didn’t take that opportunity to become extraordinarily wealthy and run your own business like some of my former schoolmates might have done. I think that just sits there, your values system that you are naturally inculcated with as a Pacific person… doesn’t send you in that direction – and the vast majority of Pacific people still don’t do that (Gosche, 2014).

Karanina Sumeo described service as the potential for her professional skills and her insight, as a Pacific person, to be of use for people in Pacific communities as the end-users of government policies.

...being able to connect with Pacific people themselves, and them being able to describe the reality – those were always important moments, and I considered every one of those phone calls or emails to be exciting or for me that was the strength – without it what I could add was no different to DOL or whatever ‘cause they would have had the same data that I’m looking at (Sumeo, 2014).

Working alongside the community, and ensuring the Pacific viewpoint was prominent, was also a vivid factor in the service element for Maria Godinet-Watts, who had been a Pacific community, business and workplace safety adviser for more than 35 years. She noted that, in accordance with traditional cultural teachings, her contribution was part of a river of people who had gone before and were going to come after her, who were all united through the traditional Pacific values and being of service to others.
It’s been phenomenal, and the number [of people] that have now gone, who laid those pathways was very inclusive of the whole of the Pacific. They saw way back that individually as Samoans, Tongans, etc. they weren’t going to cut the mustard. We needed to advance together (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

Maria Godinet-Watts also noted that mainstream policy makers or advisers were not cognisant of the acts of values-driven service offered by Pacific people in her local communities. As a result, people’s efforts and work went unrecognised, sometimes at great expense. She believed that policy makers and advisers could exploit Pacific peoples in communities.

…the put it out there that they’ll do it for nothing, they will volunteer. I used to get really ratty with our people expecting our artists to provide works of art and not be paid. I used to say even if it’s a Mea Alofa some vouchers or something [should be given]. We shouldn’t be taking advantage of their skills without contributing something. They’ve got to live too (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

**How Pacific government professionals viewed the New Zealand system**

Participants thought that the nature of the New Zealand government’s policy-making system for Pacific peoples related to a wide range of subject areas and themes. The range discussed included the ways that government conceptualised the lives of Pacific peoples, the ways it attempted to relate to Pacific peoples and the ways that Pacific policy professionals were exposed to pressure by government departments. This section of data reflects the ways that the interview group mediated the system in their own work.

A concept of a Pacific deficit model emerged among participants. This model encapsulated the image projected of Pacific peoples through relentless reporting of them as low achievers in government statistics. Interview participants felt that the model was a way for mainstream government policy makers to conveniently summarise their knowledge of Pacific peoples in New Zealand and, through
summary, claim expertise. Vui Mark Gosche described what the Pacific deficit model meant to him and also the impact he felt it had on general government thinking about Pacific peoples.

A lot of the focus that goes on Pacific peoples, within policy thinking, is around the deficit side of life: the social aspects of poor performance in education, in health statistics, overcrowded housing, youth suicide (Gosche, 2014).

In Karanina Sumeo’s view, Pacific policy makers faced a dichotomy between what they knew from experience and the view they saw government expressing in its commentaries about statistical data or in requests for policy advice. She also expressed the frustration that the dichotomy caused her, when having to navigate the two viewpoints: the first inside the policy processes of analysis and the second in consultation with communities who would be impacted by policies and other government departments.

I don’t see our people as consumers and take, take, take and unable to develop themselves. However, in the policy setting, that is how they are seen and it’s about ‘how do we uplift these people?’ Like we need someone to uplift us?! (laughs) (Sumeo, 2014).

Luamanuvao Winnie Laban described a period when the position of Minister of Pacific Island Affairs, which she held, was moved from being inside cabinet to outside cabinet. She explained that Pacific peoples had often faced cynical actions of powerful mainstream leaders whose arbitrary decisions affected the decision-making powers of Pacific peoples.

We either lie down and die, or we stay and think creatively. I thought, I’m not going to be a puppet. We are very proud people, we have navigated that ocean, and we can navigate anywhere. I thought, [all] right – I’ve been dealt these cards, so I started to meet with the Minister of Health, the Minister of Economic Development, etc. … I was passionate about my ministry saying it’s really
important that we create a space where we can relate to each other as equals (Laban, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche also discussed the structures that existed within governments he’d worked in. He noted that claims by parliamentary parties, to want to collaborate and solve Pacific problems, were contradicted by separatist attitudes taken by mainstream government policy-making departments. In his view, such a paradox reflected more on mainstream policy actors’ and departments’ desires to build and hold power than the collaborative solving of problems in their own silo spaces.

The silos are as big and as strong as they ever have been. There’s political will to break them down from both sides of the political spectrum. Everybody would like to see a greater collaborative response, and perhaps it’s the way in which the state sector is shaped into CEO driven organisations. Maybe it’s impossible for them to be truly collaborative – so that’s why government decides to create bigger [spaces] and merge a whole lot in, so at least if you’ve got silos you’ve only got a few to worry about (Gosche, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche also explained that the power orientation is a reflection of the wider policy-making system established in New Zealand. He noted that people in senior positions were more likely to be listened to in policy discussions, and the relationship between Minister and policy manager was significant. In his view, Pacific peoples had to become those people in senior positions with greater influence.

I think the managerial structure that’s been created over the last 20 to 30 years requires you to be part of it. It’s just the nature of the system. The higher you go, the more chance you have of influencing the overall outcomes and philosophies of those organisations. Therefore you shape the advice that goes to the Ministers who essentially rely greatly on the advice they get from their departments in making their decisions. I think it’s vital that there’s an upward movement of Pacific peoples – but we are starting from a low base – it’s not going to happen quickly (Gosche, 2014).

Luamanuvao Winnie agreed that policy managers held powerful roles in a system that relies on relationships and seniority. She expressed dismay at the lack of Pacific
peoples in such managerial structures of the government system. Luamanuvao noted that the government department responsible for ensuring that the State Sector was reflective of the community it served was critical of MPIA, while not accepting responsibility for reflecting the demographic significance of Pacific peoples in New Zealand.

SSC is pointing its finger but what has SSC done in terms of lifting the number of Pacific CEOs in the public sector? How many Pacific people are actually in the senior management positions? Until they can tick their boxes off, it’s no use pointing the finger at MPIA (Laban, 2014).

Karanina Sumeo found that mainstream government departments held enormous power to influence the self-image of Pacific peoples through using statistics that demonstrated social disadvantage. She noted that Pacific policy makers had bought into the mainstream policy discussion through sheer exhaustion at being relentlessly exposed to such statistics. In her view, Pacific people working in the policy system had to find the strength to overcome that exhaustion to ensure that Pacific values remained present in policy outcomes, documents and discussions.

It’s not as if we don’t have networks, [and] ways of discussing. We know how to use Facebook for instance. There is all this expertise and I don’t understand why we are still floundering! We’ve been around a long time; it’s not a new problem. I don’t think we are a powerless agency. However, I think there are people in there who do think like that, I don’t believe that at all. We moan about it but we do not work to change it, we say to our communities ‘we value your voice’ but we haven’t yet prepared the vehicle to capture that voice (Sumeo, 2014).

Interview participants noted that mainstream policy-makers’ inattention to, and lack of knowledge about, the realities of Pacific peoples’ lives went hand in hand with the rigidity of policy making environments. Pacific policy makers and advisers felt it was
their duty to work within the structures, while pushing the boundaries, to ensure that Pacific peoples’ needs were met.

Maria Godinet-Watts explained that she found her working environment, in the former Community Employment Service and the former Department of Labour, to be inflexible. Within a context of rigid planning, lack of access to other departments and ignorance of Pacific peoples, she was able to use planning and work-flow organising tools, including official work plans, to her and her community’s advantage. Maria noted her experience of organising a youth programme that took students through a simulation of parliamentary process in her own department and in conjunction with other public service Pacific colleagues.

It was in the plan and it was forecast in the outcomes and that’s what I said to MPIA and to everyone involved, and you too Fil. Get it in the plan so you get the time off for overnight stays and getting (the retreats) organised. All my years in public service, I’m glad I learned that very early. I had a very good minder when I first started - in Louisa Crawley - who had been there for a while. She advised me. She said to me ‘you want anybody, do it all officially, write to them, invite them, then they can get there’ (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

**Palangi people speaking for Pasifika**

Interview participants in this study discussed relationships between the need to use evidence in creating policy and the irrelevance of the statistics chosen by governments to illustrate the lives of Pacific peoples. They found that the combination of evidence-based policy thinking, the ideologies behind which statistics were used and a lack of government leaders of Pacific ethnicity were barriers to progression, both individually as professionals, and collectively as a community in general.
Vui Mark Gosche noted that the policy-making system was biased towards the normative values of Palangi men. He also believed that the system was unlikely to change due to the security it afforded its members.

I think that you only have to look at the number of women who have broken into those ranks, and it’s still a male-dominated sector. If you take the population ministries out and try to think of leaders who’ve made it into those top positions who are women, Maori or Pacific; they’re non-existent or extremely rare. I look at Leadership NZ and the stuff that they do. They still have a minority of Maori and Pacific people doing that … because of the cost. And you have to be in a leadership position where you work, to be eligible. So there’s very few of you, you’re not going to enter into what is a very comfortable, closed circuit (Gosche, 2014).

Luamanuvao Winnie Laban noted that the government policy-making system, with its focus on majority communities, was a reflection of those who controlled the system, and the desire to maintain power for themselves and others like them. She believed that governments in the past had made decisions which enabled minority groups to have policy-making power. Luamanuvao noted that recent governments had rejected the intentions of previous governments and focussed policy making on majority populations, which led to a need for Pacific policy makers to be relentless in advocating for Pacific peoples.

The reality is that Pacific people are a minority, and as much as we have this liberal belief that everyone is an equal and has an equal say, it’s constant advocacy to ensure that our peoples’ economic, social and cultural reality is addressed. For me, a lot of that work was always advocating, whether it was via select committee or Bills that were being put before the house. The fact that we were there by our people, and others of NZ, who believed in having Pacific people in parliament is a great thing, but you could never ever take it for granted. You had to be vigilant all the time. You had to make sure that you were there to advocate and to make sure Pacific people were being addressed in policy making, but more than anything (in) implementation and resource allocation (Laban, 2014).
Participants noted that operating inside the government system was frustrating due to the considerable effort needed to challenge thinking and also the constant need to defend a Pasifika viewpoint. Karanina Sumeo discussed the challenges of advocating for Pacific viewpoints in public sector organisations.

There was a submission that we were working on around ECE and I was working with a public sector colleague. I was outlining some of the incentives for Pacific people to get kids into ECEs. One of them was our spiritual values, our lotu [spiritual spaces and churches]. This advisor came to me and said that’s not a real value. I had to explain that Tongans go to the Tongan ECE because they have the prayers. If they want to go to ABC they would go to ABC, but they specifically say ‘no, because there’s nothing about God in there. That is a value. However, my colleague didn’t recognise that as a value. But you or I would know that has monetary value, provides a service, attracts people and attracts government funding. The spiritual relates to economic. The advisor couldn’t make that connection. The reference [the reference to spiritual values] was taken out. That made me angry (Sumeo, 2014).

Other participants talked about how they established defence mechanisms against challenges from Palangi policy makers and expert advisors who resisted the validity of population-based policy. Maria Godinet-Watts spoke of her reliance on a robust administrative system and a direct approach in overcoming challenges from colleagues about the value in focussing time and attention on Pacific peoples’ development.

Those of us who’ve been around a while know that you work the system for your benefit [to see] if you can get something in under your particular system. The only bother I had was when I had a South African boss. It was a cultural problem, I just went over his head. I told him ‘you’ve only been here five minutes’. What did he know about culture? That was my role as cultural adviser (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

Karanina Sumeo navigated a tension between advice that she was providing and managing the expectations of her policy sector stakeholders. She found herself
advocating for policy interventions that would arrest disparity as was evidenced in data.

I was told ‘this is like a rag to a bull’. I had said the words, ‘Pacific children are missing out’ and I was told to take them out. That was just how it was … (Sumeo, 2014).

Karanina Sumeo explained that, in the end, those sentences that had been controversial remained in the briefing which, to her, represented success. She reiterated that as part of her professional conduct as a policy adviser, and as a Pacific policy adviser, she wanted her minister to be properly informed so that advocacy for Pacific development could be adequately supported.

They went to the Minister and she wanted them [left in]. You want your Minister to then go up to MOE [Ministry of Education] and ask ‘what’s going on?’ That is what you want (Sumeo, 2014).

**Pacific ways to view the economy**

Vui Mark Gosche said that links between Pacific peoples, their communities and the wider economy were not usually prominent in discussions he had had with Pacific community people. He felt that if the link was ever going to be made between Pacific communities and the wider economy, it was going to be underpinned by demographic change in New Zealand’s population, notably in its largest city, Auckland, where scale could be demonstrated in policy documents.

Vui Mark Gosche noted that the economy was a notion that was determined and controlled by mainstreamed concepts of business, entrepreneurialism and commerce. He also noted that mainstream government policy organisations were unlikely to view Pacific peoples in mainstream economic frameworks, and instead Pacific peoples would be considered as a threat to the base-line budgets of departments such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health.
Going back through the years, percentage wise, the number of Pacific people who were self-employed, for instance, really never grew. And, I don’t think the mainstream public policy thinking has ever really addressed it. In recent times there’s been a stirring, if you like, of the issue, because there’s a slow awakening to the fact that the Pacific demographic population is going to become increasingly more important in a city like Auckland. With the size of Auckland in terms of the overall economy, you can’t ignore it any more (Gosche, 2014).

