Te Ao Kohatu – Principled framing of best practice with mokopuna Māori

A literature review of Indigenous theoretical and practice frameworks for mokopuna and whānau wellbeing.

The Oranga Tamariki Evidence Centre works to build the evidence base that helps us better understand wellbeing and what works to improve outcomes for New Zealand's children, young people and their whānau.

Citation guidance:

This report can be referenced as Dobbs, T. (2021). *Te Ao Kohatu – Principled framing of best practice with mokopuna Māori: A literature review of theoretical and practice frameworks for mokopuna and whānau wellbeing.* Wellington, New Zealand: Oranga Tamariki—Ministry for Children.

Disclaimer:

Oranga Tamariki has made every effort to ensure the information in this report is reliable, but does not guarantee its accuracy and does not accept liability for any errors.

This report was published for internal Oranga Tamariki use only in August 2021, based on research conducted during 2015 and revised in 2021. Names, terms and contexts were not updated, and some have been superseded or are no longer in use. In particular, note that the Indigenous and Bi-cultural Principled Framework is now known as Te Toka Tumoana in the Oranga Tamariki Practice Centre: Working with Māori: Te Toka Tumoana | Practice Centre | Oranga Tamariki

Contents

Executive summary

The purpose of this literature review was to:

- Examine the national and international literature on Indigenous theoretical frameworks and their applications to social work practice.

- Discuss this literature in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand's statutory Child Youth and Family Indigenous and Bicultural Principled Framework (Strategic and Practice) (IBPF) within the context of advancing mokopuna and whānau wellbeing.

Sections 1 and 2 of this report examines the position of Indigenous children within the statutory child welfare system internationally, and then within Aotearoa New Zealand. Section 3 describes the role of the statutory child welfare system in Aotearoa New Zealand, specifically looking at the development and applications of Indigenous social work frameworks within statutory social work. Section 4 discusses the development and need for indigenous social work theoretical and practice frameworks. Finally, section 5 comments on changes within the Aotearoa New Zealand child welfare system within the context of advancing mokopuna and whānau wellbeing. This section also reviews the principles of the IBPF, reporting on the international literature in terms of the development and application of bicultural social work frameworks. The findings for this literature review have highlighted the following:

1. Indigenous children are over-represented in every phase of child welfare intervention, with the national and international data pointing to increasing over-representation the further along the social welfare intervention pathway children are. Indigenous children are more likely to be reported or to be notified to child protection authorities, be substantiated for abuse or neglect, be subject to court orders, be in out-of-home care and be involved with the youth justice system than non-indigenous children and young people.

2. Many Indigenous peoples share similar histories. The impact of colonisation (loss of land, language, culture, and self-determination), structural risks (poverty, unemployment, poor housing and access to services) and systemic and racial bias within the state child welfare system have all contributed to this over-representation. Many Indigenous communities experience high levels of intergenerational trauma as a result of colonisation, with its associated social and economic disadvantage which impacts on the wellbeing of their children. The issue of maltreatment within Indigenous families may be *"more reflective of larger society than a microcosm of isolated dysfunction"* (Wesley-Esquimaux & Snowball, 2010, p.391, cited in Cram, 2012, p.11).

3. The effects of colonial pasts and the subsequent disadvantage for Indigenous children may be beyond child welfare systems per se. However, these factors need to be recognised and considered when child welfare interventions occur

within Indigenous families and be mitigated both at policy and at practice levels within child welfare systems. Government policies need to focus on supporting vulnerable children and their families, especially in reducing structural risks such as poverty.

4. The risk of child maltreatment increases when children and their families face economic disadvantage (poverty, unemployment, poor housing), social disadvantage (racism, discrimination) and community disadvantage (social exclusion), which marginalises them from full participation in society.

5. There is scarce literature on Indigenous social work theoretical and practice frameworks within statutory social work. A number of Indigenous frameworks and programmes are used by non-statutory social service providers. Nationally and internationally, most of these frameworks have come from recognition that western/mainstream theoretical approaches on their own have not been successful when working with Indigenous children, families and communities. Evaluation of these theories and practices within Aotearoa New Zealand needs to be funded and use kaupapa Māori research methods.

6. Nationally and internationally, literature that focuses on children and young people's views of what constitutes wellbeing is scarce, and within that indigenous children are further marginalised. The meaning children and young people ascribe to this concept and whether or not distinct dimensions or characteristics can be identified would contribute significantly to more meaningful interventions. Developing child- informed frameworks for wellbeing may be required and/or ensuring mokopuna are included in any evaluation.

7. Indigenous social work that is guided by Indigenous participation and experiences that has, at its heart, human rights and social justice is required. Indigenous social work theory and practice developments are being generated by those working in this field. Aspects of this praxis include recognition of the effects of invasion, colonialism, and paternalistic social policies upon social work practice with Indigenous communities; recognition of the importance of self-determination; contemporary Indigenous and non-indigenous colleagues working in partnership; the impact of contemporary racist and neo-colonialist values and rethinking contemporary social work values and practices. *"What is needed is a dialogical process amongst Indigenous and non-indigenous social workers*" (Gray & Fook, 2004, p.627).

8. The rights of Māori, including Māori children, to their cultural identity, and the state's responsibility to protect this right is found in key documents that this country has acceded to, namely the Treaty of Waitangi, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

9. Māori children belong to whānau, hapū and iwi and, as such, responsibility for raising children is shared beyond the bounds of their immediate whānau. The roles and responsibilities of these childrearing networks include the transmission of cultural mores and monitoring of child safety. Unfortunately, and for complex reasons, not all whānau are safe places for children in their care. As such collective kinship parenting and support is not a reality for many Māori. Solutions require multi-layered approaches that aim to strengthen the conditions and cultural foundations that whānau require for positive mokopuna and whānau ora (development and wellbeing).

10. Kaupapa Māori theoretical frameworks are grounded on the notion that te reo and tikanga Māori are both valid and legitimate, and provide both the conceptual understandings and practices to bring about change for Māori whānau. Using them can guide transformative practices and inform strategies for whānau wellbeing. They can also be seen as protective factors within whānau, hapu and iwi.

11. Māori are, and have been, the motivators for change within the child welfare system in Aotearoa New Zealand and have been supported by many non-Māori to provide better services to and for supporting children and family wellbeing. Legislative changes have assisted in this process, and there has been significant increase in the level of investment over time. Government has a role in supporting vulnerable whānau to care for their mokopuna, the challenge is how to do this more effectively. Effective contemporary frameworks for addressing Indigenous children's welfare and wellbeing are essential. Investment in trialling and evaluating Indigenous frameworks is important in working towards improved outcomes for communities.

12. There is no one Indigenous worldview. However, several common themes from the literature on Indigenous social work theories and practice frameworks have emerged. Most strongly indicate that some of the fundamentals of western critical social work, including social justice, emancipation, human rights, empowerment, self-determination and respect need to be reinterpreted through an Indigenous lens. At the heart of these themes are those of self-determination, decolonisation, Indigenous meanings of family, the connection to land and to the spiritual world and the interconnectedness of all things in framing Indigenous wellbeing.

13. The co-construction of the Indigenous and Bicultural Principled Framework methods used by CYF for the engagement, consultation and development of the framework is supported within the national and international literature. Using co-constructed Indigenous and non-indigenous knowledge and frameworks within social services has the potential to mitigate the impacts of the past, and

ensure that tiaki mokopuna can be realised. A bicultural approach, which combines the knowledge and practice that both Māori and tauiwi bring to social work practice allows workers to develop culturally sensitive and responsive practice. A key for practitioners in seeking to create 'change-ful-environments' is being able to work with culturally embedded narratives and to understand how these can be harnessed.

14. The kaupapa and principles of the framework concur with the national and international literature on addressing the over-representation of Indigenous children in the child welfare system. Internationally, it is recognised that where local culture is used as a primary source for knowledge and practice development, social work practice can become culturally appropriate, relevant and authentic (Gray, Coates & Yellowbird, 2008). The notion of self-determination, partnership and indigenous rights that underpin contemporary culturally responsive social work practice in Aotearoa New Zealand can be traced back to the essence and spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi (Ruwhiu, 2009).

Te Ao Kohatu – Principled framing of best practice with mokopuna Māori

Introduction

This report reviews the national and international literature on indigenous social work theoretical and practice frameworks for mokopuna and whānau wellbeing within statutory social work. Before looking at these frameworks and their development it is important to review the position of Indigenous children in today's child welfare system as a starting point. As the whakatauki below suggests, it is important to have an understanding of the journey of Indigenous children and their families to be able to respond to and support their ongoing wellbeing (states of 'Ora'). The report will then look at the national and international literature on Indigenous frameworks and their applications to social work practice. Comment will be made and discussed in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand's statutory Child Youth and Family Indigenous and Bicultural Principled Framework (Strategic and Practice) (IBPF) in the context of advancing mokopuna and whānau wellbeing.

Section One

The over-representation of indigenous children in the child welfare system

Ngā hiahia kia titiro ki te tīmata, a, ka kite ai tātou te mutunga (You must understand the beginning if you wish to see the end (Jackson, 1988).

The over-representation of Indigenous children in administratively recorded child abuse and neglect statistics has become an international phenomenon, (Cram, Gulliver, Ota & Wilson, 2015). This is both alarming and reveals major structural fractures in the "*social contract of our country*" warranting an examination of present day social welfare systems (Sullivan & Charles, 2010, p.3). Over-representation has been described as *"the rate of an event for a particular racial group being higher than what would be expected, given the proportion of population for that group and describing disparities in terms of comparisons between different racial groups"* (Needell et al, 2007 cited in Blackstock, 2009, p.22).

Developing effective responses to this over-representation needs to be informed by a thorough understanding of the scale and nature of the problem (Tidbury, 2009). Indigenous peoples in Canada, the United States, and Australia, all have similar experiences to Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, with over-representation amongst their children and young people found to have been abused or neglected and those who are removed from their homes and families. They also share similar histories of colonisation. Indigenous children are over-represented in every phase of child welfare intervention, with the national and international data pointing to increasing over-representation the further along the social welfare intervention pathway children are. They are more likely to be reported or to be notified to child protection authorities, be substantiated for abuse or neglect; be subject to court orders; be in out-of- home care, and be involved with the youth justice system than non-indigenous children and young people (Blackstock, 2007, 2009; Blackstock et al, 2005; Cram, 2012; 2014; Cram et al, 2015; Libesman, 2013; Tidbury, 2009; Trocmé et al, 2001; 2006; Sullivan & Charles, 2010; UNICEF, 2013; Yellowbird, 2013).

Although over-representation of Indigenous children in child welfare systems is well documented, its explanation is unclear. Research has only just begun to examine the complex underlying factors to this phenomenon. This section examines some of those factors.