Luamanuvao Winnie Laban noted that despite mainstream policy makers not recognising the economic participation of Pacific peoples, Pacific people were an increasing part of the New Zealand economy.

Like many other Pacific people, I came from parents who came [to NZ] in the 50s. They worked hard. My father had two jobs. But they always wanted us to have a good job and I think they wanted us to participate as equals and encouraged us to be proud of who we are and where we come from (Laban, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche recognised that Pacific peoples had a unique form of economics, which was motivated by traditional values. He explained that Pacific peoples’ entrepreneurialism was based on service to others and care for the collective, as opposed to the mainstream economic views of the profit generation and individual utility maximisation. He believed that Pacific values, as an economic motivator, would need to be given attention in the future.

The economic development of Pacific people won’t go according to the model of Palangi New Zealand, which is more around private business. When you look at the entrepreneurs – the people capable of driving economic growth in a Pacific community – they tend not to be in private business, but tend to be more centred into the public and semi-public sector. It’s interesting that there isn’t a drive to be a successful business person in a Palangi sense of going and starting your own business. But there is a strong drive for Pacific people to create their own organisations that serve community interests instead of personal interests. There’s nothing wrong with that, but it doesn’t fit the current model of economic progress that you assign to a successful economic person in a New Zealand context (Gosche, 2014).
Maria Godinet-Watts shared her experience in working with Pacific entrepreneurs who had set up and operated commercial businesses in New Zealand. She noted that Pacific peoples were capable of creating fiscal sustainability in their businesses which, notionally, was a challenge to the Pacific deficit model produced by mainstream policy makers and experienced by Pacific communities.

There are lots of businesses in different areas like construction, not all social services. There have been different ways of getting them on [into businesses] and I’ve always been keen to make sure they are started with community-based funding. They are quickly turned around into being self-sufficient within a few years. If they don’t, then they’re not worth having. I think it’s dangerous to rely on community-based funding to keep the organisation going because you are then at the beck and call of the funder (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

Maria Godinet-Watts also noted that in her time working with Pacific businesses she saw new enterprises rely on the input and efforts of members of the wider family, as an example of traditional values in action. She found that tensions arose between business owners’ need to remain competitive in the marketplace, and the expectations of families who had contributed to the establishment of the enterprise. In her view, traditional Samoan resource-sharing protocols - the fa‘alavelave - contradicted the mainstream fiscal model, which was focussed on annual accounting, but enriched the development of a business over a longer term.

There’s a good and a bad side of family. [Name removed] will probably tell you ‘keep family out of it’ because when you have family working for you, you get all the problems of ‘you can’t tell my nephew what to do’ ‘you can’t tell my son what to do’, [or] ‘I’m your auntie, I need money’. The fa‘alavelave drains the community, but it’s paid back in a number of ways but at the time and place, some people (in new businesses) can’t afford fa‘alavelave. I think it’s still got its place. (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

During their interviews Vui Mark Gosche and Maria Godinet-Watts spoke of mainstream government agencies that took advantage of social service providers
run by people of Pacific ethnicities. Vui Mark Gosche noted that mainstream government departments with large financial resources did not recognise the costs associated with the services they were contracting from Pacific providers.

I know that when you contract with the government in that sector, you tend to get paid the salary for the social worker, the youth worker, whoever it may be but there’s no money for your office, your car, your telephone and your management structure. So that’s why it’s never been described as a fully funded service. Whereas in health, your contracts will cover the staff wage for the nurse or the community worker but then there’ll be the margin for the back office costs (Gosche, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche discussed a government funded programme that supported young people who undertook training to become builders. The building industry became prominent due to the rebuild of Christchurch following earthquakes in 2010 and 2011. He explained that education programmes were promoted to Pacific young people with the promise of a pastoral- or community-care and support services which would be offered by local church leaders. He noted that mainstream government agencies refused to fund the services provided in the initial pilot year, free of charge, by the church leaders. Instead, the subsequent year’s pastoral care was contracted out to a mainstream organisation which was funded to deliver the service, outside of Pacific spiritual values’ systems.

For Pacific, the community, the vast majority of our lot is to be relied upon to continue to give. The Pasifika Trades [Training programme for apprentice builders] was premised on having pastoral care attached. The pastoral care was attached to it by a church, and the ministers in particular, but there was no money attached to that. What I see now is some money being added into the picture, but will Pasifika church people who did it for free last year actually want to bid for and become part of the paid workforce now? I suspect not, and I think that the mainstream policy people within the agencies that hold those funds might not understand, or value, just what the contribution those Pacific church ministers made to make Pasifika trades so successful (Gosche, 2014).
Pacific peoples and data – knowing and using figures

In Vui Mark Gosche’s view, New Zealand governments take a commercial approach to solving problems in communities, such as education. He believed that governments and their commercial focus were not worth challenging or fighting because the commercial ethos and values were entrenched in the mind-set of government. He explained that in order for Pacific peoples to be successful, they would have to utilise the commercial mind-set to their advantage. He noted that to effectively utilise the system was to take note of data and statistical information and advocate based on numbers and trends.

I think they [statistics] are hugely important, given that governments try to emulate corporate behaviour by setting targets and that’s going to be the way into the future. Therefore you use those stats to say you won’t hit your targets unless you do something about this group over here, and here’s the statistical evidence to show you (Gosche, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche also found that the New Zealand government’s agenda-setting system, and its reliance on data, has impacted the image of Pacific peoples. He argued that data helped to construct an image of Pacific peoples for the policy debate space.

What you see now, in terms of public policy debate, is ‘we have to make our decisions based on evidence and then we have to measure the outcomes and that what we have done is effective and not just for the sake of it’. So if Pacific issues are to be dealt with properly within that context, then we get the stats, produced by the very people charged with doing something about the things that the issues represent. And then the people who keep on saying it’s got to be evidence based… well there’s the evidence – it’s there, you can’t argue with it – rheumatic fever rates, worst, Pacific underachievement in literacy and numeracy, number of people with bachelor degrees etc. If you keep arguing that point then you’ve got another group of people saying that whatever we do, we have to have measurable outcomes. Well the outcomes are very measurable if you know how many people are failing or how many people are sick, or committing suicide, or whatever it might be (Gosche, 2014).
Karanina Sumeo worked constantly with data through her career and explained that she faced a considerable amount of data that wasn’t congruent with Pacific peoples’ experiences of wellbeing. She noted that data compiled in mainstream agencies lacked Pacific cultural insight. As a result of mainstream agencies inability to reflect Pacific values, Karanina found Pacific being represented in the same terms as Māori.

There is such a huge lack of that quality data and then as a Pacific person your hands are tied and you have to give advice on this homogenous general data. I think that is really unfair when you compare us with Māori. I am sure that in the policy for Māori we are looking at iwi, we are looking at whanau. That’s what I mean, we are looking for that detail, and that’s what makes me frustrated. But you do what you can (Sumeo, 2014).

**Pacific Attitudes to Policy**

All participants noted that policy had the potential to play a significant role in the future of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. This section of data outlines examples of policy discussion that were determined as useful by participants. This section also contains participants’ viewpoints about the different ways MPIA could further advocate for Pacific peoples’ economic development, and the strengths that were present across the different groups in the wider Pacific community.

Maria Godinet-Watts explained that governments had not usually considered Pacific communities in Christchurch to be of statistical or policy significance. She found that being outside of a significant group gave her, and the Pacific communities of Christchurch, space to become active advocates for Pacific peoples.

Because we, in Christchurch, have been a smaller Pacific community … while we do work together on things, you very much have communities within communities. We still come together on common needs and wants. Because we have been labelled ‘Pacific’ in the big picture, people do realise it’s the only way you’re going to
Karanina Sumeo discussed her frustration at some Pacific policy makers’ inattention to changing viewpoints and attitudes among younger generations in Pasifika communities. She noted that there was a comfortable community of Pacific expert advisors in the government sector which continued to present a one-sided image of Pacific communities.

I think there’s definitely the people who’ve been there long enough and don’t believe there’s anything new. Then there are people in MPIA’s advisory network who themselves have been around for a long time. Why are we still using people who we used 20 years ago, paying them consultant fees? We are still going to the same people when there are these young entrepreneurial kids. We haven’t moved with the times, we haven’t moved with our people. We aren’t all immigrants now. When you don’t have a lot of money, you’ve got to think and be brave and innovative. Every time I’ve called up a Pacific person, out of the blue or a business person they have been more than happy to give their time. It’s not like consultants, where they have to charge first (Sumeo, 2014).

Luamanuvao Winnie Laban thought that the Minister for Pacific Peoples needed to consider the purchase arrangement it had with MPIA. She noted that governments were unlikely to want to increase the number of policy advisers in MPIA. She thought that the Ministry ought to become a centre for government accountability regarding Pacific peoples and policy.

MPIA have always had a small budget. They haven’t had a lot of power. That’s why I wanted to move much more to the audit role. People can also say ‘we have our own PI people in our departments; we don’t have to listen to you’. But by having that objectivity and a Ministry that sits just outside some of that can offer a fresh view. By having [a Minister of Pacific Island Affairs] in cabinet also gives it that mandate that it’s taken seriously (Laban, 2014).

---

2 Pacific peoples was the designation given to the minister responsible for MPIA as of early 2015.
Karanina Sumeo found that the development of a research unit at MPIA between 2009 and 2012 had not provided necessary support in the key areas of government discourse during that period. In her view, quality data and research into the impact of Pacific values in Pasifika peoples’ development was needed to further guide policy discussions. Karanina could see that MPIA wanted to emulate other larger research-strengthened government policy agencies. However, she felt that MPIA had wasted an opportunity to meaningfully contribute by not collaborating with other MPIA colleagues.

The research was not directly serving the needs of policy. The research group was doing their own research projects. So, they weren’t researching to feed or help us to gather the necessary information in education. They weren’t doing things in health, family violence. They weren’t connected. To say we were a policy-and-research unit was meaningless unless we were connected. Then you’ve got the people doing policy trying to be experts at research when that’s not what you were employed to do (Sumeo, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche reflected on his post-ministerial work as a manager with MPIA and the world the organisation was navigating. As a manager with the Ministry he experienced the creation of a policy paradigm where central government agencies were brought together to develop policy through the Auckland Council [local government agency].

Suddenly you had a very powerful organisation created with a research capacity and a policy-making capacity that could match central government that we’d never had before, with its focus on this city. This city has got an enormous Pacific population. It is concentrated and sits in the negative statistic area, and the Auckland Council’s recognition of that has helped to shape central government’s thinking around this, because suddenly there’s a ‘somewhere’ you can test your policy thinking with an equal resource. These guys have a very powerful research and policy capacity. I don’t think anybody probably thought about that at the time, and I don’t think it was done for those reasons, but a by-
product of the creation of an Auckland Council and its resources has been a very good thing for Pacific people (Gosche, 2014).

Vui Mark Gosche said that central government was learning lessons from local communities about identifying and creating solutions. He described the change as being a shift in the areas of policy that central government was allowing local government to address.

You were allowed to talk about more than rates, rubbish and roads, in a policy sense, and get into the people and the social, cultural and the economic [factors]. There was a very close working relationship created between Auckland Council people who were writing the plan and the central government agencies through the Auckland Policy Office (Gosche, 2014).

Gosche noted that inside the wider relationship between Auckland Council and central government agencies, Pacific peoples became prominent in economic development discussions.

And on the economic side, with skills (development and training for building and manufacturing industries), there is a massive amount of work going in there behind the scenes which we were able to be part of and have significant say in. There was a realisation of the importance of Pacific people in the future development of Auckland, in a positive sense, to become the liveable city, coupled with the government wanting to solve some intractable problems, in the Better Public Service Targets, and it all came together nicely at the same time (Gosche, 2014).

Karanina Sumeo discussed her experiences of working with the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC). She explained that she found the attitudes of the TEC to be focused on enabling to the community, in its goals to develop. Karanina noted that she was able to have policy discussions with TEC where she felt that Pacific values were respected.

They weren't talking about Pacific people as a problem. They were talking about Pacific people as the capital that would enable wider development. They were open to 'how can we do this' and not in a
‘how-can-we- feel-sorry’ way. It was as if the TEC called for Pacific people. They wanted to know how to source the best graduates, the best Pacific engineers. They were seeing us as assets to their businesses and to their regions, and it’s a different frame (Sumeo, 2014).

Maria Godinet-Watts saw the TEC taking a simple approach to valuing Pacific peoples. She explained that, in her relationship with TEC, the commission’s stance was a reaction to changes in Christchurch’s demographic composition and the shortage of workers participating in the construction industry.

To be frank, they [TEC and the Industry Training Sector] have got no other option. We are the largest workforce coming through, even though we aren’t the largest population. Asian communities are the other major ethnic group, but they don’t have the big families like we do, they don’t have the kids coming through and their kids go into other areas (Godinet-Watts, 2014).

**Summary of Findings from Participant Interviews**

Participants in this study shared their experiences as policy makers or advisers who have been influenced by Pacific values of service, leadership, care, spirituality and reciprocity. Participants noted that these and other traditional Pasifika values are a foundational factor that motivates people to become policy makers or advisers, to ensure that decisions are made for the good of the whole community. In their experience in working in their respective communities, the participants in this study also acknowledged that traditional Pacific values underpinned decisions that would be interpreted as consumer-choice decisions by the mainstream, such as education choices, career paths, entrepreneurialism and the distribution of resources.

In their view, the mainstream policy-making system was inflexible and disinterested in viewpoints that challenged the normative values of Palangi males. In the experiences of participants in this study, some mainstream policy makers and expert advisors, did not believe that Pacific peoples had the right to hold values outside of
mainstream constructs – let alone act on them. Participants noted that such viewpoints were able to persist due to the rigid nature of government departments which had established work plans to meet the priorities as set out in government agendas. As a result of prolonged exposure to these challenges, participants explained that one of their reactions was to find ways to ensure that mainstream systems could be modified to accommodate the development aspirations of Pacific communities. More often than not, this activity took place beneath the surface so as not to draw attention that may turn out to be hostile.

The following chapter presents research data from documents produced by a variety of policy makers.
Chapter 5  Research Findings – Government Documents

“Faka’ita fai ki tahi” – “Bestow anger upon the sea.”

Anger should never rule judgement

Introduction

This section presents data from documents emanating from policy-making ministers and expert advisers in government departments. The main criteria for selecting documents to be analysed were that they were published between 1998 and 2013 and that they were related to the economic wellbeing or development of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. The documents were selected from a pool of information available at the time this study took place (for a list of the documents selected for analysis, see Table 3-2 on page 67). A list of documents considered in this study is found in Appendix Four.

The period from 1998 to 2013 spans six New Zealand parliamentary terms. Data is presented in chronological order and grouped by parliamentary term. Parliamentary sessions in the years 1998 to 2008 were selected in this study. Despite its exploratory nature, it was important to ensure that official documents for analysis had sufficient background and contextual information to illustrate ways in which the framing of Pacific peoples may have been influenced by environmental factors related to policy. Each section of this chapter begins with a discussion about events in wider government policy or political activity that led to the event or documents analysed.
One of the significant features of the 1996 to 1999 parliamentary term was that it was the first to sit following the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) election in 1996. The MMP system allocates each voter two votes: one for the preferred candidate and the other for the preferred party. In an MMP election, the total number of seats is divided between the candidates who gain the highest number of votes in each electorate, and those allocated party list seats. The total number of party seats is divided up according to the percentage of party-seat votes each party wins in an election. Seats are then allocated to candidates in order of numerical rank on the party list, which is determined before each election campaign. In the 1996 to 1999 parliamentary term, there were 65 electorate representatives and 55 list seats. In order for any one party to govern alone, or have ‘single party majority’ (Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, 2014) it must win more than fifty per cent of the seats in the House of Representatives. At the 1996 election, the National Party which won the greatest number of seats but did not meet the single-party majority criterion, agreed to govern in coalition with the New Zealand First party, to create a two-party coalition government.

The focus of this section of analysis was the speech given by Hon Bill English to delegates at the Pacific Vision conference in 1999. He had recently become the Minister of Finance at the time. In 1996, he had been the Minister of Health and became responsible for a reform of New Zealand’s public health system. Between 1993 and 1996, English inherited a newly restructured health system that consisted of four regional health authorities, a public health commission, contracting
arrangements with community trusts, private medical practices and a network of 23 commercial public-health companies (Barnett & Malcolm, 1997; Parliamentary Library, 2009). Those public-health companies were known as Crown Health Enterprises.

Upon accepting the Minister of Health position, Mr English was briefed by the Crown Company Monitoring Advisory Unit about public reaction to the health sector reforms. He was told “the language of business and the jargon of economics have alienated staff (as well as the public)” (Crown Company Monitoring Advisory Unit, 1996, p29). In 1997, as Minister of Health, Mr English authorised a further restructuring of government-funded health-care delivery, by creating a single health funding authority and a network of Hospital and Health Services (Parliamentary Library, 2009, p. 17).

Significant during this period were the parts, practices and processes in New Zealand’s public health system that were opened up to public view and scrutiny. Most notable was the introduction of user fees at previously cost-free public hospitals. Fees were introduced in 1992 and were abolished a year later, after costing just over $8 million (NZD) to administer. Flood (2000) explained that local communities raised concerns to their local health authorities and through local media about the non-provision of services and booking systems in local hospitals. Community groups, including groups of Pacific researchers and activists approached the government and claimed that booking systems for non-urgent surgical treatments signalled to them that local hospitals were not focussed on the needs of patients (Parliamentary Library, 2009).
1999 – The Pacific Vision conference

The speech given by the Minister of Finance was among other presentations given by government advisors and also by researchers. Two other speeches given at the conference (Cook, 1999; Fairbairn-Dunlop; 1999) are presented in this section to give context to the level of discussion afforded to expert viewpoints for consideration by the audience. The Pacific Vision conference was held in Auckland between July 27 and July 30, 1999. The meeting was a gathering of Pacific community leaders from across New Zealand. Among the delegates were representatives of industries, workforces, churches, universities, government, youth and communities. To introduce this conference and to illustrate the wide-ranging topics encountered in its discussion of Pacific economic development, I focussed on papers presented by Cook (1999) and Fairbairn-Dunlop (1999). Their papers were the majority of information still available from the 1999 conference in 2014.

Statistics New Zealand’s chief government statistician Len Cook (1999) presented a paper discussing the demographic composition of Pacific peoples in New Zealand from 1945 to 1999. It defined Pacific as being representative of people who identified with Samoan, Cook Island, Tongan, Niuean, Fijian or Tokelauan ethnicity. Cook discussed the age and child-bearing structure of the population and the dynamics and makeup of Pacific families and households. Statistics New Zealand reported that the Pacific population was more youthful than the mainstream Palangi population which it claimed was due to the “high fertility of Pacific women and rapid miscegenation of the Pacific population” (Cook, 1999, p. 7) which meant that the population was regenerating and becoming more ethnically mixed.

Cook (1999) also presented demographic information to illustrate how Pacific peoples have participated in the national workforce. The paper discussed changes
that had occurred in New Zealand industries and the impacts that had been felt by Pacific workers who relied on those industries for employment. Cook (1999) suggested the growth in the “Wholesale and Retail trade and Restaurants and Hotels (and) ‘Community, Social and Personal Services’ sectors” (Statistics New Zealand, 1999, p. 17) would provide spaces for large numbers of the Pacific workforces in the future.

Fairbairn-Dunlop (1999) presented a paper on a community development programme that had been undertaken to address issues of violence towards children in Samoa. The findings of the paper were that, contrary to initial thoughts, the participants [who were mothers in Samoan villages] began to recognise themselves in discussions about child beatings and abusive language. Fairbairn-Dunlop (1999) explained that Samoan families recognised the impacts that development and urbanisation were having on their village communities. They felt that their physical punishment of children stemmed from the pressures of development on the traditional family unit and its ways.

Fairbairn-Dunlop’s (1999) paper was also a demonstration of community groups taking ownership through the processes of understanding a problem, defining it on their own terms and creating solutions. She explained that the Tetee Atu strategy emerged following seminars with branches of the Samoan National Council of Women on the effects development had on women and the role of women and the National Council of Women in the development space. Fairbairn-Dunlop (1999) outlined to the Pacific Vision 1999 conference delegates that the women involved in Tetee Atu led discussions with council members to consider the reasons why Samoan parents hit their children, why Christianity and the Bible played a role in
defending acts of physical punishment and, from these, develop a Samoan definition of abuse and ways to reduce the incidence of it.

In the context of a conference with an economic development focus, Fairbairn-Dunlop’s (1999) paper outlined a development-based discussion that was taking place in the Pacific homeland of Samoa. Her paper signalled to the conference delegates that development created and enacted on distinctly Pacific terms was a concept which was worthy of debate and discussion. The paper claimed that the inherent strength was present in Samoan [and other Pacific] communities to take responsibility for their own destinies. It demonstrated that communities were capable of recognising the impacts of development, identifying particular problems, defining the problem on their own cultural terms and devising solutions that were appropriate and relevant for putting into practice.

Speech by Hon Bill English

At the Pacific Vision conference in 1999, Bill English addressed an audience of Pacific community leaders who had gathered to discuss economic development. Attending the conference were Pacific lawyers, academics, church leaders, community group leaders, youth representatives and politicians. English began his speech by explaining that his roles within government had given him opportunities to interact with Pacific communities. Early in his speech he encouraged community leaders in the audience to feel confident to approach the government with ideas about Pacific peoples’ economic development.

I want to encourage you to come to Government with your ideas and proposals - everyone else does. The growing strength of this community means you must be listened to. You are welcome to push us, challenge us, and work with us. (English, 1999)
Bill English’s invitation to community groups reflected a desire to see population
groups play a more influential role in shaping policy decisions. That desire echoed
the viewpoints of Boston et al. (1996) who believed that communities with unique
knowledge would become influential in policy making under an NPM-styled public
sector. He moved on to describe his experiences with communities in his previous
post as Minister of Health.

My experience in Health taught me a number of things. Firstly,
communities have more resources than we think, regardless of how
that community looks to us from the outside. There are few who
have no understanding of their disadvantages and no capacity to do
anything about them. The reality is that people who live with
economic and social disadvantage every day know how it feels. The
problem that Government may be setting out to solve is much alive
to them. This understanding is much more sharply focussed than the
standard public service litany of generalised failure. (English, 1999)

Bill English encouraged the audience to be inspired by their experiences of being
disadvantaged in creating innovative ideas to be brought to the government. While it
was an inspirational message, it was one that was focussed on the Pacific
experience being one of disparity and deficit, of ‘disadvantage’. In his view, the value
of community among Pacific peoples was the ability to communicate face to face in
an unintimidating fashion – something he believed government agencies were
incapable of doing.

One of the more moving experiences I've had as a politician was a
visit to the Mangere Community Centre a few years ago. I was
asked to hand out certificates of recognition to people who had
helped in the meningitis campaign. They were a real mixture -
students, housewives, unemployed - who went door-to-door talking
to families in their own language about how to tell if their children
might have the killer disease - more effective than any pamphlet or
trained professional. The Government produced a few thousand
dollars, but they owned the sense of empowerment and community
building (English, 1999)
In his view, the government was changing the way it related to communities, and he believed that Pacific communities needed to change the way they viewed their development. English told the audience that leadership was needed in order to foster change in communities and that attitudinal change was vital if Pacific peoples were going to embrace economic development. He proposed that attitudes that focussed on traditions were harmful to Pacific peoples’ economic aspirations.

I’ve also learned that the good old days weren’t so good after all. Communities can be trapped by their view of how it used to be. If we’re honest, we know that many of the needs in the Pacific Island community were simply ignored by Government. Our young people are not well served, if all we can tell them is that before they were born things were better. They need to understand our history, but it’s important that they are not trapped by it. This applies particularly in our Pacific community... We have to learn that it's a long haul to get there. If partnerships are going to make a difference, then both partners need to be realistic about what can be achieved and how. The best partnerships are based on common expectations and mutual obligations. In the worst, each blames the other for not meeting their unreasonable expectations (English, 1999).

Bill English moved to focus on the challenges he experienced in attempting to make changes in government service provision systems. In his view, Pacific community leaders were not being effective partners as they were arguing with his approach to change. He believed that Pacific viewpoints that he had been exposed to were incongruent with the changes required to foster effective development.

Members of this audience ought to know that they can't have it both ways. If you want real change and real partnership then you must argue for change. It’s very confusing as a Government to see communities who need real change arguing against it. How many of you here have thought in recent years that the changes in health for instance were some kind of mad right-wing experiment? Probably most of you. You must consider the benefits for your own people. (English, 1999)
It was interesting to note that Mr English did not express a viewpoint on Pacific wellbeing values in relation to his experiences as Minister of Health. This was despite the emergence around the same time of wellbeing systems in the writings of Pacific health authors who had developed wellbeing systems based on Pacific values systems (Bathgate & Pulotu-Endemann, 1997; Tamasese et al, 1997).

5.2 – Pacific Progress – Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs

1999 to 2002 – The 46th Parliament of New Zealand

The 46th parliament saw a change in governing parties from the coalition of the previous term to a one made up of the New Zealand Labour Party and Alliance. In her speech announcing that the two parties had reached a coalition agreement, Prime Minister Rt. Hon. Helen Clark stated that the first objective of the government was to “implement a policy platform which reduces inequality, is environmentally sustainable, and improves the social and economic wellbeing of all New Zealanders” (Clark, 1999). At the opening of the 46th parliament, the government’s ideas on social and economic wellbeing were further discussed in the Speech from the Throne, which was delivered by the Governor General Sir Michael Hardie-Boys.

Hardie-Boys (1999) referred in the speech, written by the representatives of the incoming Labour Government, to a period of economic volatility in the decade between 1989 and 1999. He discussed an economic recession and subsequent recovery – which led to a further economic recession in 1998 (Hardie-Boys, 1999). The speech acknowledged economic disparity between Māori and Palangi New Zealanders and a need to close gaps between the two groups. After introducing economic disparity experienced by Māori, the Speech from the Throne moved to
discuss Pacific peoples. The speech explained that the government was concerned about deprivation felt by Pacific peoples as well as Māori. It positioned Pasifika people as part of the wider ethnic and cultural landscape of New Zealand.