International studies that have examined rates of reported child abuse and neglect and child placements have suggested that differential treatments, beyond individual family dysfunction, may occur between Indigenous and non-indigenous children once a report of alleged child abuse is received (Courtney, 2006; Fluke et al, 2003; Eckenrode et al; Needell et al, 2003, cited in Trocmé, et al, 2004; Bowser & Jones, 2004). The issue of maltreatment within Indigenous families may be *"more reflective of larger society than a microcosm of isolated dysfunction"* (Wesley-Esquimaux & Snowball, 2010, p.391, cited in Cram, 2012, p.11). Studies that have begun to

investigate the possible explanations for this 'differential treatment' concur and debate the influences of 'risk'; 'real risk' and 'bias' within the child welfare system 'decision making' as contributing factors to over-representation along with the impact of colonisation (historical) and subsequent contemporary factors (structural risk) (Cram, et al., 2015; Drake et al, 2011; Trocmé et al, 2004; Sinha et al, 2011).

Cram et al (2015) investigated and furthered Drake et al's (2011) 'risk' and 'bias' models to build an understanding of the high representation of indigenous children using administratively sourced measures of child abuse and neglect (CA/N) in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Briefly, to explain the use of risk and bias within the literature Drake's models would appear to concur with other authors. The 'risk model' concludes that Indigenous children are more exposed to risk factors, such as poverty, and therefore child abuse rates are higher for minority groups and the notifications to the child welfare system are in response to real risk. The 'bias model' concludes that bias among those reporting and investigating suspected CA/N results in "hyper-surveillance and discriminatory treatment by the child welfare system" (Cram et al, 2015). The bias is situated by the race or ethnicity of the child. These models may give some explanation to Indigenous children's position in child abuse and neglect data within the welfare systems of many developed countries.

Whilst not conclusive Drake et al's (2011) study suggested that reduction of black/white racial disproportionality in the child welfare system in the United States can best be achieved by reducing underlying risk factors that affect black families. However, they found evidence supporting the presence of cultural protective factors for Hispanic children to reduce risk. From their study, Cram et al (2015) suggest that these models may be useful. However, they caution that there are other factors that need to be considered and viewed as explanations:

> *"Rather than considering risk and bias as competing explanations, we suggest an acknowledgment of the impact of colonization and the existence of systemic bias generating increased risk as key drivers. As linked administrative data are increasingly used for research and evaluation, and considered for use in supporting decision making, there is a need for a deeper understanding of the drivers of administratively recorded CA/N in order to effectively address the needs of indigenous populations"* (p.1).

Supporting this, Blackstock (2009) also argues that structural risks need to be considered when looking at why Indigenous children are over-represented. Consideration also needs to be given to whether real risk or bias creates difficulties in developing effective interventions:

> *"The lack of research on structural risks and First Nations children makes it almost impossible to develop effective interventions to redress their over-representation in child welfare care. The outstanding question is whether First Nation children are over-represented amongst those in child welfare care*

because they are at greater risk and/or whether they are over-represented because the services provided to them fail to adequately address the primarily structural risks they experience…the best chance to reverse the tragic over-representation of Aboriginal children in care in Canada, the USA and Australia lies in supporting Aboriginal peoples to leverage western and traditional knowledge to design, and implement, culturally based welfare interventions targeting structural risks" (Blackstock, 2009, p.27).

Blackstock (2009) suggests that targeting structural risk is 'easier' in Canada as evidence suggests that removal of children is often the primary intervention that child welfare services use and this does not tackle the determinants of child abuse, or acknowledge that child welfare should be assessed within traditional/contemporary knowledge systems.

Within contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand Māori exposure to 'risk' is evident (Child Youth & Family, 2006; Cram, 2012; Cram et al 2015; Cram & Pitama, 1997; Cooper & Wharewera-Mika, 2009; Te Puni Kokiri, 2010). Māori continue to experience significant social and economic disadvantage in relation to income levels, employment, health, education and housing (Ministry of Social Development, 2007). These consequences are regarded as some of the major contributing factors to the high rates of partner violence within the Māori population (Koziol-McLain, Rameka, Giddings, Fyfe, & Gardiner, 2007; Robertson & Oulton, 2008).

> *Māori are the most likely to die early; be unemployed; be imprisoned; be homeless; suffer mental illness; collect a welfare benefit (except for the old age pension which no-one lives long enough to collect). These issues are not new. They are issues that were raised over twenty years in two key reports, (i) Pūao Te Ata-tū and (ii) The Royal Commission on Social Policy. Both reports challenged a nationwide failure to respond to appropriately to the issues facing Māori people* (Cram & Pitama, 1997 cited in Te Puni Kokiri, 2010, p.8).

Similarly, the literature suggests that most Aboriginal children in Canada and Australia are in care due to child neglect through disadvantage and poverty (Tidbury, 2009; Green & Baldry, 2009; Sinha, et al, 2011) rather than because of abuse. This requires longer comprehensive services that need to be designed to address these factors, which often challenge the ability of Indigenous parents and communities to ensure the wellbeing of their children (Cram et al, 2015). Access to, availability and acceptability of services also impact Indigenous families' ability to care for their children. Blackstock (2003) concurs that child welfare practice has tended to focus primarily on child and family intervention, paying only subsidiary attention to the impact of structural factors such as poverty, poor housing and the multi-generational impacts of colonisation. She cites an example:

> *"This focus on risk in child and family environments is reflected in child welfare risk assessments models and methods that do not account for structural risk,*

other than how it may manifest at the level of the child…a social worker may assess a child as malnourished but not take into account the impoverished conditions in the community or lack of services which interfere with parents capacity to provide a nutritious diet…caregivers living in area where structural risks are more prevalent (reserves or low income areas) will be held responsible…when they are not reasonably capable of affecting the causes" (p.27).

The highest rates of partner abuse are found among young families (i.e., co-habiting adults with children) of low socioeconomic status (Moffatt, Caspi, Rutter & Silva, 2001; Koziol-McLain et al., 2007). Māori have a large young population and many live in the most deprived parts of Aotearoa New Zealand (Statistics NZ, 2013). Social and economic disadvantage impact the likelihood of someone being affected by family violence. There are risk factors for children being exposed to family violence and the intergenerational cycles of violence. The attainment of Māori family wellbeing (whānau ora) will be made more difficult by these risk factors. However, they do not predetermine violence in all cases. It is important to note that the majority of Māori children and young people are not maltreated but are loved and nurtured (Te Puni Kokiri, 2010, cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014).

Many Indigenous communities experience high levels of intergenerational trauma, with its associated social and economic problems which impact on the wellbeing of their children (Libesman, 2013). A number of authors concur (Blackstock, 2007, 2009; Blackstock et al, 2005; Cram, 2012; 2014; Cram et al, 2015; Robertson & Oulton, 2008; Sullivan & Charles, 2010; Tidbury, 2009; Trocmé et al, 2001; Kruger et al, 2004; Cram & Grennell, 2008; UNICEF, 2013). Intergenerational trauma impacts on the ability of parents and communities to care for their children and not only needs to be considered when looking at the over-representation of Indigenous children in child welfare systems but also needs to be considered when the child welfare system is supporting families to care for their children. The literature exploring individual and collective impacts of this is growing as are the methods to address such trauma (for further discussions see Cooper & Wharewera-Mika, 2011; Wirihana & Smith, 2014).

When considering the influence of bias and Indigenous children's position within the child welfare system Sullivan and Charles (2010) suggest that impoverished resources, secondary to structural inequities are not alone in explaining disproportionality and that in the absence of clear guidelines for child protection, children can be taken into state care based on individual workers' definition of 'risk', leaving the decision-making process more open to culture, class and gender bias. However, they also argue that there are enough examples of the child 'rescue' movements targeting marginalised children to show that a simplistic structured approach to decision-making does not work either.

They suggest that there can be no doubt that racism and assimilation underpinned the placement of Aboriginal youth into residential schools and offer that:

"even in a racist society most "helpers" are not openly racist. They can justify their actions as contributing to what they consider the common good…as we have seen…time and again with marginalised people, this justification of 'helping' has led to horrific consequences" (p.4).

Within Aotearoa New Zealand institutionalised racism (bias) was identified some 30 years ago (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Development of Social Welfare) and has been a strong "motivator for change":

"At the heart of the issue is a profound misunderstanding or ignorance of the place of the child in Māori society and its relationship with whānau [Māori families], hapu [sub-tribe], iwi [tribe]structures'' (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Development of Social Welfare, 1988, p. 7). *The Committee recommended tackling cultural racism, eliminating deprivation, enabling iwi to make decisions about child welfare services for Māori, and making the child welfare agency an intervention of last resort* (Cram et al, 2015 p.2-3).

The national and international literature suggests that child welfare policies and practices have also impacted on the wellbeing of Indigenous children and their families. Freire (1990) argues that *"the social worker, as much as the educator, is not a neutral agent either in practice or in action"* (p.5, cited in Sinclair, 2004). The social work profession and education has not been free from colonial influence. In Canada, and in Australia, early social work practices were complicit with government's colonial actions. Social workers were complicit in the mass welfare 'scooping' of children in Canada and forced placement into residential homes. There were similar experiences in Australia (Lost Generation) which resulted in the trans-racial fostering and adoption of children when protests against residential homes increased. Sullivan and Charles (2010) cited tens of thousands of 'Children of the Empire' who were removed to Canada from the United Kingdom – being 'rescued' from poverty and sent to live with 'good families'. The stories of abuse of these children are very similar to those of Indigenous children being 'rescued' and forced into residential schools. Social work (albeit through government policy) has been involved in and has colluded in racist, patronising, and unjust practices (Green & Baldry, 2008). One British Columbian social worker saying:

"…when we removed children from their own homes and put them into foster homes about which we knew next to nothing, no matter how we cloaked our actions in welfare jargon, we were putting those children at risk…the welfare department which employed me was the biggest contributor to child abuse in the province" (Fournier & Crey, 1997, p.86, cited in Sinclair, 2004, p.50).

Sinclair (2004) continues with this quote from Justice Kimmelman (1982) *"the road to hell was paved with good intention and the child welfare system was the paving contractor"* (p.50). While Aotearoa/New Zealand did not institute specific policies of

forced removal of Māori children, historical atrocities were committed and have had generational impacts (Libesman, 2013). These historical conditions have contemporary consequences.

> "*New Zealand did not forcibly remove children from their families to non-Māori families and boarding schools, creating 'lost generations' – as was the case in Australia and North America. However from the 1940s to the 1980s a considerable number of Māori children lost connection with their families through closed adoption, often to non-Māori families, or through being placed in children's homes or being made wards of the state. In 1988 a report on the Department of Social Welfare, responsible for child welfare, was highly critical of the way the agency operated in its dealings with Māori. Institutional racism was identified as a major problem with the agency imposing a strongly European cultural perspective on its Māori clients* (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988 cited in Blaiklock, Kiro, Belgrave, Low, Davenport & Hassall, 2002, p.17).