The economic, social and educational needs of our Pacific communities are also of particular concern for my government and will be similarly addressed. New Zealand celebrates its Pacific location and the special contribution to our culture from its peoples, as it welcomes the contribution now being made by the many other ethnic communities which have been established in our country. (Hardie-Boys, 1999, p. 3)

In the first budget set by in the 46th parliament, $114 million was allocated between the Government's budget years of 2000 and 2002 to help fund Pacific and Māori community organisations to design and deliver social development initiatives (Cullen, 2000). That funding was announced under a heading of “Closing the Gaps” (Cullen, 2000, p7) and included economic and social balancing policies and initiatives among later budgets.

In the 2000 budget MPIA was allocated $5.878 million in funds to provide policy advice, monitor government programmes, communicate with Pacific communities, and support communities to develop capabilities in devising programmes and initiatives and to provide business development and promotional opportunities (Treasury, 2000). The policy, monitoring, communications and community support roles were all justified in the Pacific Island Affairs funding allocation document as being aligned to the government’s Closing the Gaps philosophy and programme of work. Closing the Gaps became a significant part of the Ministry’s work that was mandated in the purchase agreement as evidenced in the budget statement (Treasury, 2000, p. 217). The Ministry’s remit to provide business development and
promotional opportunities was delivered through a third-party agency, the PBT which had carried out that task since 1985.

2002 – Pacific Progress Report

In June 2002, Statistics New Zealand and MPIA released a report which brought together statistical data encompassing the social, economic, health and educational development of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. The report had been the result of interaction between the two government agencies with a focus on defining the economic status of Pacific peoples. It was significant as it was the first time that government agencies collated data tables that reflected, in the viewpoints of the advisers in each agency, the elements that constituted Pacific economic wellbeing in New Zealand.

Pacific Progress contained a definition of ethnic groups that made up the Pacific population it portrayed. The report defined Pacific peoples as “Samoan, Cook Islands, Tongan, Niuean and Fijian” (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 17) who were resident in New Zealand. The report’s cultural definition also included people from Tahiti, Kiribati and the Society Islands in the Pacific peoples’ category. Statistics New Zealand and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs acknowledged that those three groups were not analysed as separate ethnic groups but were included in the wider cultural definition. The report also acknowledged that Fijian communities consisted of people of Melanesian and Indian ethnicity – and that some Indian-Fijian people identified as Fijians.

The report was introduced with the following words:

The growth of the Pacific population in New Zealand has been one of the defining features of New Zealand society in recent decades. Migrating in increasing numbers following the Second World War,
Pacific people faced challenges of adapting to and establishing themselves in a new country and a new social and economic environment. Since the large-scale migrations of the 1960s and 1970s, they have become a well-established and integral part of New Zealand’s social landscape, a vibrant and dynamic community experiencing considerable progress and change. (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 17)

The introductory paragraphs set the tone of the reports as being focussed on the Pacific community’s adaptation to New Zealand society and its norms. It is interesting to note that in this report, which was co-authored by MPIA, the opening messages did not contain discussion about Pacific values. The document went on to highlight the uniqueness of Pacific peoples as a population group.

In many respects the Pacific population has a similar social and economic profile to the Māori population. However, comparisons with the Māori population have not been made in this report as the aim has been to show how the Pacific population fares in relation to the New Zealand population as a whole rather than how they compare with other groups. Therefore, where statistical comparisons are made in this report, Pacific peoples are compared with the total New Zealand population (which includes Pacific peoples). (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 17)

Statistics New Zealand and MPIA demonstrated their intent to ensure that Pacific peoples had a space in which Pacific peoples could be seen through statistics. This assertion could have been a response to the challenges that MPIA faced as a result of pressure from mainstream agencies and also following the 1997 ministerial review (Makisi, 2009). As the report presented statistics that related to employment, housing, education and criminal convictions, it also provided commentaries about relevant community entities or programmes. The following passage accompanied statistics about family composition.

The family has a central role within New Zealand society, and this is particularly true for Pacific peoples. Although constantly evolving, the family provides support and care, and is the environment in which most children are raised. Family and household sizes tend to
be larger among the Pacific population, and this is linked to both cultural and economic factors. (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 30).

Compared with literature that was around at that time, which described the dynamics of extended Pacific family structures (Hau'ofa, 1994; Pasikale & George, 1995; Tamasese et al, 1997), this description appeared tentative. It is interesting to consider a tentative description of family systems, and the relevant values in the context of the work environment of policy advisers as a result of the external pressures faced by MPIA during the 1996-1998 period of threats of closure, review and restructure (as discussed on page 44). Statistics New Zealand and MPIA made a causal link between socio-economic deprivation and increased rates of criminal activity, and noted this as a risk for future development of Pacific peoples.

Pacific people are over-represented in justice statistics, with higher rates of conviction and prosecution than the total population. While they have relatively low rates of conviction for some crimes, like drug offences, they are strongly represented among violent offenders… Socio-economic factors may also play a part as unemployment, low-status jobs, low incomes and low levels of education are factors which are often associated with criminal offending. (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 34)

Another way to view the warning given by the authors of Pacific Progress was to view the possibility of a causal link between socio-economic status and criminal activity that the advisors at MPIA could have been signalling to other policy advisers, or policy makers, that inattention to deprivation could lead to increased costs to the justice system later. This point was later picked up on in the Pacific Economic Participation Report (NZIER, 2005) and by McCarthy in the Pacific Analysis Framework (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006).

A later section of the Pacific Progress report presented data tables to illustrate the wage rates, sources of income, total household income and the relationships
between income and expenditure. The section contained the following commentary on the practice of remittances.

These transactions usually involve the transfer of private capital from migrant individuals or families back to family members in the country of origin. Money may be sent back out of goodwill to help support family, or to repay an investment made in an individual’s education in New Zealand. (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002, p. 99)

In the view of the report’s authors, the act of remittances was linked either to altruistic acts of goodwill or the repayment of investment. Pacific progress presented a very different view of remittances from literature available at the time, notably the narrative presented in Our Sea of Islands (Hau’ofa, 1994) which discussed the connections between migrants and their families back home, as well as the maintaining of a place for migrants to return to.

5.3 – The Pacific Analysis Framework


2005 to 2008 – The 48th Parliament of New Zealand

The 48th New Zealand Parliament was a minority coalition government which consisted of the New Zealand Labour Party and the Progressive Party. The government also entered into agreements securing the support of the New Zealand First Party and the United Future Party. In the Speech from the Throne, Governor General Dame Sylvia Cartwright delivered the policy focus for the upcoming parliamentary term, as laid out by the government. The government wanted to focus its policies on the structure of New Zealand’s economy with special attention being paid to industries that were knowledge based or specialist in nature. The government’s economic development message was about increasing the amount...
being produced by New Zealand industries in relation to the amount invested in them (Cartwright, 2005).

The other prominent economic development theme in the 2005 Speech from the Throne was that of transformation (Cartwright, 2005). The speech referred to a need for New Zealand’s economy to move away from relying on the agriculture and dairy commodity sectors to create a more diverse economy able to trade internationally. The government’s up-coming policy agenda included the signalling of changes in social development and welfare policy with the intention of changing the cost of borrowing money from the State for tertiary education. The speech claimed that removing interest charges from student loan contracts would encourage people to upskill in New Zealand and create investment in local universities, and time in local industries (Cartwright, 2005).

At the same time as the lead-up to the 2005 Pacific Prosperity conference was the release of a report by the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research. This report investigated the economic participation of Pacific peoples. (NZIER, 2005). The economic participation report was commissioned by MPIA and was designed to present the Ministry with a more comprehensive understanding of the impact that Pacific underachievement had on the financial position of the government of the day and of future governments.

Some of the demographic and income-related statistics used by NZIER also appeared in Pacific Progress. The NZIER report gave an impression that Pacific peoples did not have the capability to contribute equally to the New Zealand economy in the future.
In economic terms, the Pacific population performs, on average, worse than the New Zealand population; the Pacific population is growing faster than the New Zealand average population and will be a considerably larger proportion of the New Zealand working age population in the future. This has social and economic implications for New Zealand now and in the future. (NZIER, 2005, p. iv)

The report studied the incomes and employment rates of Pacific peoples and made conclusions about the risk to government if disparities were not arrested. It illustrated a risk picture by creating a series of projections from 2006 to 2021, and advised that risk could be mitigated through having the wages of Pacific peoples match those of the general population.

By contrast to a negative tone detected in the NZIER report to MPIA, MPIA framed itself in a confident tone in its budget allocation statements. In these statements for 2005 and 2006, also known as *Estimates of Appropriations*, MPIA was framed in the document’s text as being experts in the Pacific communities’ space on its behalf. In both years, the Ministry noted itself as “the Government’s leading provider of advice concerning the wellbeing of Pacific people in New Zealand” (Treasury, 2005, p. 906; Treasury, 2006, p. 1017). In 2005 and 2006 the MPIA statement read “… the organisation is primarily focussed on providing policy and communications advice. But in order to inform the policy advice produced, it is essential for the Ministry to have the ability to initiate and evaluate certain innovative projects” (Treasury, 2005, p. 906; Treasury, 2006, p. 1017). The years 2005 and 2006 were significant as they led to the publication of the Pacific Analysis Framework.

**2006 – Pacific Analysis Framework**

The Pacific Analysis Framework (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2005) was a policy-making response to the ‘Closing the Gaps’ programme (Cullen, 2000) which later became known as the ‘Reducing Inequalities Strategy’ (Treasury, 2006, p. 907).
The Pacific Analysis Framework was designed to build on previously discussed notions (Hardie-Boys, 1999; Cullen, 2000; Treasury, 2002) that organisations needed to build their capabilities to understand Pacific communities, and their ways of thinking, in order to effect realistic and relevant change. To build on those ideas, MPIA produced a guide for Palangi policy analysts or policy managers. The Pacific Analysis Framework was presented to policy analysts through training sessions given by Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs' senior staff. The intention of creating training for policy analysts was to open up discussions between expert Pacific policy analysts and non-expert Palangi analysts about Pacific cultural values and the importance of including them when designing processes related to policy making or analysis.

In a foreword, the Minister for Pacific Island Affairs introduced his viewpoint, on behalf of the government of the day, as wanting to aid the improvement of Pacific peoples’ economic status through appropriate policy.

Government has a commitment to developing sound public policies that meet the needs of all New Zealanders, including Pacific peoples living in New Zealand. The diversity and unique characteristics of Pacific peoples, coupled with the disparities they experience, pose a real challenge in how Government formulates and implements policy in order to improve their position. Public policy advisers need to be aware of this challenge and to actively seek ways to incorporate Pacific peoples’ perspectives to enhance the quality of their policy advice. (Goff in, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006, p. 2)

Goff’s introduction also described Pacific peoples’ experiences as being typified by disadvantage. This follows similar descriptions by Bill English (1999) as well as in the Pacific Progress report (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002). As the Pacific Analysis Framework followed the Pacific Economic Participation Report (NZIER, 2005) and the Pacific Progress report, it is interesting to
consider the impact of evidence-based policy on the image of Pacific peoples that policy makers were projecting. In the NPM (Boston et al, 1996) environment, statistical evidence was seen as authoritative (as discussed on page 30-31). However, the foray of MPIA into evidence-based policy with Pacific Progress was also a response to direct challenges to its worthiness as a government department (Makisi, 2009).

Therefore, the tone of the document remained entrenched in the dominant government’s viewpoint. This tone was reflected in the following section of the Pacific Analysis Framework which noted that prolonged Pacific disadvantage posed a financial risk to the government.

Pacific peoples in New Zealand have yet to achieve full and equitable participation in all aspects of New Zealand life. Inequalities exist between the participation level of Pacific peoples – as compared with the general population – in social, economic, cultural and political spheres. The consequence of this is that, while such inequalities exist, New Zealand incurs avoidable fiscal costs of social disadvantage and also foregoes economic benefits because of the lower participation rates of Pacific peoples. The Ministry is therefore committed to reducing barriers and constraints on participation, promoting both the development and uptake of opportunities for improved participation and through promoting increased involvement in higher –level decision making. (McCarthy in, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006, p. 3)

The Pacific Analysis Framework document moved on to outline the problems in policy systems that it wanted to solve. It is important to remember that the framework document was an instructional guide for policy analysts and their managers, and it was also presented to policy analyst audiences in workshops where they were encouraged to discuss Pacific values with Pacific policy makers. The list of problems that the Pacific Analysis Framework was to solve reflected the challenges that government policy makers faced, as the result of consultation between the authors of
the framework and their colleagues in the public sector, during the Pacific Capacity Building programme (Makisi, 2009).

The nature of public policy-making can present obstacles towards the recognition of Pacific peoples’ perspectives as these tend to be associated with:

- Inadequate problem identification and definition from a Pacific viewpoint;
- Over-emphasis of rational policy analysis approaches favouring general measures of improvement at the expense of marginal improvement;
- Mainstream agencies controlling who can be involved on a particular policy issue;
- A lack of early involvement by small agencies in identifying and defining policy problems; and
- An over-reliance on Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs to provide the Pacific perspectives within departmental policy work. (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006, p. 5)

The framework was a set of actions or ways of completing tasks that were designed to take place as part of a generic policy process. The framework (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006, p. 10-16) was a three-step approach which encompassed; consultation with Pacific peoples, the gathering, questioning and organising of information to assess the policy problem at hand and the application of a set of Pacific values and diversity considerations at each step. (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006).

The Pacific Analysis Framework document paid special attention to the values that enhanced consultation with Pacific communities. It gave readers specific guidelines for ensuring that their consultations with Pacific peoples were going to be meaningful on Pacific terms.
Consultation techniques need to consider how best to elicit Pacific peoples’ response to an issue and how their values and cultural practices are best acknowledged in the process.

Who are the Pacific peoples to consult, and what are the best times, geographic coverage and venue for the consultation?

What are the cultural protocols to observe and who can offer this advice?

**Try to remove barriers for Pacific peoples to participate** – Use of wrong languages, complex written documents full of jargon, the wrong presenter; a poorly located venue may be too far away from a familiar place; misunderstanding about the role of government, and lack of support by community leaders

Be mindful of weekend commitments and time off work (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006, p. 13, 14, 18)


In 2007 the Labour Government released the final stage in what had become its *Pacific Prosperity Strategy* - its Pacific Economic Action Plan (PEAP) and Pacific Women’s Economic Development Plan (PWEDAP) (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007). The release of the two plans came less than a year following the release of the *Pacific Analysis Framework* and within the same parliamentary term. In 2007 Dr Colin Tukuitonga was appointed by the State Services Commission to replace Fuimaono Les McCarthy as chief executive of MPIA. In the same year Luamanuvao Winnie Laban became the Minister of Pacific Island Affairs.

The government’s intention for MPIA, as expressed in the *Estimates of Appropriation*, remained the same in 2007 as it had been for the 2006 and 2005 *Estimates*. The purchase agreement continued to require MPIA to provide policy advice, communications advice and, business development and promotional opportunities through the Pacific Business Trust. (Treasury, 2006; Treasury, 2007).
The PEAP and PWEDAP document was focussed on improvements in Pacific peoples’ economic outcomes through partnerships between government departments, non-government organisations and consultancies (see appendix 6 for a full list). Missing from that list, however, were informal community groups and church communities. The action plan document highlighted a mainstream economic focus for the development it wanted to promote.

**Self-reliance:**
Encourages a move away from dependence upon government assistance and a move towards self-reliance.

**Strengths based:**
Endorses a strengths-based focus as opposed to a deficit approach. It promotes programmes and initiatives that build upon and develop the talents and abilities currently possessed by Pacific peoples.

**Competitive advantage:**
Highlights areas of strength that are unique to Pacific peoples as well as areas where Pacific peoples currently display a natural dominance, and seeks to build on these.

**Sustainability:**
Promotes initiatives that will be supported by current community mechanisms and can be maintained within existing traditional and cultural support structures.
Regional Coverage:
While the coverage is national, a particular emphasis is placed on the Auckland region.

Partnerships:
Promotes and facilitates the establishment of new partnerships across government, private sector, iwi and other stakeholders.

Community mandate:
Framed by views and feedback obtained from Pacific communities and responds to their priorities.

Informed choices:
Seeks to ensure that Pacific peoples have access to all the information necessary to make informed choices in the determination of their future. (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007, p. 5)

The PEAP and PWEDAP also listed a set of aspirational goals that it wanted to achieve.

Goal One Education: High Pacific achievement at all levels of the education system, resulting in a highly skilled Pacific workforce.

Goal Two Workforce Development: Highly skilled and versatile Pacific workforce.

Goal Three Business Development: Pacific entrepreneurs and businesses are significantly contributing to New Zealand’s economic development.

Goal Four Creative, Emerging and Growth Industries: Greater participation by Pacific peoples in the creative, emerging and growth industries.

Goal Five Entrepreneurial Culture: Greater participation by Pacific peoples in entrepreneurial activities.

Goal Six Leadership: High representation of Pacific peoples in leadership positions and private and public sector organisations (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007, p. 5)
In articulating its goals, values and principles, the MPIA outlined its intentions to foster the development of Pacific peoples inside the mainstream economic model. Like Pacific Progress and the Pacific Analysis Framework, the PEAP and PWEDAP documents did not discuss Pacific values related to sharing of resources, mutual care, and reciprocity. Like the Pacific Analysis Framework and Pacific Progress, the PEAP and PWEDAP included a section where data was presented to illustrate Pacific peoples’ economic participation as compared to other population groups in selected measures.

Pacific peoples are less likely than the national population to receive income from self-employment, business, interest, rent or investments. Pacific employers comprise 1.6% of the total population of employers. At 4.4 percent, Pacific Peoples were the smallest number of people in self-employment (without employees) in 2001, compared to the European and Asian ethnic groups. Employers and self-employed people were more likely than paid employees to have vocational qualifications or university degrees. Pacific employers and the self-employed are more likely than others to be in secondary industries, and less likely to be in primary industries. Pacific women are less likely than Pacific men to have received income from self-employment or from their own business (3% compared with 6%), reflecting their lower rate of self-employment and business ownership.

Building the capability and management of Pacific businesses through regional partnerships will increase Pacific business productivity and contribution to New Zealand’s economic development. (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007, p. 10)

The data regarding the benefits of self-employment and entrepreneurialism was linked to the fifth strategic goal listed on page five of the PEAP and PWEDAP document. It was interesting to note that the Pacific Progress and the Pacific Analysis Framework documents included income statistics that affected individual wage earners, or households/family groups of combined wage earners. Meanwhile the PEAP and PWEDAP statistics about the percentage of business owners of
Pacific ethnicity could present less tangible benefits to Pacific people on an individual or family/community level. This raises questions about the relevant policy makers and advisers and their perceptions of Pacific values and whether or not values had been considered for a more prominent place in this document.

**Summary of Findings from Government Documents.**

On a superficial level, the framing of Pacific peoples in policy documents remained consistent between 1998 and 2013. A significant theme over the period was the viewpoint that Pacific peoples experienced economic disadvantage when compared with other population groups. Meanwhile, government policy documents illustrated economic actions and interactions which reflected an ideal state as seen by government departments and policy makers. Central to the economic interactions illustrated through the documentary evidence in this chapter was the prominence given to mainstream constructs such as the ability for individual consumers to make *better* choices with increased incomes.

The following chapter discusses the findings of this study.
Chapter 6 Discussion

“Motu ka na’e navei” – “Ensure that there is a navei [on your basket]”

The navei is a supporting strap of a basket used to gather produce. It can hold the majority of contents when the straps break. This proverb reminds us all to be prepared for disaster.

Introduction

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the study, including a statement of research purpose and the major methods involved. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to interpreting the findings of this study in terms of the research questions initially posed. A discussion of the limitations experienced in this study concludes the chapter.

Summary of Literature and Methodology

From the 1900s to 2014, migrant populations from the Pacific Islands, and their New Zealand-born families, have built communities that are recognised for being vibrant, energetic and caring. In 2014, Pacific peoples comprised seven per cent of New Zealand’s total population (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). Statistical reports prepared by government analysts noted that Pacific peoples have lower incomes, greater rates of imprisonment and more crowded housing than other ethnic groupings counted in New Zealand government statistics (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002).

Since the 1940s, various government departments and political parties have proposed or articulated different attitudes, approaches and policy documents to address economic development of Pacific peoples. Policy interventions have
included: legislation to enable temporary migration for employment (Williams, 1978; Simpson, 1990; Easton, 1997), support to purchase housing (Rata, 1975), articulation of ethnic equality by Parliament (McCluskey, 2008), and economic development action plans (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007).

Studies from social science, health and economic scholarship found that Pacific peoples’ economic realities were closely linked to cultural values of relationship maintenance through reciprocal sharing of goods and time, as well as valuing spiritual faith (Hau’ofa, 1993; Pasikale & George, 1995; Anae, 1998; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1998; Tamasese et al., 2010, 2012; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). Other studies explained that the world views of Pacific peoples motivated individuals to provide labour, money and companionship to newcomers in workplaces, households and community groups (Larner, 1991; Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005). Further studies noted that Pacific world views of communalism, service and caring were a positive influence in the effective management of government departments in resource-constrained environments (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009).

Despite the knowledge present in literature about Pacific peoples’ economic activities (Pasikale & George, 1995; Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005), some recent studies that have influenced policy making about the economic wellbeing of Pacific peoples (Anae et al., 2007; Dupuis, 2009; Stuart et al., 2012) framed the link between Pacific cultural values and Pacific peoples’ economic realities in unfavourable terms. This study found that mainstream government agency thinking could not conceptualise Pacific economic realities on Pacific terms with Pacific values as a motivational force behind consumer decisions. The causes of this inability to conceptualise could not be determined, and would warrant further study. As a result, studies commissioned or sponsored by government departments framed
the economic practices of Pacific peoples as selfish coercion by faceless ‘others’ in wider family or community circles who were inconsiderate of the needs of an individual family unit (Anae et al., 2007; Stuart et al. 2012).

Studies of policy-making systems in New Zealand have not acknowledged the presence of ethnic groups in the New Zealand population. Meanwhile, these studies have noted that economic logic is the significant factor in the creation of policy (Boston et al., 1996). A renewed prominence of economic logic in policy making coincided with government reforms between 1984 and 1998. These reforms were premised on changing international economic conditions, and changing attitudes to the management of government systems. Studies and government statistics (State Services Commission, 2004; 2013a) note that the majority of policy makers and expert advisers in New Zealand were from Palangi ethnic groups. Authors have also noted that as mainstream values of individualism and values such as economic-markets and transaction-cost economics are reflected in policy making, peoples who were not part of those systems were seen as sub-optimal (Hau’ofa, 1994; Smith, 1999; Waring, 1999).

The overall purpose of this study was to answer the following research questions:

1. How are representations of Pasifika peoples constructed and framed by New Zealand government policy makers, as seen in government economic development policy documents and policy outcomes?

2. What has been the role of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) in representing Pasifika peoples in the economic development policy process?
My research design of Heideggerian Phenomenology (Van Manen, 1990, 2007; Moran, 2000) and the Talanoa methodology (Halapua, 2003; Vaioleti, 2006) to ensure culturally safe places for participants to share their experiences and aspirations worked extremely well. This is seen in the comprehensive and honest responses shared and also in the fact that all Talanoa continued long past their scheduled time. Simply put, these participants welcomed this opportunity to reflect back on their experiences and share their views.

The semi-structured Talanoa took place with four expert policy-making professionals, all of whom were of Pacific ethnicity. The talanoa interviews were scheduled to be 60 minutes long, and were held at locations that were accessible to the participants in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch between January and April 2014.

**Findings in this study**

In the following section, the main findings are presented, followed by a discussion and an analysis of the implications of these findings for future studies. In general, this study found that economic wellbeing and associated behaviours, were framed according to mainstream economic values (see Coase, 1937) of consumer choice theory, and transaction cost theory. The second main finding of this study was that Pacific policy makers and advisors, motivated by a passionate and powerful drive, found ways to ensure Pacific communities were included in policy making. The third main finding of this study was that MPIA offered a space for Pacific policy making to be both included in mainstream policy systems and influenced by Pacific values.

**The framing of Pacific peoples’ economic behaviours**

In government documents, Pacific peoples were framed through the use of economic indicators such as having lower incomes which in turn is associated with, lower rates
of home ownership, greater challenges in accessing public health care and lower attainment of formal qualifications. The application of these indicators reflects the values that the policy-making system assigns to the concepts of economic wellbeing: - the constructs of incomes, home ownership, public health care and formal education. This study found that the normative values of policy makers led to frames that described households as parents and their offspring and that all economic wellbeing was dependent on money, most likely earned by one of the parents in the household, to be spent for the direct enjoyment of the household in question.

This framing was at odds with the values associated with Pacific cultures (Tamasese et al, 2007; Fairbairn-Dunlop; 2014) and also the economic behaviours of Pacific peoples (Ha’uofa; 1994; Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005). Had the Pacific values of care, reciprocity, spirituality and nurturing together with the behaviours of sharing resources, reliance on family networks, giving of labour and goods been included in policy making logic, policies and practices would have been different. The overall economic picture of Pacific peoples in New Zealand would also have been different.

The terms used to frame the economic wellbeing and experiences of Pacific peoples changed over the 1998-2013 period. According to the documents reviewed, earlier framing of Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing reflected a belief in the authority of government policy makers and the need for community to follow government policy makers’ viewpoints (English, 1999). English, however, also noted that the government didn’t know it all and requested that Pacific community leaders engaged government in communication. The community was receiving mixed messages. However, as more reports and documents were produced (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs & Statistics New Zealand, 2002; Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006;
Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007) there were increased instances where the aspirations and cultural strengths of Pacific communities were acknowledged.

During the 1998-2013 period significant amounts of statistical data became available to policy makers and expert advisers, which illustrated an ideal goal for economic outcomes for Pacific peoples, based on the ability of individual households to earn greater incomes. The cost of living would have less of an impact, and this would reduce the potential need for state intervention through the welfare system. Therefore, the central government framing of Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing remained entrenched in mainstream economic thinking throughout the period, its viewpoint was that the expenditure of incomes within individual households was the key to economic wellbeing. Pacific peoples were presented in Pacific Progress (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002) as having experienced ‘considerable progress and change’ (p. 17) as a result of adapting to life in New Zealand. The change and progress related to the differences between transitioning from subsistence living in the Pacific Islands, based on values systems, to being described as part of the New Zealand mainstream economy, the government’s viewpoint of how Pacific peoples’ economic futures would be considered.