The assimilationist policies of colonial governments, led to the fragmentation of families. Mechanisms included the inequitable distribution of goods and resources (e.g. employment, housing, wealth); systemic racism in the child welfare protection system imposing white middle class notions of family and childrearing upon Indigenous families (Blackstock & Trocmé, 2005; Grier, 2005; Tidbury, 2009) and racial bias in reporting maltreatment and in child welfare agency decision making (Cram, 2012; Trocmé, Knoke & Blackstock, 2004, Yellowbird, 2013). These factors all contributed to the over-representation of Indigenous children in child welfare systems. This is not to ignore the maltreatment of children within some Indigenous families and contexts. Rather, it is an acknowledgment that "*protection for Indigenous children is complex; they require the same protective measures as non-Indigenous children but also require culturally-sensitive support*" (Woolley, 2009, p.400 cited in Cram et al, 2015 p.2).

Culturally sensitive models and alternative models to risk and bias that reflect a colonisation theory of Indigenous child abuse and neglect (CA/N) are required. Other Indigenous writers support this position:

> *An alternative to the risk and bias models is a more complex schema that reflects a colonization theory of indigenous CA/N (Daoud, Smylie, Urquia, Allan, & O'Campo, 2013), highlights the moderating role of access to services (Blackstock & Trocmé, 2005) as well as protective cultural practices (Jenkins & Harte, 2011), and broadens the conception of the possible form and role that bias might play to include systemic factors (Dettlaff, 2013).The model acknowledges the historical and contemporary disenfranchisement and marginalization of Māori as a root cause of disparities in poverty and inadequate access to services (Cram, 2012)… and moves toward decolonization are part of redressing upstream, historically generated risk factors. The need for strong*

leadership and the strengthening of collaborative relationships with communities complements this as means to ensure the cultural responsiveness of services and the child welfare system for Māori whānau. Promotion of traditional positive parenting practices (Jenkins & Harte, 2011) plays a role in preventing exposure to risk factors and in reducing the impact of risk factors on children's outcomes" (Cram, et al, 2015, p.9).

Summary

The over-representation of Indigenous children and their families in child welfare systems both nationally and internationally is alarming and needs examining as previously stated. The effects of colonisation, structural risks and systemic and racial bias within the state child welfare system have contributed to this. The forced and unnecessary removal of children (Blackstock, 2008) has resulted in multi-generational trauma and the erosion of indigenous cultures and language and the ability of many Indigenous families and communities to care for their children. These historical conditions have contemporary consequences.

Section Two

Over-representation in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context

This section looks specifically at the impact of colonisation on mokopuna wellbeing and their whānau, and the literature that suggests how to lessen the impact of colonisation through suggested 'decolonising' frameworks.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, as with many Indigenous peoples, the arrival of colonialism brought patriarchal ideologies that conflicted with Māori values and beliefs (King et al, 2012; Mikaere, 1999; Walker, 2103). It also brought legislative systems which stripped Māori of their land, culture, language, identity, access to natural resources and their traditional way of life (Jackson, 1992 cited in King et al, 2012). In contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand, the pervasive impact of colonisation has resulted in immense socio-economic disadvantage for Māori. For Māori, loss of cultural identity, isolated and fragmented family systems, weakened traditional mechanisms for support, loss of land, language and self-determination have increased the likelihood of whānau dysfunction that is embedded and is sourced in historical and contemporary factors (Cram & Grennell, 2008; E Tu Whānau, 2009; Kruger et al, 2004; Ministry of Health, 2002; MRG, 2009).

Research has correlated higher levels of socioeconomic disadvantage and its related problems to over-representation of Indigenous children in the child welfare system (Trocmé, Knoke & Blackstock, 2004).

> *Māori children were to be 'rescued 'from their race, their savageness and heathen-ness via schooling and Christianity, from their Māori-ness via assimilation, and from a genetic intellectual inferiority via a school curriculum that apparently suited their station in life* (Harris, 2007, p. 21)*.

The imposition of the nuclear family and the reconstruction of whānau and gender roles and relations (Dobbs & Eruera, 2014; Eruera & Dobbs, 2010; Pihama, Jenkins & Middleton, 2003; Ruwhiu, 2005) through the Native School system and missionary teaching, impacted on traditional parenting practices and removed some of the traditional protective factors for women and children. A healthy functioning whānau provided a safe haven for women and children as it was relatively open and public. At least within hapu and iwi, which provided a base and support (Grennell & Cram, 2008). Robertson and Oulton (2008) discuss the societal level risk factors that contribute to violence and child abuse that support this view. They argue that: *"… colonisation introduced a patriarchal ideology, redefined the roles of women and undermined certain cultural practices which were protective…."* (p. 10). Similarly, Drake et al, (2011) found cultural protective factors within his study on African American children in the United States.

While the entrenchment of the 'nuclear family' model was instrumental in the attack on Māori structures and gender organisation, the affirmation and understanding of

'whānau' can in turn challenge colonial construction of gender (Pihama, 2001) and mediate the impact of colonisation. Māori family structures and gender roles were undermined by the imposition of the nuclear family as the dominant cultural paradigm. The negative impact of this colonial model can be countered by the assertion of the integrity of traditional whānau roles:

> *"Engaging in a process of de-colonisation, many colonised peoples are examining what has been stripped away and what may be useful to reclaim as the best of their culture's traditions. Māori organisations and scholars are emphasising the traditional obligation and power of the whānau to protect all its members; women, children, and men from harm (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2010). Likewise, many Native American tribes and associations are creating training manuals for both Native men and women that emphasise cultural traditions of respect for women"* (Pihama, 2001, p. 4).

Whānau is a cultural structure that was enabling for Māori *"as it provided a process of nurturing, education, and sustenance on all levels, within all domains. The role of whānau … is essential in that it affirms the roles and obligations that we as Māori have as a collective group"* (Pihama, Jenkins & Middleton, 2003, p. 41).

Although whānau can be a system of healing (Kruger et al, 2004; MRG, 2009, 2012; Pihama, Jenkins & Middleton,2002; Te Puni Korkiri, 2010 cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014), it should not be taken idealistically as relationships within whānau can be complex and the need to ensure safety within the whānau is essential.

Western gender role-norms imported into Aotearoa New Zealand positioned women as submissive to men, and placed men in positions of power and authority. This impacted on Māori social structures including the formation and maintenance of intimate partner relationships and parenting. Traditional Māori gender roles and relationships were viewed as more complementary in nature (Dobbs & Eruera, 2014).

> *"The relationship between mana wahine and mana tane is about complementarity (sic) and reciprocity. For example, strictly speaking, a man cannot go onto a marae without a woman, and a woman cannot go onto a marae without a man, simply because of the complementary roles that men and women play in the ritual of encounter on our marae. Te kawa o te marae embraces and upholds both mana wahine and mana tane"* (Rimene, Hassan & Broughton, 1998, p. 31*).*

Amongst Māori iwi, where women's economic contributions and work were valued commensurate with men's, violence against women was not common (Cram, Pihama & Jenkins, 2002; Dobbs & Eruera, 2014; Smith, 2005; Smith, 2008). An increase in violence against women came with colonisation (Cram, Pihama & Jenkins, 2002; Lerner, 1987; Robertson & Oulton, 2008; Smith, 2005; Smith, 2008, cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014)

> *"Targeting the relatively high status of many indigenous women as problematic, colonisers imposed notions of gender roles based on patriarchy and individualism which led to the devaluation of the position women held in Māori iwi (Balzer et al,1997) and in Native American tribes"* (Rose, 2012, p.12).

Patriarchal culture over time has become accepted as normal and natural (Lerner, 1987), legitimising discrimination and violence against women and children (Ehrenreich & English, 2005). In today's society, many Māori men are exposed to, and subsequently influenced by, dominant non-Māori forms of masculinity (Ruwhiu et al, 2009). In a recent article discussing an indigenous approach to masculinity and male violence for Māori men (Mataira, 2008) the following was offered:

> *"...we need to advance a new approach to decolonisation, to masculinity, to the validation of our indigenous ways and to appreciating 'nga matauranga Māori' in support of meaningful Māori men's education and mentoring group work"* (p. 35).

In Aotearoa New Zealand, Yuen and White (2007) found that young men from minority and marginalised cultures in New Zealand were enabled to move from violence to non-violence through work to help them identify positive values, and connecting them to important figures in their families, histories, or culture. In this way "*a space can be opened to deconstruct dominant forms of masculinity*" (p. 188).

Colonisation gives a framework for understanding the contemporary context for Māori whānau being at risk of whānau violence including child abuse and neglect, but it should not be an excuse for violence (Grennell & Cram, 2008, cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014). In addition to being a framework for understanding whānau violence, some of the literature suggests that colonisation is an underpinning reason for such whānau violence and abuse:

> *"There is no historical support for claims that traditional Māori society tolerated violence and abuse towards children and women, or that some members of the group were lesser value than others…"* (Durie, 2001, p.208).

Summary

This section has described some of the challenges colonisation brought and some of the impacts on Māori over this period and into today's world. Due to a range of complex contributing factors, both historical and current, some mokopuna Māori are not safe in their whānau and are over-represented in the state welfare system. As such collective kinship parenting and support is not a reality for many Māori. Solutions require multi-layered approaches that aim to strengthen the conditions and cultural foundations that whānau require for positive mokopuna and whānau ora (development and wellbeing) (Ruwhiu & Eruera, 2013). As with many Indigenous communities, Māori experience high levels of intergenerational trauma as a result of colonisation, and its associated

social and economic disadvantages, which impact on the wellbeing of their children (Libesman, 2013). Interpersonal and institutionalised racism and the effects of urban Māori being exposed to non-Māori child welfare practices and legislation have made some whānau and communities vulnerable.

Section Three

The Child Welfare System in Aotearoa/New Zealand

Analysis of children's rights and their implementation requires keeping three potentially conflicting concepts in mind at the same time. First, there is the concept of the child's autonomy to express views and make decisions; second there is the concept of the family's responsibility to nurture and bring up children, and finally, there is the concept of the state's responsibility to provide services which protect and enhance lives of children. Each one of these concepts raises value choices of its own… Overriding these value choices, is the decision as to whom determines them (Henaghan, 1996, p. 165).

Introduction

The first part of this report has discussed the over-representation of Indigenous children and families in the child welfare system; and examined risk, real risk, bias and systemic bias within these systems. This section further explores child welfare systems and the decision-making processes used within them.