Participants noted, however, that data also enabled Palangi policy advisors to seek out Pacific expert knowledge and problem-solving ideas (Godinet-Watts, 2014; Gosche, 2014; Sumeo, 2014) in economic wellbeing and tertiary education policy. Gosche (2014) explained that statistical data describing the economic wellbeing of Pacific peoples in the Auckland metropolitan area gave policy advisors a platform to create policy interventions that could have positive benefits. He also noted that MPIA
advisors were invited to policy discussions as experts with insights into the ways Pacific peoples achieved wellbeing.

The drive to include Pacific peoples in policy

An important finding from the data is the powerful and passionate drive by Pacific peoples engaged in policy making to ensure that Pacific peoples were included in policy processes. Participants in this study noted that Pacific policy makers and advisors were experienced in the value systems that guide the viewpoints that Pacific peoples in New Zealand have towards economic development matters such as the development of enterprise and sector and the influence of Pacific values in economic wellbeing (Godinet-Watts, 2014, Gosche, 2014; Laban, 2014). Gosche (2014) noted that the New Zealand economic policy discussions in the future would have to take greater notice of Pacific peoples’ approach to running businesses, which he explained emphasised providing services to communities instead of turning a profit.

Data found that Pacific policy makers and advisers exceeded the implied boundaries of their role and navigated policy systems to include Pacific values in processes, documents and outcomes. The Pacific Progress report was an example of the decision by advisers and managers at MPIA to create a compendium of differentiated, Pacific-specific data to inform future policy discussions, outcomes and decisions. Further to this, Godinet-Watts (2014) noted that development programmes for Pacific youth are the result of Pacific policy makers’ and advisers’ collective efforts to influence policy outcomes using activities that reflected the strengths and challenges of Pacific youth in their local area. This finding contrasts the notions proposed in the literature (Treasury, 1987; Boston et al, 1996; Washington, 1998; Cheyne et al, 2003; Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005) that policy
outcomes and development activities result from the feedback of policy actors to senior leaders and figureheads.

However, Pacific policy advisors faced considerable challenges in integrating Pacific values while preparing some economic policy documents. While the PEAP and PWEDAP (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007) acknowledged Pacific leaders, communities and youth who had been consulted, the basis of the two plans were entrenched in mainstream economic values. While Pacific communities were involved in the consultation process, and Pacific values formed the basis for MPIA’s modus operandi, these were not reflected prominently in the economics of PEAP and PWEDAP. The end result was an economic development plan that focussed on wage increases, increased numbers of entrepreneurs and increases in the number of people employed, without consideration for how Pacific values could be influential in the derivation or distribution of the proposed increased resources. This end result implied that individual Pacific households would benefit from higher incomes by being able to make improved consumer choices that affected only those individual households.

The lack of prominence for Pacific values in PEAP and PWEDAP is a reminder of how powerful mainstream economic values and policy systems are in the lives of Pacific policy makers and expert advisers. This finding supports the data from participant interviews. Despite the expertise of Pacific policy makers and advisers inside the policy-making processes, mainstream viewpoints and normative values appear to have the final say on how Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing or development is framed. This finding also reinforces the writings of Durie (2004) and Salmond (2012) that mainstream viewpoints have been so well recognised that there is no alternative view.
Participants revealed that Pacific policy makers and advisers worked in complex environments advocating for Pacific values while assuming those values were often destined to be marginalised by some superiors (Godinet-Watts, 2014; Laban, 2014). Despite the challenges of being marginalised, the participants noted that, in their views, perseverance had led to the inclusion of Pacific values in policy discussions, such as the inclusion of Pacific religious values in policy advisories about consumer choice motivation in the education sector (Sumeo, 2014). However, Sumeo (2014) also noted that some of her Pacific policy adviser colleagues had been fatigued by the challenges they faced through prolonged resistance in the wider public sector, which led to some believing that mainstream systems were best. It is possible that battle weariness following challenges to the validity of MPIA in the late 1990s, followed by a review in 1997 and subsequent restructuring between 1998 and 2000 (Makisi, 2009), led to the prominence of mainstream economic thinking in the MPIA documents Pacific Progress, the Pacific Analysis Framework and the PEAP and PWEDAP.

Data in this study, from documentary evidence (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007) and participant interviews (Gosche, 2014; Godinet-Watts; 2014), has revealed that economic development policy descriptions were developed in an environment consisting of two layers. The outer layer embodied economic values of wage rates, employment rates, educational attainment statistics and home ownership as well as policy values of contestability of advice, the cost of policy delivery, and accountability evident in policy decision-making. Meanwhile below that surface layer, Pacific policy makers and advisers were working within the boundaries set by the outer layer to ensure that communities were consulted with, Pacific values were included in
discussions and decision-making, and that the wellbeing of the community was considered.

Pacific policy makers, influenced by their values, through massive amounts of effort were able to make incremental changes to the attitudes and behaviours that underpinned the structures of policy making.

**The role of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs**

Data and literature showed that MPIA held a pivotal position as the space where Pacific communities directed their aspirations for representation in policy, and where highly skilled Pacific people could serve their communities by bringing those aspirations to life. Estimates of Appropriations also declared the importance of MPIA’s role in the policy process, by affirming its status as an expert advisor to the government. The affirmation given through the Estimates highlights the status that MPIA has in the NPM government environment.

Literature, government documents and participant interviews demonstrated that MPIA, its advisors and the associated policy making Ministers took this position and role very seriously. This was seen through the skilful use of Pacific values to ensure that community and government stakeholders were engaged in dialogue about policy aspirations (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009). It was also seen through the lengths MPIA went to in order to integrate Pacific policy-making with mainstream systems and views, as a response to resistance to the very existence of the organisation. The most powerful example was the selection and analysis of [then] newly available data, and integration with Pacific storytelling, in *Pacific Progress* (Statistics New Zealand & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002) – which was
designed to stimulate policy discussion with a view to improving the wellbeing of Pacific peoples.

However, the efforts of MPIA to achieve policy aspirations through mainstream integration, inside a policy system where resistance to Pacific values has been a constant challenge, resulted in mainstream economic values remaining dominant in descriptions of Pacific wellbeing. Data showed that the role of MPIA, in the context of a resistant policy system, has been to continually challenge the norms and values that are assumed by mainstream policy makers and agencies, from a Pacific perspective.

The challenge for Pacific policy making in the future

The endurance of mainstream economic values, and the lack of recognition of Pacific values raises questions about the impact of Pacific policy makers and advisers as experts in the policy process. The Pacific Analysis Framework (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006) introduced the idea that Pacific values could be applied as a lens over a mainstream viewpoint or process. Participant interviews with Godinet-Watts (2014) and revealed that the Pacific lens in a mainstream function (such as policy analysis), compromised Pacific process and analysis, and forced compromises that Pacific policy makers and advisers negotiated with different outcomes and understandings. This finding supports the writing of Makisi (2009) who noted a similar experience in his own work as a policy analyst.

A major implication of these findings is that mainstream policy-making institutions hold a significant amount of control in determining the environment in which the framing of Pacific peoples in policy documents occurs. The findings in this exploratory study also suggest that mainstream institutions and the policy makers or
advisers do not appear to want to cede that control. Pacific policy makers and advisers have appeared to be fully cognisant of such structures and behaviours, which is what has led to the compromises reported in the findings. Participants’ recall of experiences of Palangi colleagues’ resistance to include Pacific values in framing Pacific policy documents or programmes (Godinet-Watts, 2014; Sumeo, 2014) reinforced the writings of Durie (2004) and Salmond (2013) who encountered an assumed superiority of Western values in government and policy discourse. This experience contradicts the prediction made in the Treasury briefing paper on Social Policy (1987), and a promise inferred by Boston et al. (1996) that the NPM system would lead to increased responsiveness by the policy-making sector to the needs of population groups.

Therefore, as Pacific policy making systems continually evolve and the influence of Pacific values’ grows, the response of the public sector will need to respond. As greater numbers of Palangi policy makers and expert advisors are acclimatised to Pacific values-based world views, and can see their positive influence in family and community development, it is hoped that these world views become more influential in the compilation of statistical questionnaires, policy agenda and cross-government policy discussions. The way to enable these things includes the strengthening of relationships between Pacific and Palangi policy colleagues, the increased knowledge about Pacific values that Palangi policy makers have access to, and the increased good will that emerges as a result.

**Limitations of this study**

This study was exploratory in nature and investigated the significance of Pacific peoples’ economic wellbeing in a policy-making context. This study, therefore,
makes a contribution to policy issues and outcomes of monocultural interpretation of selected central government data in the context of Pacific peoples in New Zealand. It highlights the space between two different ways of “being in the world”. However, the research had a number of limitations which affected the scope and the operations of this exploratory study.

This study took place inside the values system of one of the Pacific cultures, the Tongan anga fakatonga system. A key strength of the anga fakatonga is the ‘ofa tokoni, or the offering given of love and service to others. This study is an offering to other people interested in policy and Pacific peoples. However, due to the nature of policy systems in New Zealand, this study had to take place using the terms Pasifika and Pacific. The limitation related to the use of the terms Pacific and Pasifika was that it did not enable each of the Pacific ethnic world views the space to be explored. However, as a pan-Pacific study has taken place, the influence of ethnic-specific world views on economic wellbeing and development would warrant further study.

One limitation was the lack of available literature about the relationship between Pasifika peoples in New Zealand, government policy making and economic wellbeing. Much of the literature that discusses relationships between Pacific peoples and economic wellbeing are government reports that are focussed on either using data to advocate for or detailing policy interventions (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002; NZIER, 2005; Koloto & Sharma, 2005; Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007; Ministry of Pacific Affairs, 2008).

Another limitation of this study was the small sample size which reflects the available pool of Pacific policy makers who met the criteria as set in the research design. Reports from the State Services Commission (2004; 2013a) noted that less than 2%
of policy makers in government departments were of Pacific ethnicity. To overcome that limitation, I decided, in consultation with my academic mentors, to focus attention on policy makers who held positions of seniority. All the participants recruited for this study held a position as a senior adviser, chief adviser, chief executive or government Minister.

As this was an exploratory study, it did not factor in a consideration of how changing times, places and attitudes would impact *Pacific* ways of viewing economic behaviour.

This research referenced a vast range of official key documents that are central to the policy process. This reinforces the focus of government investment in data as prioritising a market-driven economic development paradigm. A major limitation of this research is the silence reflecting a Pacific understanding of economic wellbeing in these documents.

The next chapter concludes this study, makes a summary of the research and discusses implications for future research.
Chapter 7  Conclusion

“Oua lau e kafo kae lau e lava” – “Stay positive and count your blessings”

In the Tongan culture, it is common belief that spiritual faith helps keep people positive and moving ahead

Introduction
This conclusion chapter summarises the findings of this study. It also discusses the significance of the findings for relevant areas of policy and literature. Implications for future study are also be discussed.

Summary of study and findings
This was a qualitative, Heideggerian Phenomenological study (Van Manen, 1990; 2007; Wojnak & Swanson, 2007) that was significantly influenced by the Talanoa methodology (Halapua, 2000; 2003; Vaioleti, 2005; Otsuka, 2006). This combination of methodologies in this exploratory study was both useful and culturally appropriate.

Data was analysed from a series of government documents and semi-structured participant interviews.

The study set out to answer the following research questions:

1. How are representations of Pasifika peoples constructed and framed by New Zealand government policy makers, as seen in government economic development policy documents and policy outcomes?

2. What has been the role of The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) in representing Pasifika peoples in the economic development policy process?
This research was a critique of the assumptions that policy makers and advisors have made about Pacific peoples’ economic activities, and how economic activities are translated into public policy. This study found that the voice of communities who are the subject of policy interventions are key to ensuring that those policies are worthwhile. The findings of this study articulate a different economic world view to that presented in literature and government documents. The findings of this study also confirm the findings of previous authors (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009) that Pacific policy makers and advisors are guided by traditional Pacific values of service, and that they tirelessly navigate complex and high-tension work environments to make incremental changes to the way policy is made, for the advancement of Pacific communities on Pacific terms.

The findings proved, quite compellingly, the value and importance of this exploratory study. The findings have also set a foundation for further robust research and debate at the national, departmental and community level. For example, while studies noted that Pacific values system rank the sharing of resources higher than personal material gain (Hau’ofa, 1994; Tamasese et al, 1997; Helu-Thaman, 2008; Tamasese et al., 2010; Regenvanu, 2011; Ratuva, 2011; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014), this study connected and reviewed how economic related behaviours have been taken account of in economic policy making in New Zealand. This is a first study of this nature. Second, and just as important, the research provided the place where Pacific participants could openly share their views about the policy making space generally and their efforts to factor a Pacific ‘voice’ into policy making. What is more, these conversations were nurtured, on Pacific terms, by the use of the Pacific method of Talanoa.
Studies have noted that Pacific peoples and Pacific value systems of relationship management, care for others and the environment, spirituality and provisioning of resources for the good of a collective has been an enduring feature of the communities that are established in New Zealand (Hau’ofa, 1994; Tamasese et al, 1997; Thaman, 1998; Tamasese et al., 2010; Regenvanu, 2011; Ratuva, 2011; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). The literature has noted that policy-making systems in New Zealand, between 1998 and 2013, were a consequence of government reforms which took place between 1984 and 1998 (Boston et al., 1996). Policy-making systems, institutions and protocols established during the 1984 to 1998 period reflected the world views of the community of policy makers at the time. Authors noted that government reforms between 1984 and 1998 were characterised by a focus on transaction-cost economics which was illustrated by the introduction of legislation and reporting protocols that highlighted the cost of delivering policy interventions (Boston et al, 1996).