Whilst this section is not a critique of the child welfare system within Aotearoa/ New Zealand it is important to understand it as part of the context for looking at the development and applications of Indigenous social work frameworks within statutory social work. The effects of colonial pasts and the subsequent disadvantage for Indigenous children may be beyond child welfare systems per se. However, these factors need to be recognised and considered when child welfare interventions occur within Indigenous families and be mitigated both at policy and at practice levels within child welfare systems. Government policies need to focus on supporting vulnerable children and their families, especially by reducing structural risks such as poverty.

Historical context

In the Aotearoa New Zealand context from colonisation in the 1800s into the 1970s practice discourses, including interventions with families and children, social policies and decision-making practices concerning welfare and care of children were framed in terms of Western constructs (Munford & Sanders, 2011, p. 63). This dominant cultural lens saw high numbers of Māori children remaining in, and entering, the welfare system. Before the 1960s, Māori child welfare was largely seen as the responsibility of whānau. This changed with growing urbanisation and the involvement of mainstream social welfare services where there was little understanding of whānau. This change was reinforced by the legislation of the time. (Cram, 2014). Professional social work in Aotearoa/ New Zealand did not commence until the 1950-1960s and has more recently developed a stronger commitment to indigenous rights and bicultural (Māori/Pākehā) practice principles (McDonald, 1998; Nash, 2009, 2001; Ruwhiu, 2009; Staniforth, 2010, cited in Staniforth, Fouche & O'Brien, 2011). While Māori desires for justice and economic and social aspirations have changed little over 100 years, since the 1970s Māori have struggled for and achieved a great deal of

progress, with increased influence over government policies leading to funding of Māori health, education and welfare initiatives (Walker, 2004 cited in Eketone & Walker, 2013).

The late 1980s saw the beginnings of debates and indigenous theoretical construction with regard to violence at disproportionately high levels within indigenous communities and prevention strategies to address these issues (Eruera & Dobbs, 2010). Indigenous people continue to culturally invigorate the development and delivery of social work globally both in practice and theory (Ruwhiu & Eruera, 2013).

In 1984, New Zealand elected a government that broke radically from the traditions of the past, starting a process of social and economic reforms (for further discussion see Blaiklock, Kiro, Belgrave, Low, Davenport & Hassall, 2002; Hollis- English, 2012). Although these reforms eased off in the mid-1990s, the structural changes they introduced remain. New Zealand's extensive programme of deregulation and privatisation emphasised the role of market forces and markedly reduced both the welfare state and the direct role of the state in the economy. These reforms further disadvantaged Indigenous children and their families:

> "*The reforms have not led to an overall improvement in the well-being of children. There has been widening inequality between ethnic and income groups which has left many Māori and Pacific children, and children from one parent and poorer families, relatively worse off. Government agencies have had difficulties in addressing the impact on children. There have been advances made since the mid-1990s, when the pace of the reform process slowed. The New Zealand experience illustrates the vulnerability of children during periods of social upheaval and change and the importance of having effective mechanisms to monitor, protect and promote the interests of children"* (Blaiklock,et al., 2002, p. 2).

These reforms impacted on both practice and policies within our child welfare systems as New Zealand experienced the same issues seen in other Western countries (Connolly & Smith, 2010). Our system needed to become "*less vulnerable to …out breaks of moral panic and to consequent knee-jerk policy formulation, which have served to both inflate child-protection bureaucracies and subject their operation to yo-yo practice*" (Spratt, 2008, p. 422, cited in Connolly & Smith, 2010, p. 10). Connolly and Smith (2010) argue that despite a deep commitment to family and cultural responsiveness in law (to be discussed further), the risk-focused and managerially-dominated 1990s left its mark on social work practice, instilling a more adversarial and arguably "*less responsive intervention style*" (p. 12).

What was needed was an integrated system "*to be developed to combat the negative aspects of these shifts in practice and to foster a more responsive, resilient and sustainable organisation*" (p. 12).

System reforms

In the context of statutory child welfare system reform in Aotearoa/New Zealand the 1980s saw some movement towards recognising the importance of an indigenous lens with similar reports in literature by other indigenous and First Nations peoples (Cripp & McGlade, 2008; Sivell-Ferri, 1997). Blackstock (2009) suggests that western theoretical approaches have not successfully addressed the over-representation of First Nations children. Western frameworks and models of social work practice were not working for Māori as over-representation in child welfare data continues.

It was within this environment that child protection and youth justice legislation became a part of the general reform process. There were calls from iwi Māori that the Children and Young Persons Act 1974 promoted institutionalised racism, by privileging European values and child rearing practices over those of Māori, by separating Māori children from Māori families through institutional care, and by fostering and adoption outside of kinship groups. The 1974 Act meant decisions on the placement of children in need of care or protection were made by the courts and the state welfare agency (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare Puao-te-Ata-tu, 1988).

Puao-te-Ata-tu (Day Break) was an in-depth critique on the then Department of Social Welfare and the Children and Young Persons Act 1974. Both were found to be party to institutionalised racism, and as a resulthigh numbers of iwi Māori and Pasifika had entered foster care (Keddell, 2007). Puao-te-Ata-tu reported iwi Māori wanted more say and greater input into the new legislation, and more influence in the care and protection process.

> *"The process of reforming child welfare legislation was long and involved and extensive and, for the time atypical, consultation. A government appointed committee of experts recommended a multi-disciplinary specialist team model, and a number of community workers and an influential body of Māori opinion favoured a family decision-making and family placement model. Treasury saw that an emphasis on family autonomy, which transferred greater responsibility onto families for the care of children, would be less expensive than alternatives that required high levels of professional services"* (Blaicklock, et al, 2002).

Walker and Eketone (2013) suggest that the 40 years of Māori renaissance, as it is often referred to, was a time when many Pākehā were coming to grips with the oppressive and racist nature of the mono-cultural systems their forbearers had instituted and that in fact it is Pākehā who have gone through a transformation, moving away from justifying the misdeeds of colonisation as beneficial to Māori.

> *"There have been growth in Pākehā support for Māori issues, but this interaction with the protest movement ensured more advocates for greater Māori self-determination, the resolution of historical grievances…and, a focus*

of acknowledging Māori cultural values in government departments…Māori continue to struggle, but now had more allies among public servants, social workers, policy writers and politicians…the challenge to the myth that New Zealand was an egalitarian country had been made and a slow groundswell was building" (Walker, 2004, cited in Eketone & Walker, 2012, p. 260).

Puao-te-Ata-tu was the first official government document that acknowledged Māori social work methods and recommended their use (Hollis-English, 2012). *"It validated the Treaty of Waitangi and sought to end racism within the Department of Social Welfare* (Keenan, 1995, cited in Hollis- English, 2012, p. 42). The Treaty of Waitangi (to be discussed further) also provided a constitutional imperative for including Māori values and concepts into legislative frameworks, something the previous 40 years of Māori protest had highlighted. Oliver (1988) argues that *"Te Tiriti o Waitangi is the first formal social policy document of New Zealand's post-contact history"* (cited in Ruwhiu, 2009, p. 110), and Hollis-English (2012) considers the founding document of Māori social work in Aotearoa New Zealand to be Puao-te-Atu-tu. It was *"instrumental in changing the social service environment and some elements of practice, rather than changing Māori practice, it validated the use of tikanga in the social service"* (Hollis, 2006, p. 41).

Government accepted this and the new Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act (1989) was enacted within this social, economic and political environment. Whānau responsibility, children's rights, cultural acknowledgement, and partnership between state and community were seen as the four underlying tenets of the new Act (Hassall, 1996b). The family group conference, a statutorily-defined meeting of family and others able to assist, decided on the child's placement and other issues. Families being given a large degree of autonomy in decision making over both children in need of care and protection and children within the justice system was seen as radically moving away from the oppressive 1974 Act.

The Children, Young Persons and their Families Act (1989) gave and supported a legal and policy framework to change the traditional professional powerbase model where professionals determined the nature of assessment process, dominated decision-making and shaped practice solutions. It endorsed greater decision making by families and signalled less state intervention (Connolly, 1999). From this the New Zealand's Department of Child Youth and Family developed practice models that integrated three perspectives: child-centred; family-led and culturally responsive; and strengths- and evidence-based. Developing new frameworks, models and tools is the first part of the process of practice change (for further discussion on practice tools see Connolly and Smith, 2010). The use of strengths-based approaches was a move away from a focus of deficit and individual pathological models.

The 1989 Act and its revision (2010), and Puao-te-Ata-tu ushered in an air of optimism that new changes to statutory social work would generate better culturally appropriate services and delivery for our most vulnerable. However, the Children, Young Persons

and Their Families Act and the Public Finance Act were both passed into law in 1989, and the structure imposed by the latter has had a profound influence on the operation of the former (Duncan & Worrall, 2000). The Mason Report also commented on the impact of government fiscal policies on the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act, and warned against a system that attempted to quantify social response in dollar terms (Mason, Kirby and Wray, 1992). That the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act was seen as a cost-saving measure can be ascertained by the fact that, in spite of an increase in annual numbers of abuse notifications, annual budget levels for Child Protection spending decreased (cited in Brown, 2001, p. 19). Baldock and Cass (1990) state that *"such official emphasis on the family as the provider of a private welfare system presumes that all individuals may call upon family support, and that all families have equal financial capacity to provide it"*.

Impetus for change

These changes affirmed and validated working with mokopuna Māori using relevant frameworks and models of practice based on te reo me ōna tikanga (Māori language and culture). For example, the use of family group conferences, based on whānau hui and hui a whānau which revolutionised user decision making. However, a statistical review indicated that this 'air of optimism' was unfounded – Māori are still disproportionately over-represented in New Zealand's vulnerable population (CYF Key Statistics on Māori Children and Young People Report to the Māori Leadership Governance Group, July to December 2012).

Of the 63 children and young people who experienced abuse while placed with a caregiver in the 2011/2012 year, 65% (41) were mokopuna Māori. Likewise, 61% of all vulnerable children and young people in CYF care are mokopuna Māori.[1] The Child, Youth and Family 2014 Workload and Casework review also signposted that 40% of safety assessments had been completed without seeing mokopuna. This is of great concern as social workers core business is to talk to children and young people. It is difficult to see how social workers can determine whether a child is safe without speaking to that child or young person. This approach also contravenes UNCROC, a child's right to be heard on matters that affect them, and is poor practice (Dobbs, 2015).

In fact, 30% of assessments were conducted without direct contact with relevant families or whānau, and 15% were written up without seeking insight from other agencies providing specialised support. Concerns regarding the status of CYF capability and capacity for working with mokopuna and whānau Māori, painted the following picture. *'Our service struggles with Te Ao Māori frameworks guiding practice, localised Māori community approaches are not well understood, our performance around cultural competency to work with Māori lacks a relevant principled practice*

---

[1] Official Oranga Tamariki website data for all children in care is 61% Māori for 2011/12. This had risen to 68% for 2019/20.

framework, and there is little evidence of systemically embedded ways of practicing with mokopuna and whānau Māori' (CYF Internal Report, 2014).

The capacity of CYF to respond effectively is severely impeded by a majority tauiwi workforce and Māori staff who are challenged by the need for more resources, supports and tools to guide the expectation of improved practices for working with Māori (CYF, 2014).

> *"The work of CYF…has been resisted and criticised by Māori for its lack of cultural responsiveness. Culturally non-responsive social work practice has been variously described as poor practice, 'institutional abuse'… and even 'cultural genocide' (Blackstock, Trocmé, & Bennett, 2004, p. 902). It is poor practice because social workers do not have the skills, knowledge and resources to address the systemic problems (eg, poverty, disempowerment, loss of parenting practices) and the intergenerational trauma and grief faced by indigenous families in colonised countries. They therefore revert to the removal of indigenous children from families, largely motivated by a political unwillingness to address the 'etiological drivers of child maltreatment' (Blackstock et al, 2004, p. 903). In this way, an intervention of last resort (ie, child removal) becomes used on a population-wide basis"* (Cram, 2012, p. 15).

In Canada public child welfare administrators have identified several challenges to addressing over-representation and disparate outcomes in a meaningful and impactful way, which may assist. The following are several factors that were shared across a number of jurisdictions: widespread lack of professional and public awareness; unavailability of family support services and resources; reluctance to address structural and institutional racism; limited cultural competence of agency staff; limited cultural relevance of agency services and service providers; lack of racial/ethnic diversity among staff and service providers; challenge of engaging other systems and community partners; agency policies and systemic practices (Millar, 2009).

Statutory child welfare systems cannot do this on their own. In the child abuse and neglect domain there is a broad agreement that preventative services and systems need to be strengthened (Health Select Committee, 2013; Māori Reference Group for the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families, 2013; NZ Government, 2012) and that evidence on programme acceptability, accessibility and effectiveness, both overall and for Māori is required (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit, 2014, cited in Cram, et al, 2015). As far back as 2001 Judge Brown in his *Ministerial Review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services 2001 Report: Care and Protection is about adult behaviour* posed the question: "How do we build a culturally competent workforce?" He discusses this question both within the context of statutory social work and the then beginning of Māori Social Service providers who were taking on more social work functions (for further discussion on this see pages 72-101 in this report):

> *"To build effective partnerships with iwi and Māori in the delivery of statutory social work services, it is vital that work to develop Māori models of statutory practice proceeds. The absence of clearly articulated Māori social work practice models will hold back the transfer of functions to Māori providers"* (p.97).

Judge Brown goes on to recommend that some of the practice tools within statutory social work need to be able to be culturally validated. "Social work tools such as the Risk Estimation System (RES) have gained a certain measure of credibility due to an exhaustive process of consultation and testing with Māori. These tools should be able to translate to Māori service providers. However, other social work processes, such as investigative interviewing, family group conferencing, and placement processes have not been through a process of cultural ratification" (Brown, 2001, p. 97).

Whilst Judge Brown was discussing this in 2001 it is questionable whether these recommendations have yet been fully realised. There has been a cycle of reviews into child welfare since 2001. However, from the Child Youth and Family Strategic Plan 2012-2015 below, it seems some of these guiding principles are still wanting:

> *"Anei ra aku ringa hei ringaringa mau Puao-te-Ata-tu*
>
> *Pupuritia kia mau hei kaimahi mau Puao-te-Ata-tu*
>
> *Twenty six years ago Puao-te-Ata-tu was gifted to us, and provided the guiding principles needed to build a service that is responsive to tamariki and rangitahi Māori. The concepts set out in Puao-te-Ata-tu are equally relevant today. We acknowledge this history as providing a foundation for our work, and a clear pathway towards fulfilling aspirations for Māori. Our success in this will be measured by our ability to walk comfortably in Te Ao Māori"* (Child, Youth and Family, Strategic Plan: 2012-2105, p.10).

And: In the three years 2012 to 2015 we will:

• Deliver a service that is internationally recognised as being culturally sensitive, respectful and responsive for Māori.

• Build strong, respectful and positive partnerships with hapū and iwi.

• Incorporate the values, culture and beliefs of Māori and promote te reo in our everyday work.

• Lead by example.

It is encouraging to see within the Strategic Plan that some of the factors that have been discussed in this section may be ameliorated, if actioned through across the whole organisation and through an Indigenous cultural lens. Most contemporary governments (Australia, Canada, United States and New Zealand) and child welfare services acknowledge the significance of culture and there is a growing recognition of the nexus between cultural strength and children's wellbeing (Libesman, 2013). It is perhaps in the application of this knowledge that work needs to be done.

Summary

There are a number of challengers for the child welfare system in addressing over-representation and disparate outcomes in a meaningful and impactful way. Māori are and have been the motivators for change within the child welfare system in Aotearoa/New Zealand and have been supported by many non-Māori to provide better services to and for supporting children and family wellbeing. Legislative changes have assisted in this process, and there has been significant increase in the level of investment over time. Government has a role in supporting vulnerable whānau to care for their mokopuna, the challenge is how to do this more effectively. Effective contemporary frameworks for addressing Indigenous children's welfare and wellbeing are essential (Libesman, 2013).

> *"Indigenous knowledges are particularly important in relation to child protection, for in many jurisdictions, Indigenous children and families, as well as children and families from many immigrant minority groups, are the most affected by child protection policy and practice, with, often, minimal attention paid to Indigenous knowledges and practices for protecting children. In seeking to be culturally robust we wholeheartedly accept that theory and practice are not a-cultural and should enhance and support "other" ways of knowing rather than relegating them to being an add-on, exotic or alternative"* (Young et al, 2014).

The over-representation of Indigenous children within child welfare systems has been part of the reason for the emergence of Indigenous theoretical frameworks within social work practice, assisting in the 'decolonisation' of practice and in promoting Indigenous self-determination. The disproportionality of Indigenous children in child welfare signifies a breach of the oldest covenant of all – *to do no harm to future generations by our actions in the present* (Sullivan & Charles, 2010).

Section Four

Indigenous social work theoretical and practice frameworks for mokopuna and whānau wellbeing

"It is not the fact of government intervention in Indigenous family life that is problematic, but the nature of the intervention" (Tilbury, 2009, p.62)

Introduction

The two previous sections have given an overview of the position of Indigenous children and their families within their respective child welfare systems and have discussed a number of complex factors which have led to over-representation within these systems. This next section discusses the development and need for indigenous social work theoretical and practice frameworks. However, there is scarce literature on this topic within the context of statutory social work.

A number of Indigenous frameworks and programmes are used by non-statutory service providers, however due to minimal investments in evaluation processes many have not been researched or evaluated (Calma, 2008). The majority of these frameworks have come from the recognition that western/mainstream theoretical approaches on their own have not been successful when working with Indigenous children, families and communities (Blackstock, 2009; Cram, 2012, 2014; Cripp & McGlade, 2008; Grennell & Cram, 2008; Hollis-English, 2012; Kruger et al, 2004; Pitama, Jenkins & Middleton, 2003; Tidbury, 2009; Young, et al., 2014). The literature on western social work theories is not described in any length in this literature review, unless in conjunction with Indigenous theoretical social work frameworks.

Principled frameworks

For the purpose of this review a practice framework is defined as a tool for practitioners, a conceptual map that brings together, in an accessible way, *"a theoretically informed intervention logic and a set of triggers to support best practice"*. (Connolly, 2007, p. 825). In social work circles a framework is often referred to as 'discourse' or 'worldviews' (Munford & Nash, 1994).

Frameworks can be used to engage, stimulate, reflect, monitor and evaluate transdisciplinary teams and organisational change. Canvassing the relevant team or organisational views and attitudes regarding the various attributes with the framework helps participants to be more reflective on their own values and norms and how these might impact on the effectiveness of their practice (Tsey, 2008, cited in Whiteside, Tsey & Cadet-James, 2011, p. 229−230). The importance of principled frameworks is that models of practice are housed inside them (Tan & Dodds, 2002). It is these models of principled practice that are 'transportation sites of contestation' or 'critical dialogue between theory and praxis' (Allan, Pease & Briskman, 2003) that is the conduit between values, beliefs, principles and actions (Ruwhiu, 2009). Healy (2005) points out the circumstance in which a framework is revealed and is transformed:

"Through critical analysis of how we use and develop knowledge in practice, our embedded framework for practice is revealed. Being able to articulate our framework for practice enhances our capacity to share and develop our approach with others, such as colleagues and service users. We are also in a position to understand the weakness of our framework for practice and this can provide directions for further development of our framework and future learning (p.219).

Children's human rights

Recognition of human rights within child welfare frameworks can help to facilitate recognition and inclusion of Indigenous understandings in responses to Indigenous children and young people's welfare and wellbeing (Cram, 2015; Libesman, 2013; Millar, 2009; Staniforth, et al, 2011; Yellow Bird, 2013). Human rights are not a static given but rather dependent on how they are framed and understood. Māori living in Aotearoa New Zealand, unlike many other Indigenous peoples, have a constitutional founding document that protects their rights and provides validation for tauiwi (all those who have settled in New Zealand after Māori) to live in this land – Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The Treaty formally defines the relationship between Māori and the Crown with three guiding human rights principles – partnership, protection and participation – to manage this relationship. The Hunn report (1961) first highlighted the failings of the Crown to meet its Treaty obligations. While the Treaty has a troubled past and was ignored for over 100 years by the Crown (Hollis-English, 2012; Munford & Sanders, 2011; Walker, 2004), Smith (2000) notes that the recognition given to the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand legislation (Protection, Partnership and Participation) should also be accorded to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCROC). The Convention consists of 54 Articles, which Lansdown (1994) has divided into three main types:

1. Provision Articles, which recognise the social rights of children to minimum standards of health, education, social security, physical care, family life, recreation, culture and leisure.
2. Protection Articles, which identify the rights of children to be safe from discrimination, physical and sexual abuse, exploitation, substance abuse, injustice and conflict.
3. Participation Articles, civil and political rights, acknowledge children's rights to a name and identity, to be consulted and to be taken account of, to physical integrity, to access to information, to freedom of speech and opinion, and to challenge decisions made on their behalf.