Government statistics show that communities of policy makers and expert advisers in New Zealand almost exclusively consisted of people from the mainstream New Zealand European/Pākeha ethnic group (SSC, 2004; 2013). Authors also noted that policy-making systems, through accountability and contestability measurement, relied on expert advice given by suitably qualified individuals (Boston et al., 1996) often chosen informally through networks of interconnected and like-minded individuals (Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005). Critical voices have noted that policy-making systems with economic principles that reflect the world views of policy makers has led to the marginalisation of indigenous (Smith, 1999), women’s (Waring, 1999) and Pacific (Hau’ofa, 1994) values; these values have been seen as of no value in the eyes of the mainstream economic worldview.
Data in this study highlights the prevalence of mainstream economic ideas and ethnic Pākehā/Palangi values in the representation of Pacific peoples in government policy outcomes and documents. Data collected from both policy documents and participant interviews reveals that as Pacific policy-makers or experts attempted to include Pacific values, and ways of seeing economic behaviours, it occurred over and over again.

Interview participants noted that policy-making systems with no capacity to recognise Pacific economic interactions gave Pacific policy makers opportunities to bring Pacific values to their task. Policy documents analysed in this study (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006; 2007) noted that Pacific policy makers and advisers were able to combine Pacific values into a recognised policy analysis process (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006) and economic development thinking (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007). Participants also noted that they faced considerable challenges in gaining legitimisation of Pacific values from their mainstream Palangi colleagues and managers. However, the cross-agency collaboration in Auckland was an exception.

An ambiguous relationship between framing in policy documents and research into Pacific people’s economic wellbeing emerged over the 1998-2013 period when government documents chosen for this study were written. While a small number of studies moved thinking towards Pacific cultural values, and their influence in lived economic experiences (Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005), Pacific economic development remained framed in market-oriented measurements such as improvements in incomes, increased educational attainment, reductions in unemployment and increased numbers of self-employed people (Statistics New
In this study, MPIA was found to have had an influential role in providing space for Pacific policy makers to reconceptualise the representation of Pacific peoples in government policy documents. The significance of the MPIA space was that it contradicted the mainstream values reflected in recognised policy systems (Shaw & Eichbaum, 2005) and was led, nearly all the time, by Pacific values (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009). A significant finding from both literature (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009) and participant interviews was that the ministry faced sustained challenges from mainstream agencies (Gosche, 2014; Laban, 2014) and Palangi policy makers (Godinet-Watts, 2014), between 1998 and 2013. In response to those challenges, Pacific policy makers drew on their Pacific values of service and relationship maintenance to find ways to advance policy objectives on Pacific terms.

**Significance of findings on literature**

This exploratory study makes a contribution to knowledge in the areas of economic wellbeing, world views and wellbeing, policy making in New Zealand and Pacific peoples’ relationships to government policy. This study was positively influenced by other studies that demonstrated the positive influence that Pacific values can have as drivers of economic development in Pacific contexts (Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014). The study contributes to knowledge in this area through interview participant data that details the constituents of economic wellbeing inside Pacific world views and is also a focus of the literature review.

The study also provides additional evidence of the relationship between Pacific world views and policy-making institutions. This small and emerging field of knowledge has
been established through studies by Anae and Macpherson (2008) and Makisi (2009). This study contributes an introductory exploration of the influence of Pacific world views on the formation of policy documents where economic wellbeing of Pacific peoples is a desired outcome.

**Significance of findings on policy-making**

Findings in this study have centred on Pacific world views and their place within definitions of economy and policy making in New Zealand. Drawing together the various themes connected to Pacific worldviews, throughout the years of migration and settlement in New Zealand from the early 1940s to the 21st century, Pacific peoples’ values were not incorporated into the dominant economic values of New Zealand of economic policy. The impact of marginalisation was seen in the lack of recognition of Pacific values in policy-making institutions, procedures and behaviours which were entrenched in mainstream New Zealand Palangi/Pākehā communities and values, and the resilience and strategy needed by senior Pacific policy makers who circumnavigate this environment.

Pacific communities have grown in number and also in cultural strength between the 1940s and the 2010s. The growth of Pacific communities has been enabled by the endurance of Pacific cultural values and practices which are centred on the maintenance of relationships, reciprocity, service to others, appreciation of others and spirituality. Community growth and endurance of values are important in the context of government projections of the demography of New Zealand for the future. Pacific values and economic interactions should indicate to policy makers that future policy documents will need to be founded on bases relevant to the population being discussed in policy documents.
This study questions the central focus of western world views as the only paradigm in determining the contents of government documents, data tables and commentaries. The study proposes that Pacific peoples’ economic realities of value creation in recognising reciprocity, service to others, the social protection and capital resources in the family, and spirituality need to be recognised in the setting of policy agenda and policy discourse. It is hoped that mainstream policy makers take notice of the wealth of knowledge available about Pacific values and economies and begin changing data collection techniques and policy processes to be more relevant to the economies and economic agents being discussed.

This study found that Pacific peoples in the policy-making sector have advocated having Pacific values recognised in policy. However, as some participants noted, Pacific policy makers found their cultural values were overshadowed by dominant westernised world views. Participants also reflected on the impact that fatigue had on their ability to advocate sustainably for Pacific values and influence mainstream policy-making systems. The findings of this study indicate that in order for future government policies to be effective for Pacific communities, a greater number of Pacific people need to be in positions where they can influence the policy-making processes. The study also concluded that mainstream policy-making institutions needed to legitimise Pacific values and economic interactions in future policy outcomes related to the economic wellbeing of Pacific households and family groups.

**Recommendations for future studies**

This research has identified questions that warrant further investigation. Among the ideas raised in this study are the following suggestions for future research:
- State Sector reforms in New Zealand (1984-1998) and the influence of Pacific policy making;
- Pacific ethnic-specific economic world views
- Changes in time and place for Pacific peoples and its effect on Pacific peoples economic wellbeing
- Neo-liberalism in New Zealand and policy making for marginalised Pacific peoples
- The experience of Palangi policy makers who have advocated for Pasifika values in economic development;
- Government policy and service-delivery models as reflections of New Zealand European world views;

Interview participants discussed instances where government funding agencies favoured businesses and corporate entities over non-profit Pacific organisations when assigning paid service delivery contracts, following an unpaid pilot project. Interview participants’ discussions of validity challenges by Palangi policy makers have also raised matters for further investigation. Analysis of time-use surveys, analysis of the value of unpaid labour contributions in the third sector and the use of comparisons from income data tables are others.

The study has also raised questions of Pacific economic wellbeing that are worthy of future investigation. Influenced by recent studies (Byers, 2003; Koloto & Sharma, 2005; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2014) as well as government documents (Anae et al., 2007; Stuart et al., 2012) it has become clear that the western economic model, as seen by policy makers, was cognisant of the presence of Pacific peoples' labour and efforts in a cultural construct, but is yet to recognise them as economic phenomena. The study has found that more work is needed to develop the linkages between culture and economics, established by Fairbairn-Dunlop (2014) for Pacific and Palangi audiences to appreciate.

It would be interesting to explore the professional progression and working conditions experienced by Pacific policy makers. This study found that Pacific peoples comprised less than 2% of the policy-making workforce in the New Zealand
State Sector (State Services Commission, 2013a). Meanwhile, participants noted that despite the lack of Pacific policy makers, those that have been present were often willing to share information and experiences to empower other Pacific people to contribute to overall causes of community wellbeing. A study that explores the progression of and conditions faced by Pacific policy makers would extend current knowledge about marginalisation (Macpherson & Anae, 2008; Makisi, 2009) and the strategies that reflect the centrality of Pacific world views in the use of data to inform policy outcomes.
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Warmest Pacific Greetings, Malo e tau lava, welcome and thanks for taking part in this talanoa.

This talanoa discussion is a semi formal and recorded discussion where invited participants will recall their involvement in a government programme or policy making system. Talanoa discussions are taking place with up to five different people, who have been involved in different ways in helping to develop, drive or deliver government policies and programmes focused on improving the lives of Pasifika people in New Zealand.

The talanoa discussions are part of the research process as a requirement for a Master of Philosophy degree for Filipo Katavake-McGrath at Auckland University of Technology. The other major part of the process is a review of documentation produced by government departments related to policies and programmes to help improve the lives of Pasifika peoples in New Zealand.

This thesis is being researched and written under the supervision of Professor Tagaloatele Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop and Professor Marilyn Waring.

This study has been reviewed and approved by AUTEC, the AUT Ethics Committee.

About the researcher

Warmest Pacific Greetings to you and again malo 'aupito for kindly giving your time in consideration of this project. I am undertaking this project as part of a career in which I have decided to serve our Pacific communities by finding and helping to provide the best possible information to those who are charged with making policies that affect our communities. I was born to a Tongan mother and a Palangi father and my family is from Ma'ufanga in Tonga. I myself was raised between my grandparents in Ma'ufanga and Toronto, Canada where my mother was an accountant and my
father an engineer. My family settled in Omaui, Southland when I was 14. I have worked as a journalist, communications advisor, policy advisor and also as a programme manager in the banking sector and am undertaking postgraduate study to help better inform my thinking as I look towards a career in research.

Faka’apa’apa lahi atu

About your input and answers

A talanoa discussion is a reflective and heartfelt process, and will be entered into only when all parties involved are comfortable and trusting that their contribution will be treated with high standards of respect.

The purpose of this talanoa is to understand experiences and to discuss trends and government understandings in general. There is no requirement for participants to have to defend particular actions as being right or wrong, however participants are welcomed to discuss why their thoughts/approaches/activities were felt to be appropriate or inappropriate in relevant contexts.

During talanoa discussions, participants are welcome to advise that they are uncomfortable answering particular questions, or discussing particular topics. Explanations of why discomfort is felt would be warmly welcomed as they will help inform future research programmes and projects, and such discussions will be treated with the highest levels of respect.

About the Data

The researcher will be recording the audio of the talanoa discussion session, in order to make sure the most accurate understanding of your feedback is represented. Once recorded, audio recordings will be securely stored on a password protected computer (the log in details are known only to the researcher) for transcription and analysis.

Data is gathered on the understanding that participants will be identified in the research findings, academic writing and final Masters of Philosophy thesis. Participants can elect to have their names replaced with a pseudonym and this can be discussed before interviews. At any time participants can withdraw from their discussion, or have their comments made confidential by written application to the researcher or his supervisors.

Once field work research gathering is complete participants will be mailed copies of research findings.

After publishing the thesis, all hard copies of data will be stored in a secure facility. The transcripts of an individual’s data can be obtained upon written application by the participant or, in the event of their death or incapacitation, their nominated representative.
What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns about the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor: Tagaloatele Professor Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, peggy.faibairn-dunlop@aut.ac.nz, +64 9 921 9999 ext 6203

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O'Connor, ethics@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 ext 6038.

For Further information about this research

Researcher: Filipo Katavake-McGrath, csf7012@aut.ac.nz, +6421 744198

Supervisor: Tagaloatele Professor Peggy Fairbairn Dunlop, peggy.fairbairn-dunlop@aut.ac.nz, +649 9219999 ext 6203

Supervisor: Professor Marilyn Waring, marilyn.waring@aut.ac.nz, +649 9219999 ext 9661
Participant Consent Form (Interview): You’ve got to have food if it's a Pacific consultation: Understanding how Pacific peoples are presented in the making of government policy in New Zealand

Project Supervisor:
- Tagaloatele Professor Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop,
- Professor Marilyn Waring

Researcher:
- Filipo Katavake-McGrath

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 22 July 2013
☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.
☐ I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.
☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way.
☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.
☐ I agree to take part in this research.
☐ I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s signature: .................................................................................................................................
Participant’s name: ...........................................................................................................................................
Participant’s Contact Details (if appropriate):
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
Date: 
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Appendix 2 – Ethics Approval Letter

20 September 2013

Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop
Faculty of Culture and Society

Dear Peggy

Ethics Application: 13/244 You've got to have food if it's a Pacific consultation: Understanding how Pacific peoples are represented in the making of government policy in New Zealand.

Thank you for submitting your application for ethical review. I am pleased to advise that the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) approved your ethics application at their meeting on 16 September 2013, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of the indicative interview questions;
2. Amendment of the Information Sheet as follows:
   a. Review for spelling, in particular the title;
   b. In the section ‘An Invitation’ introduction of the researcher;
   c. Revision of the paragraph ‘I am undertaking….’ informing the participants that the research is part of a thesis for a qualification;
   d. Provision of the information about options for the location of the interviews and an indication of a date when the interviews are likely to take place.

Please provide me with a response to the points raised in these conditions, indicating either how you have satisfied these points or proposing an alternative approach. AUTEC also requires copies of any altered documents, such as Information Sheets, surveys etc. Once your response is received and confirmed as satisfying the Committee’s points, you will be notified of the full approval of your ethics application. Full approval is not effective until all the conditions have been met. Data collection may not commence until full approval has been confirmed. If these conditions are not met within six months, your application may be closed and a new application will be required if you wish to continue with this research.