The Convention calls for continuous action and progress in the realisation of children's rights based on four general principles defined by UNICEF (2002):

1. non-discrimination (Article 2) by which states commit to respect and ensure the rights of all children under their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind;

2. the best interests of the child (Article 3) in which the interests of the child are recognised as paramount and budgetary allocations should give priority to children and to the safekeeping of their rights;

3. respect for children's views and their right to participate in all aspects of democratic society (Articles 12-15) which asserts that children are not passive recipients, but actors contributing actively to the decisions that affect their lives;

4. the child's right to survival and development (Article 6) which claims the right for children to realise their fullest potential, through a range of strategies from meeting their health, nutrition and education needs to supporting their personal and social development (FNCFCS 1, 2003, p. 4).

UNCROC recognises children as a group to whom international human rights law applies and provides a framework for the consideration of the position of children in our society (Dobbs, 2005). Freeman (1994) contends that UNCROC is a landmark in the history of childhood, while Lansdown (1994, p. 36) calls it *"a turning point in the international movement on behalf of children's rights"*. Smith (2000) asserts that UNCROC provides an internationally accepted standard to be applied to basic human rights affecting children. It is a document of reconciliation, which treats parents and children with respect. It is an instrument which offers support to the child within the family context and at the same time identifies children as rights-bearers and families as the fundamental group unit of society (Jones & Marks, 1999). It also recommends a partnership between children, families and the institution of the state:

> *"In this way UNCROC can be seen as a document of reconciliation of the perceived conflict between the parent and the child and the state as a document which transcends the battlefield in order to ensure that there is room for all players to be treated with respect"* (Jones & Marks, 1999, p. 2).

UNCROC provides a framework within which children's civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights are articulated (Dobbs, 2005) and provides a useful 'yardstick' for child welfare departments, community organisations and others to measure themselves against. It can also be used as a focus for dialogue when considering problems with and solutions to legislation and practice with respect to children's and families' wellbeing (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2009; Libesman, 2013). Interestingly, it is the participation articles within UNCROC that are the most continuously similar to those participation rights within the Treaty (Dobbs, 2005) − a 'double whammy' for many Indigenous children. Recognition of specific rights of Indigenous children requires an understanding of equality which recognises difference. Within a self-determination framework it is likely that the best interest of the child (Article 3)of UNCROC) and Indigenous children's rights to their culture (Article 30) will dovetail (Libesman, 2013, p. 101).

Promoting self-determination and wellbeing

The adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007 was a milestone for Indigenous peoples. It gives recognition of the history of dispossession and trauma for Indigenous peoples (Yellow Bird, 2013) and provides a two-fold strategy that "aims at empowering indigenous groups by according them control over the issues which are internal to their communities and importantly procedures to participation and consultation which insure Indigenous peoples are involved in the life of the state" (Errico, 2007, cited in Yellow Bird, 2013).

Libesman (2013), Yellow Bird (2013) and Cram (2012) have all used a human rights (mana-enhancing) lens when discussing a framework for what is in the best interests of Indigenous children's wellbeing. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (the Declaration) states that:

> *"Indigenous individuals have an equal right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health"* (Article 24 (2)) and *"free to promote, develop and maintain their institutional structures and their distinctive customs, spirituality, traditions, procedures and…customs"* (Article 34).

Cram (2014) suggests that these are minimum standards for Indigenous wellbeing. Measuring and progressing these minimum standards is not straightforward as *"wellbeing is complex and hard to measure* (Kingsley, Townsend, Henderson-Wilson & Bolam, 2013, p. 680 cited Cram, 2014). See also Wirihana and Smith (2014) and Penehira, Green, Smith and Aspin (2014). Cram (2014) argues that these measures are often neglectful of the worldview of Indigenous peoples, and adds that the progress of Māori rights as enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi, and the Declaration, should be measured by assessing how Māori wellbeing is moving towards this minimum standard. The CYF Act also enshrines the rights of children to have their own cultural identity and to be cared for within this identity. This aim is also supported by the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics:

> *Members actively promote the rights of Tangata Whenua to utilise Tangata Whenua social work models of practice and ensure the protection of the integrity of Tangata Whenua in a manner which is culturally appropriate* (Paragraph 1.6).

Explicit here is not only the requirement to act for rights but also to respect the particular Indigenous models of social work which are culturally appropriate (Young et al, 2014). This right to cultural identity is enshrined in the Article 30 of UNCROC with many State parties to UNCROC having accepted that colonised Indigenous peoples in western countries have an identity which is distinct from other minority groups (Libesman, 2013). Treaties and agreements mainly regarding native land title, but also including other rights, have existed between Aboriginal Canadians and the Canadian government and between Māori and the New Zealand government for well over a

century. Although these treaties have not been fully honoured, they do provide a basis upon which to build relations and argue for, and gain, formal rights and position (Green & Baldry, 2008).

> *The Treaty of Waitangi is interpreted … as being the founding document of Aotearoa. For Māori, the Treaty is the source of Māori rights to access Māori health services as of right, to have control over determining Māori priorities for Māori health and to act to address these. Health is regarded as a taonga by Māori and this places a responsibility on government to act to improve and protect the health of Māori. This interpretation for Māori is consistent across all social policy areas. It is also inherently part of the constitutional position of Māori in Aotearoa and affords political status and rights to Māori to be self-controlling.* (Lawson-Te Aho, 1998, p. 24, cited in Cram, 2001).

Kaupapa Māori frameworks

There is an increasing recognition that a diversity of paradigms helps to understand family/whānau needs, practice and policy frameworks. Māori worldviews have made a major contribution to the development of social work practice within organisations and at policy level (Green & Baldry, 2008). A number of theoretical frameworks have been developed to enhance mokopuna and whānau wellbeing. Tangata whenua in Aotearoa, as with other indigenous and minority groups throughout the world, continue to progress the development of their own cultural frameworks and models of practice. These frameworks founded on cultural values, principles and customary practices contribute to self-determination and improved wellbeing. In Aotearoa New Zealand, tangata whenua frameworks are grounded in the notion that te reo me ona tikanga Māori are valid and legitimate, providing both the conceptual understandings and practices to bring about change for Māori (Eruera & Dobbs, 2010; Grennell & Cram, 2008; Kruger, et al., 2004; Ruwhiu & Eruera, 2013).

Smith (1997) promoted Kaupapa Māori as a theory of change that needed to be described in cultural and theoretical terms, and proposed alignment of Kaupapa Māori with critical theory. He saw Kaupapa Māori theory as having three significant components: as a 'conscientisation' that critiqued and deconstructed the hegemony of the dominant culture and the associated privilege that came with that; a focus on resistance to the dominant western structures that created and maintained 'oppression, exploitation, manipulation and containment', and finally, the need to reflect on the world in order to change it (Hetherington et al., 2013, p. 261). There are many definitions used for 'Kaupapa Māori'. For further discussion see Pitama, Cram and Walker (2002); Cram, (2006); and Smith (2005): The most commonly-used definition of Kaupapa Māori is by Smith (1990).

> "*Related to being Māori, is connected to Māori philosophy and principles, takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori and the importance of Māori*

language and culture, and is concerned with the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well-being" (Smith, 1990 p. 1).

Kaupapa Māori also opens up avenues for approaching and critiquing a colonial worldview that constructs Māori disparities as personal deficits (Cram, personal communication, 2015). Smith (2012) suggests that:

"*Kaupapa Māori has its roots in two intellectual influences – the validity and legitimacy of Māori language, knowledge and culture, as well as critical social theory. And this critical tradition demands we pay attention…to structural analysis…and to everyday practice, both of which inform the other"* (Smith, 2012, p. 12).

The emancipatory intent of Kaupapa Māori theory can be viewed as a decolonisation process (Pihama, 2001). It is not only about theorising for the reconstruction of a Māori world, it is directly related to the practical development of sustainable interventions for whānau Māori (Moyle, 2014). It is important to consistently re-assert Kaupapa Māori as being part of the context of Māori communities that consider Māori understandings as the heart of the process of research and analysis (Pihama, 2001; Smith, 2006). Eketone (2008) talks about the importance of Māori understanding and knowledge building not being located solely within Māori academia. He continues to say Māori knowledge building should also come from those voices within all communities where the way of living is 'intrinsic' and 'everyday'. It acknowledges the diverse nature of contemporary Māori society as well as complementing the existing voices from Māori academia (Eketone, 2008).

In his 2014 article *A model for Māori research for Māori practitioners* Moyle suggests that Māori knowledge is often owned and held by non-Māori (ie, a non-Māori academic institution such as that hosting the thesis that his research came from) and a Māori-centred approach can employ both Māori and non-Māori methods as well as contemporary research and analytical tools such as interpretative phenomenological analysis. Other Māori researchers who have described useful models of collaborative research between Māori and non-Māori have also supported this approach (Bishop, 1996; Cram, 1997; Durie, 2012). Throughout the literature there are many authors who advocate for Māori practitioners to write about their experiences so that the body of Māori social work knowledge and practice is strengthened (see Bell, 2006; Bradley, 1995; Eruera, 2005; Hollis, 2006; Hollis-English, 2012; Love, 2002; O'Donoghue, 2003; Ruwhiu, 1999; Walsh-Tapiata, 2003; cited in Moyle, 2014).

While it is acknowledged that there is no one Indigenous worldview, several common themes from the literature on Indigenous social work theories and practice frameworks have emerged. These strongly indicate that some of the fundamentals of western critical social work, including social justice, emancipation, human rights, empowerment, self-determination and respect need to be reinterpreted through an Indigenous lens. Some of these have been discussed above. At the heart of these

themes are those of self-determination, decolonisation, Indigenous meanings of family, the connection to land and to the spiritual world and the interconnectedness of all things in framing Indigenous wellbeing.

> *"The development of Indigenous … social work is not one of setting prescriptive practice. It is one of shifting modes of thinking for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous about respectful partnerships and dialogues (decolonising hearts and minds), and of valuing the frameworks and capacities of Indigenous (self-determination)… the decolonisation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous social workers and the acceptance and inclusion of Indigenous views including, but not limited to, Indigenous understandings of land and family and their importance in social relations and wellbeing"* (Green & Baldry, 2008, p. 400).

Hetherington et al. (2013) suggest that the theoretical underpinning of research and social work processes generally are important, but the implementation of these must enhance lives of the participants or families. They go on to say that in Aotearoa New Zealand, Indigenous processes and values can only go so far because it is the dominant culture that holds the power. However, they cite Bishop (1996) who suggests that there are processes to share power *"in a way that is useful to all stakeholders concerned and provide a platform for both Māori and Pākehā to evaluate programmes, research methods, policy and institutional arrangements"* (p. 268).

Kaupapa Māori theoretical frameworks, social work practice and wellbeing

> *"The lesson for indigenous peoples of the world is that we do need to understand our history, to value the identity-promoting power of our narratives, and to respect our traditional notions of wellbeing…indigenous peoples of the world do have home-grown theories that inform best practice in social and community work. Our cultural eyes influence the formation of these theoretical explanations. No more are these constructions left outside the door of social and community work engagements of healing in Aotearoa New Zealand with indigenous whānau Māori or Tauiwi families and individuals"* (Ruwhiu in Connolly, 2013, p. 135).

Reviewing the literature on the more commonly known theoretical frameworks used within Aotearoa (See Table 1) it is evident that they seek to enhance a Te Ao Māori (Māori worldview) of wellbeing. All are framed using Māori knowledge, values and principles with a belief that with support whānau have the ability and potential to effect their own positive changes towards wellbeing. They all use kaupapa Māori cultural imperatives or a principled approach providing the foundations of a Māori worldview of wellbeing. This leaves the flexibility for the implementation and enactment of these principles to reflect diversity in iwi, understanding, context, professional standards and other critical requirements for practice and application. They also recognise the impact of the historical relationship between tangata whenua (Indigenous people) and tauiwi

(non-indigenous New Zealanders) and the influences this has had on many tangata whenua.

Table 1: Commonly used theoretical frameworks in Aotearoa New Zealand

Theoretical Framework	Literature
Te Whare Tapa Whā	Durie (1994; 1998, 2001) Durie & King, (1997) Hollis- English (2012) Young et al., (2014)
Te Wheke	Pere (1991)
Te Mahi Whakamana	Ruwhiu (1999) Young et al., (2014)
The Poutama	Tangaere (1997) Harvey (2002) Hollis-English (2012) Stanley (2000)
Mauri Ora Framework	Kruger et al. (2004) E Tu Whānau (2009) Te Puni Kōkiri (2010)
Dynamics of Whānaungatanga	Henare Tate (1993; 2010) Mead (2003) Young et al. (2014)

In many Indigenous systems the person is considered holistically, alongside relational responsibilities and the environment, which is inclusive of the natural and spiritual world (Durie, 1998). Such systems promote knowledge of te reo (language) and tikanga Māori (culture) and history (Walker, 2012). The following offers a summary of a selection of the more commonly-known kaupapa Māori frameworks.

Te whare tapa whā is seen as the first documented 'Māori model' (Hollis-English, 2012). It consists of a four-sided health construct, that symbolically is represented as a 'whare tapa whā' (four sided house). Each side represents an important element of Māori health, and it is considered that each dimension is necessary to ensure strength and symmetry. The four dimensions are taha wairua (spiritual side), taha hinengaro (thoughts and feelings), taha tinana (physical side), taha whānau (family). Te Whare Tapa Whā can be applied to any health issue (physical, spiritual, psychological or connections with family) affecting Māori. It is influential for describing concepts of health and wellbeing from a Māori perspective (Hollis-English, 2012). Whilst it is

acknowledged that Māori are not a homogeneous group and are quite diverse with no single or typical Māori identity (Durie, 2001), this model can be adapted to all levels of identity. Looking after all aspects of wellbeing, taha wairua (spiritual), taha hinengaro (mental and emotional), taha tinana (physical) and taha whānau (family) must all be considered. Together, all four are necessary and when in balance, represent 'best health'. Each taha (side) is also intertwined with the other. Accordingly, if any one of these components is deficient this will negatively impact on a person's health (Durie & Kingi, 1997). This framework has been used within all social service jurisdictions with both Māori and non-Māori.

Similarly, the **Mauri Ora** framework's goal or vision has been identified as the wellbeing (mauri ora) of whānau, hapū, and iwi and within that, individual Māori. The processes used to achieve and sustain wellbeing may be diverse. This is reflected in the framework's practice models, but the kaupapa is unified at the philosophical level. The three fundamental tasks to be carried out when analysing and approaching violence (which this framework was developed for), and when responding to a perpetrator of violence are to: 1. *Dispel the illusion* (at the collective and individual levels) that whānau violence is normal, acceptable and culturally valid 2. *Remove opportunities* for whānau violence to be practised through education for the liberation and empowerment of whānau, hapū and iwi. The act is moving from a state of whānau violence to a state of whānau wellbeing; and 3. *Teach transformative practices* based on Māori cultural practice imperatives that transform violent behaviours and provide alternatives to violence. The transformative process for empowerment and self-realisation relies on demystifying illusions held by the perpetrator, victims and their whānau. This involves a process of displacement through education and the replacement of violence with alternatives. The transformative process includes contesting the illusions around whānau violence, removing opportunities for the practice of whānau violence and replacing those with alternative behaviours and ways of understanding.

Te reo Māori, tikanga and āhuatanga Māori are all conduits for transformation from whānau violence to whānau wellbeing. The Mauri Ora Imperatives of whakapapa, tikanga, wairua, tapu, mauri and mana ensure that cultural constructs from Te Ao Māori (Māori world view) underpin the implementation of whānau violence prevention strategies within the realities of today's society (Kruger et al, 2004). This framework has been piloted and is used extensively within agencies and assists in the setting of government and non-government organisations joint programme for addressing family violence (E Tu Whānau Strategic Plan, 2013-2018, Māori Reference Group).

Te Mahi Whakamana draws upon the cultural metaphor of 'he Ngakau Māori' (a Māori heart). There are six key thematic concepts that are used to examine wellbeing among Māori families and their relational and environmental circumstances. Within this framework they are as follows: Wairuatanga (ideology, philosophy, paradigms, and theoretical conceptualisations); whānau (relational development); tikanga matauranga

(protocols of engagement); mauri ora (levels of wellbeing); mana (respect); and ko au (identity and interconnectedness). Te Mahi Whakamana is a mana-enhancing theory and practice and is premised on tangata whenua epistemologies and ways of viewing the world (Young et al., 2014). Tangata whenua inherently recognise the human (he tangata), natural (te ao turoa) and the ideological (wairuatanga) dimensions of their worldview as being held together by the cultural adhesive of mana (Ruwhiu, 1995). Within practice terms, Te Mahi Whakamana is restorative and seeks to: build on inherent strengths, facilitate emancipatory strategies, enhance positive self-worth, demystify and deconstruct oppression, and promote wellness, service and love for others (Ruwhiu, 1995, cited in Young et al., 2014). Social work operates between the terrain occupied by the individual in the private world and the social, or external, world in which the state intervenes to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the particular ideological positionings in different locations, to ameliorate the circumstances affecting people's lives. Strengths, resources and assets of both the individual and her/his environment, then, characterise this worldview (Ruwhiu, 1995).

The Poutama framework uses symbolism and draws from traditional ways of learning and the importance of 'connectiveness'. The poutama model symbolises the poutama design from a traditional Māori tukutuku panel. The image represents steps leading upward, signifying the growth of people, striving upwards and onwards. The pattern also refers to various kōrero o neherā (ancient stories) (Hollis-English, 2012). Tangaere (1997) wrote about learning and development as being inseparable from the influences of tīkanga Māori and the Māori context. The poutama or stairway to the twelve heavens explains how development occurs − along and up the steps of the Poutama, each stage being complete and leading to the next stage of development. Webber-Dreardon (1997) describes another framework based on the Āwhiowhio (whirlwind) spiral design and the poutama (steps) that also signifies the development and growth of people from strength to strength (Harvey, 2000). The three main principles of the āwhiowhio is that it embraces the 'au' (me, I − singular), the whānau (extended family) and whānaungatanga (relationships). It also connects the past, present and the future. Through connecting the individual to their whānau and wider ancestry, they are connected more strongly with their identity. According to Webber-Dreardon (cited in Hollis-English, 2012) the second principle is a method of gathering information to place into a kete (basket) in the centre so that it may assist with decision-making. The third principle is that the centre is where the issues are discussed so that the whānau, hapū and iwi (extended family, sub-tribe and tribe) can make their own decisions (Webber-Dreardon, 1997).

The Dynamics of Whānaungatanga (Tate, 1993; 2010) is a framework that provides understanding of concepts and principles that enhance personal skills and actions. Whānaungatanga encapsulates the tikanga of tapu, mana and their expressions through the principles of tika, pono and aroha. The framework is for Māori working within whānau, hapu and iwi systems. It is focused on fundamental principles which might assist restoration of healthy relationships within whānau. Whānaungatanga is

able to provide a restorative framework and as such is a clear site of intervention. Young et al (2014) cites Tate (2010) when giving examples of these principles in its application to social work practice:

> *"…restoration of tapu (being, restriction and sacredness) is central and mana (spiritual power and authority, influence, control, prestige and status) of the children and families. Therefore, in Māori social work practice and theory there are three guiding ethical principles for this work. Pono is seen as social workers being true, genuine, unfeigned, honest, integrity and faithful). Tika is understood as being right, correct, appropriate, proper, just, straight and direct, and is a societally agreed value or action. Aroha requires workers to be people who act with and are motivated by affection, love, compassion, mercy, empathy. Aroha recalls us to the Rogerian "unconditional positive regard", noted by Banks (2001, p. 37) in her justification for subsuming "respect for persons", a core belief in social work, into any precondition for ethical acts. Generalised 'love' (agape), or, here, aroha, require these ethical principles be indivisible from practice"* (pp.903−904).

The application of this framework can support whānau to address, restore and enhance te tapu o te tangata so they may have the mana to achieve their own goals. Whānaungatanga can be described as a value (Mead, 2003), but has also been described as a theory. Whakawhānaungatanga (family making) is a fundamental part of the interaction with the whānau, and with the philosophical approach from Te Ao Māori, once the whānau connections are made through the use of whakapapa, those relationships are never-ending (Hollis-English, 2012). Young et al. (2014) assert that whakawhānaungatanga in the social work context refers to relationship making which is standard social work practice in terms of the planned change process, ie, engagement, assessment, intervention and evaluation, however they do question if it is valued in child protection work.

These frameworks have been developed by Māori practitioners from across Aotearoa New Zealand and as such come from the experiences of qualified practitioners working to 'effective practice' from a Māori paradigm. It is also important to note that some of these frameworks have enabled iwi and the government to work together within this Māori worldview. The frameworks link different components of tikanga to enable practitioners to interpret and apply the Kaupapa in a localised context, to bring about whānau wellbeing. For example, the Mauri Ora framework which promotes self-determination and the strengths within whānau, hapu and iwi:

> *"The local application of this model must reside within the domains of whānau, hapū and iwi. The roles of Māori practitioners are to facilitate, educate, monitor and translate this framework into practice inside whānau, hapū and iwi − not to do it for them, but to show them how it can be done and support them to liberate themselves from the burden of whānau violence"* (Kruger et al, 2004, p.3).