To enable us to provide you with efficient service, we ask that you use the application number and study title in all correspondence with us. If you have any enquiries about this application, or anything else, please do contact us at ethics@aut.ac.nz.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours sincerely

Kate O’Connor
Executive Secretary

Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee
Cc: Filipo Katavake-McGrath filipo.mcgrath@gmail.com
Appendix 3 – Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule

The following is a list of topics for discussion during the Talanoa. Items are not listed in order and prompts may only be used if required.

Profile of participant’s journey as a policy-maker
  - Agencies worked for
  - Policies worked on
  - Successes and Challenges

Pacific People In Government Policy Agencies
  - Presence or Absence of Pacific people in agencies
  - Perceptions of Pacific professional’s influence on government policy
  - Collegiality of Pacific peoples across the public sector

Pacific Communities and Government Policy Processes
  - Mandated or Voluntary presence of Pacific communities in policy making
  - Organisations’ approaches
  - Policy makers’ perceptions of communities’ influence
  - Relationship between Pasifika staff in agencies and communities

Aspirations of Pacific communities
  - Form or method of expression
  - Changes over time
  - Origins of aspirations
  - Interpretation of aspirations

Aspirations of government departments for Pacific communities
  - Origins of aspirations
  - Method or form of expression
  - Changes over time
  - Influences of different governing party ideologies

Sharing of Aspiration (Community and Government)
  - Examples of Aspiration Sharing
  - Compromises in getting to place of sharing
  - Divergence of aspirations
  - Mediating to get to sharing or convergence of ideas

The future state of Pacific peoples and government policy
  - Possibility of an “ideal model”
  - Past successes for inclusion in ideal models
  - Past ideas previously un-included that could be integrated
  - Concepts that could be avoided
Appendix 4 – List of Documents Considered for Analysis

- The Auckland Plan, Auckland Council, 2013
- Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs Value for Money and Budget 2009
- Performance Improvement Framework - Formal Review of MPIA (MPIA) – October 2011
- Labour Party Manifesto, 2011: Own Our Future
- Pacific Business Trust, Annual Report – 2010
- Pacific Business Trust, Annual Report – 2012
- Growing an Innovative New Zealand, New Zealand Government, 2000
- Speech from the Throne, 1999
- Speech from the Throne, 2002
- Speech from the Throne, 2005
- Budget Speech and Fiscal Strategy Report, 1997
- Budget Speech and Fiscal Strategy Report, 1998
- Budget Speech and Fiscal Strategy Report, 1999
- Budget Speech and Fiscal Strategy Report, 2000
- Budget Speech, 2001
- Budget Speech, 2002
- Budget Speech, 2003
- Budget Speech, 2004
- Budget Speech, 2005
- Budget Speech, 2006
- Budget Speech, 2007
- Budget Speech, 2008
- Budget Speech, 2009
- Budget Speech, 2010
- Budget Speech, 2011
- Budget Speech, 2012
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 1998
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 1999
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2000
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2001
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2002
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2003
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2004
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2005
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2006
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2007
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2008
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2009
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2010
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2011
- Estimates of Appropriations – Vote Pacific Island Affairs, 2012
- Pacific Analysis Framework, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006
• Pacific Vision International Conference, Speech – Jenny Shipley, 1999
• Pacific Vision Conference Speech – Bill English, 1999
• On the Demography of Pacific People in New Zealand, Statistics New Zealand, 1999
• Pasifika Strategy for the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2009-2012
• Pacific Content Strategy, New Zealand On Air, 2012
• Evaluation of the impact of the pilot of the national pacific radio network – Niu FM, prepared for the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2004
• Launch of Pacific Radio Network, Press Release – 2002
• New Zealand Living Standards 2004: Ngā āhuatanga Noho a Aotearoa, Ministry of Social Development, 2006
• Social Report Indicators for Low Incomes and Inequality: Update from the 2004 Household Economic Survey, Ministry of Social Development, 2004
• 2006 The Social Report: Indicators of Social Wellbeing
• 2010 The Social Report: Te purongo oranga tangata
• Ministry of Social Development, Pacific Strategy – 2002
• Specifically Pacific, Engaging Young Pacific Workers – Prepared by EEO Trust for MPIA, 2012
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Statement of Intent, 2013-2016
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2006
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2007
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2008
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2009
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2010
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2011
• Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Annual Report, 2012
• Pacific Progress: A Report on the economic status of Pacific People in New Zealand, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2002
• An outcomes framework for Pacific peoples in New Zealand: a report prepared for MPIA, 2008
• Pacific people in the New Zealand Economy: understanding linkages and trends – NZIER, 2007
• Pacific Prosperity: Pacific/Maori Synergies – presentation to Te Tatau a Maui Maori Fisheries Conference, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2006
• Pacific Peoples’ Economic Participation Report: Implications for the New Zealand Economy, report prepared for MPIA, NZIER, 2005
• Briefing to the Incoming Minister of Pacific Island Affairs, 2008
• ‘Ala Mo‘ui 2010-2014: Pathways to Pacific Health and Wellbeing, Ministry of Health
• Pacific Housing Experiences: Developing Trends and Issues, report prepared for the Centre for Housing Research Aotearoa New Zealand and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2007
• Draft Housing Strategy for Pacific People – Housing New Zealand Corporation, 2009
• Budget Debate – Pacific Economic Development Agency, 2010
• Department of Labour Pacific Division Review, 2008
• Inquiry Report: Inquiry into Immigration Matters – Volume 1, Visa and permit decision making and other matters, Office of the Auditor General 2009
• Au O Matua Fanau: Our children are our treasures - Child Youth and Family Pacific Action Plan 2010 and Beyond, 2010
Appendix 5 – Statistical Information Regarding Pacific Peoples in New Zealand

Table xii-1 Change in selected Pacific Ethnic Groups: 2001-2006 and 2006-2013 Censuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>144138</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Maori</td>
<td>61839</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>60333</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>23883</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics New Zealand (2014)

Table xii-2 Pacific Ethnic Community Counts – Census 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>144138</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Maori</td>
<td>61839</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>60333</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>23883</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics New Zealand (2014)
### Table xii-3 Pacific Population by birth in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Pacific Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>133791</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>157203</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>181791</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014)

### Table xii-4 Pacific Ethnic Group, birth in New Zealand – Census 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage of Group Born in New Zealand %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Maori</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014)

---

3 Niue, Tokelau and the Cook Islands citizens are all born with New Zealand citizenship – however for the census, being born in New Zealand is interpreted as being born in either the North Island/Te Ika ā Māui or the South Island/Te Waiponamu
### Table xii-5 Pacific Population Distribution by Metropolitan Area Census 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Pacific Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial North Island</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial South Island</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014)

### Table xii-6 Projected Ethnic Population Characteristics 2006-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Median Age (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Series 6</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>301600</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>310100</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>318800</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>327600</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>336300</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>345000</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>353800</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>362500</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>371300</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>380000</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>388800</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>397700</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>406600</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>415600</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>424600</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>433700</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>443000</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>452300</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>461800</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>471400</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>481200</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2006)
### Table xii-7 Earnings for people in paid employment by prioritised ethnic group (1998-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European/Pakeha</td>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>European/Pakeha</td>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Average Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Median Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Average Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Median Weekly Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014)

### Table xii-8 Earnings for people in paid employment by prioritised ethnic group (2009-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Total Ethnic Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European/Pakeha</td>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>European/Pakeha</td>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Average Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Median Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Average Weekly Earnings</td>
<td>Median Weekly Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Authority Area Description</th>
<th>2001 Total</th>
<th>% Pacific</th>
<th>2006 Total</th>
<th>% Pacific</th>
<th>2013 Total</th>
<th>% Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North District</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei District</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>154680</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>177948</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>194958</td>
<td>13.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames-Coromandel District</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato District</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>4104</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>5142</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>6798</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waikato District</td>
<td>2844</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupo District</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Bay of Plenty District</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga City</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua District</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>2811</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatane District</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne District</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings District</td>
<td>3210</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>4137</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier City</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui District</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North City</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2817</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>3396</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tararua District</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowhenua District</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiti Coast District</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua City</td>
<td>12228</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>12264</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
<td>12738</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt City</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt City</td>
<td>8745</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>10095</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>10257</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>8292</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>8931</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>8928</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterton District</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough District</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>7674</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>9465</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>10101</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>2826</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invercargill City</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table xii-9 Population Distribution of Pacific Peoples by Territorial Authority Area (2001, 2006 and 2013 Census)

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014c)
Table xii-10 Pacific Peoples unemployment rate (HLFS Dec Qtr 2003 to HLFS Dec Qtr 2013)

(Statistics New Zealand, 2005; 2007; 2008; 2010; 2011; 2013)

Table xii-11 Student population count (Primary and Secondary) Pacific and European Ethnicity 1996-2013

(Ministry of Education, 2014)
Table xii-12 Pasifika school roll by ethnic group 1996 to 2013

(Pasifika School roll by ethnic group 1996-2013)

(Ministry of Education, 2014b)
### Table xii-13 Attainment rates of University Entrance by Pasifika Students 2004-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pasifika Students</th>
<th>Total Pasifika Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ministry of Education, 2014e)

### Table xii-14 Total Enrolments of Pacific people in tertiary education by qualification level 2005-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5-7</th>
<th>Bachelor degrees</th>
<th>Grad C/Dip</th>
<th>Hon/PG C/Dip</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>7,221</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>6,884</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>6,566</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>7,419</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>29,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>4,098</td>
<td>8,285</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>8,135</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>32,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>7,314</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>8,827</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>7,561</td>
<td>7,049</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>9,153</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>33,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>7,264</td>
<td>7,446</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>9,855</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>33,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ministry of Education, 2014f)
Table xii-15 Educational Attainment of Pacific People 1991-2009

(Ministry of Education, 2014d)
Table xii-16 Total Apprehension Data for Crimes Committed by Pacific People 1995-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide and related offences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts intended to cause injury</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>3132</td>
<td>3155</td>
<td>3167</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>3142</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>3344</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault and related offences</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous or negligent acts endangering persons</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction, harassment and other related offences against a person</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery, extortion and related offences</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful entry with intent/burglary, break and enter</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and related offences</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>2897</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>2945</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>2816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, deception and related offences</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit drug offences</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited and regulated weapons and explosives offences</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage and environmental pollution</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order offences</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>2274</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>3012</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>2575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences against justice procedures, government security and government operations</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014d)
### Table xii-17 Total Apprehension Data for Crimes Committed by Pacific People 2006-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide and related offences</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts intended to cause injury</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>3868</td>
<td>4534</td>
<td>4909</td>
<td>5052</td>
<td>4742</td>
<td>4268</td>
<td>4110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault and related offences</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous or negligent acts endangering persons</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction, harassment and other related offences against a person</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery, extortion and related offences</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful entry with intent/burglary, break and enter</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and related offences</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>2678</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>2959</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>2949</td>
<td>2414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, deception and related offences</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit drug offences</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited and regulated weapons and explosives offences</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage and environmental pollution</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>1552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order offences</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>3491</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>4332</td>
<td>5124</td>
<td>5392</td>
<td>5270</td>
<td>4156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences against justice procedures, government security and government operations</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>2306</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014d)
### Table xii-18  New Zealand General Social Survey, Results – Pasifika 2008, 2010, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pacific peoples</th>
<th>Pacific peoples</th>
<th>Pacific peoples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population distribution</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall life satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 or more</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001–$70,000</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 or less</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequacy of income to meet everyday needs</strong>&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just enough</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-rated general health status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair / poor</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major problem with house</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a major problem</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of safety when walking alone in the neighbourhood at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe / safe</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither safe nor unsafe</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe / very unsafe</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support in a time of crisis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can access support</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household storage of emergency water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have emergency water for three days</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of discrimination in last 12 months</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social contact and isolation**

Contact with non-resident family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had face-to-face contact with family</th>
<th>91.8</th>
<th>88.3</th>
<th>91.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around once a fortnight</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in the last four weeks</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had non-face-to-face contact with family</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around once a fortnight</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in the last four weeks</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with amount of contact with non-resident family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.7</th>
<th>7.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact with non-resident friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had face-to-face contact with friends</th>
<th>90.2</th>
<th>89.8</th>
<th>90.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around once a fortnight</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in the last four weeks</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had non-face-to-face contact with friends</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around once a fortnight</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in the last four weeks</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with amount of contact with non-resident friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Felt lonely in last four weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>61.8</th>
<th>64.7</th>
<th>66.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little of the time</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most / all of the time</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voluntary and unpaid work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undertook voluntary work</th>
<th>38.8</th>
<th>40.3</th>
<th>34.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertook unpaid work</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics New Zealand, 2014g)
Appendix 6 – List of Organisations listed as partners in the Pacific Economic Action Plan and Pacific Women’s Economic Development Plan

- Ministry of Consumer Affairs
- Ministry of Education
- Tertiary Education Commission
- Tertiary Education Organisations
- Auckland Regional Council
- City of Manukau Education Trust (COMET)
- Department of Labour
- Industry Training Organisations
- Work and Income New Zealand
- Centre for Housing Research Aotearoa New Zealand
- Housing New Zealand
- Ministry of Economic Development
- Ministry of Social Development
- New Zealand Pacific Business Council
- Pacific Business Trust
- Institute of Environmental Science and Research
- Enterprise New Zealand Trust
- New Zealand Trade and Enterprise
- State Services Commission
- Pacific Allied (Womens) Council Inspires Faith in Ideals Concerning All (PACIFICA Inc)