Te Ao Māori cultural imperatives

Within the literature Te Ao Māori, tikanga and cultural imperatives are mentioned as being fundamental to kaupapa Māori frameworks. These kupu (words) can hold different meanings and descriptions depending in what context they are used in (Dobbs & Eruera, 2014). *"There is no one Tā Te Aō Māori, rather there are a collection of contributions that develop those principles which will collectively add to the philosophy of Tā Te Aō Māori"* (Nicholls, 1998, p. 60). Tikanga is commonly described as cultural customs and practices. There are many approaches or ways of looking at tikanga Māori:

> *"Tikanga is the practice of Māori customs and processes founded in a Māori worldview ... Tikanga embodies Māori values and prescribes acceptable and unacceptable behaviours from a specifically Māori value base ... The application of tikanga provides the opportunity for the restoration of order, grace and mana to whānau, hapū and iwi"* (Kruger, et al., 2004, p. 20).

One explanation pertaining to all human relationships views tikanga as a means of social control to guide encounters and behaviour. Therefore, tikanga provides a guide to relationship interactions. *"Tikanga guides interpersonal relationships and provides processes and rules for engagement such as how groups are to meet and interact, and determines how individuals identify themselves… It may also include guidelines for behaviour of individuals and families"* (Mead, 2003, pp.5−8).

Ruwhiu describes Tikanga Māori as ways of doing things, traditional and contemporary practices framed by Māori knowledge and wisdom (Matauranga Māori). Hollis-English (2012) suggests that her research with Māori social workers showed that tīkanga is fundamental to the practices of Māori social workers and is the core of their mahi (work). Kruger et al. (2004) contend that tikanga includes the enactment of whānaungatanga and the reverence of whakapapa and that an effective practitioner uses tikanga as a tool to educate whānau about the responsibilities of whakapapa and whānaungatanga. Contemporary Māori realities may impede the use of tikanga to fix and make right acts of abuse or violence because often there is external interruption and a lack of knowledge about how to resolve whānau violence and begin the healing process. Kruger et al., (2004) suggest that practitioners are responsible for clarifying tikanga processes with whānau and guiding whānau back to the use of tikanga to prevent the reoccurrence of violence.

Whakapapa

The significance of whakapapa is highlighted within these frameworks and supports the importance of and recognition of interconnectedness. The literature describes whakapapa as the foundation of a Māori worldview, and is the process that records the evolution and genealogical descent of all living things. The interconnectedness of relationships between people and the environment, both spiritual and physical, as well

as people to each other follows an ordered process (Nicholls, 1998; Henare, 1988). Therefore, whakapapa embodies the origins and nature of all relationships:

> *"Whakapapa describes the relationships between te aō kikokiko (the physical world) and te aō wairua (the spiritual world) ... The reciprocity and obligatory nature of whakapapa means that it can be used to create productive and enduring relationships to support change. Whakapapa establishes and maintains connections and relationships and brings responsibility, reciprocity and obligation to those relationships..."* (Kruger et al., 2004, p. 16).

Whakapapa establishes the identity of an individual and assists them to clarify themselves and their relationships with others. It enables the individual to understand their position in relation to their whānau, community and society and as such their roles and responsibilities (Eruera & Dobbs, 2010):

> *"The dialogue about inter-relationship between self and others is understood when a person identifies themselves. There is a weaving whitiwhiti kōrero that is laid down, to bind the human (people connections), natural (landmark identifiers) and spiritual (esoteric locators) dimensions of a person in their worldview as a means of highlighting their cultural identity"* (Ruwhiu et al., 2009 cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014, p. 11).

Traditionally whakapapa often influenced intimate partner relationships and was very important in the continued succession and protection of whānau, land and overall wellbeing. Whakapapa also ascribed roles for tāne and wahine in a variety of contexts. Often the mātāmua, or eldest in the whānau had particular roles and sometimes these roles were gender specific in the practice of tikanga. For some iwi the eldest male was expected to be the kaikōrero or speaker for the whānau. In another context, the important role of wahine as te whare tapu o te tangata (child bearers) is described and this reinforced the necessity for women to be protected as critical in the continuation of whakapapa (Eruera & Dobbs, 2010). Although these concepts are located within a traditional framework they are not historical concepts that are left in the past but are living, evolving processes that currently enable the survival and maintenance of kaupapa Māori within the contemporary world (Dobbs & Eruera, 2014). These principles can guide transformative practices and inform strategies for whānau wellbeing. They can also be seen as protective factors within whānau, hapū and iwi. While it is recognised that many Māori do not identify with whakapapa or kin-based whānau, all Māori have whakapapa. It is the consciousness, acceptance and practice of it that differs (Kruger et al., 2004).

Indigenous principled approaches

Within the international literature Blackstock (2009) suggests that if relational worldview principles are out of balance, then risks to children's safety and wellbeing predictably increase. Therefore, if interventions are geared towards restoring balance

among the relational worldview then systemic balance will be achieved and children will have an optimal opportunity for safety. Similar to the frameworks above and for other Indigenous peoples Blackstock suggests:

> "*Among First Nations peoples, balance is the ultimate state of well-being both on an individual and collective basis; therefore, each cultural group has highly developed mechanisms to optimize balance among the principles. Values, social norms, teachings, laws and ceremonies were, and are, used to maintain or restore balance among the relational worldview principles within and across dimensions of reality and time. For example, the Ojibwe believe that individual and community life is governed by seven life values known as the Seven Grandfather Teachings: Respect, Humility, Love, Truth, Honesty, Bravery, and Wisdom (DeMaille, 1984). These values are situated within a holistic worldview that requires balance among the spiritual, emotional, physical, and cognitive elements of self and communities*" (pp. 34−35).

Blackstock's (2009) Breath of Life Theory draws from both First Nations and western knowledge to create the ethical space advocated by Ermine (2004) for the exploration of the experience of First Nations children in child welfare. This model goes beyond describing structural risk to identifying a series of constants that must be in balance in order to eradicate or reduce structural risk and its manifestation at the level of individuals and groups (Blackstock, 2009). "*The model would agree that Bronfenbrenner's dimensions of reality (1979) are important but would argue one lifetime is inadequate to truly understand the experience of intergenerational groups of disadvantaged children* (p. 49). It embraces the value of ancestral knowledge in not only identifying the constants that govern indigenous reality, but also the culture and context which give shape to different manifestations of reality. It considers oppression is important only as a contextual factor − not as a focal factor − and provides a mechanism for restoring wellbeing. Blackstock (2009) suggests the implications of the model are potentially significant and says:

> "*If this new theory is proven correct, it would suggest that child welfare interventions should focus on restoring balance among the relational worldview principles instead of over focusing on treating how the imbalance manifests at the level of individual children and families. It also likely has application in other disciplines where structural risk impacts on individual experience such as in justice, health, and education. Importantly, even though the breath of life theory was developed for use with First Nations, with proper cross-cultural evaluation it may inform structural interventions for other cultural groups*" (p. 49).

Moreover, the greatest potential is that it is potentially testable using Indigenous and western research techniques given the plausible development of culturally-based measures for the principles. Blackstock argues that testing the model means having the theory validated by First Nations knowledge holders, particularly Elders, who will judge it against ancestral knowledge and their own experience as to the effect its

application has on children in the community and their descendants. The theory has already been presented to Indigenous knowledge holders in Australia, the United States and Canada who judged it as fundamentally sound.

In Canada the development of the Hollow Water Holistic Circle Healing model (see Cripp & McGlade, 2008 for further discussion) by the community and statutory agencies (Welfare and Police), aims to reduce the number of sexual and physical assaults in this community. It was guided by the seven sacred teachings given by the Creator for Aborginal people to follow (Cripp & McGlade, 2008). These are honesty, strength, respect, caring, sharing, wisdom and humility (Sivell-Ferri, 1997, p. 129, cited in Cripp & McGlade, 2008). This holistic model is aimed at healing victims, victimisers, families and the intergenerational trauma and experiences of abuse in residential schools within communities that stem from policies and practices of colonisation, dispossession and cultural dislocation from families.

Cripp and McGlade (2008) comment that the model also engages factors that contribute to distress in communities such as unemployment, racism, addictions and health issues. Whilst contested by some, there has been some evaluation of this model indicating levels of success which has been reflected in various ways – happier children and better parenting, more disclosures and empowerment of victims, women feeling empowered, community actions and responsibility, respect, broadening of resources, responsiveness, openness and honesty, strengthening of traditions, harm reduction, and violence being controlled (Ross, 2006, pp. 51−65, cited in Cripps & Glade, p. 248).

> *"Research has shown that the core values by which the Community Holistic Circle Healing operates (and the sacred teachings at the heart of the process) have become integrated into the community and that the community's own healing journey to achieve full balance or P'madaziwin – spiritual, emotional, physical and mental wellbeing – has improved significantly since the establishment of the Community Holistic Circle Healing model".*

The literature reports that Indigenous peoples understand and experience self-determination largely, but not exclusively, within a collective framework (Young et al., 2014, Ruwhiu, 2009) and suggests there is no aspect of Indigenous life that can be separated from responsibility to the group and the land (Kruger, et al., 2004). Indigenous peoples call for the right to determine the futures for both the collective and the individual in light of these responsibilities.

Malezar and Sim (2002, cited in Green & Baldry, 2008) argued that the obligations and reciprocity of relationships among humans and between humans and nature are fundamental to an Indigenous worldview. Indigenous 'social work' should have a collective understanding of self-determination that encompasses the concepts and practices of reciprocity and obligation (Green & Baldry, 2008). Erosion of cultural identity and spiritual disconnection have been linked to heightened risk for stress-

related disorders and substance misuse (Carriere, 2005; Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Dell & Lyons, 2007). Positive spiritual connection has been linked with increased reunification rates of children in child welfare care (Bullock, Gooch, & Little, 1998).

Sinclair's (2002), outline of Indigenous social work is a useful working definition: *"a practice that combines culturally relevant social work education and training, theoretical and practice knowledge derived from Aboriginal epistemology (ways of knowing) that draws liberally on western social work theory and practice methods, within a decolonising context"* (p. 56). Sinclair suggests that this context is one in which Indigenous epistemology is linked to land and nature, hence to ecological survival and to the fundamental living out of the knowledge that all things are related (2002, p. 54). Her discussion reflects Indigenous social work as developed and practised by Indigenous Canadian social workers.

Ruwhiu (2001) describes mana as a key concept for social service development because it acts as the cultural adhesive that cements together those various dimensions (spiritual, natural, human) of Māori culture and society (p. 60). He then explains that mana-enhancing behaviour is about ensuring that interactions between the spiritual, physical and natural realms are advantageous. Social workers, both Māori and non-Māori, can benefit from the understanding that every person has mana and can increase and share mana with others (cited in Hollis-English, 2012, p. 49).

> *As Māori people in Aotearoa/New Zealand, our struggle has been a long and arduous one across years of resisting colonialism to reclaim our identity, lands and original ways of ensuring the well-being of our people. This reclamation had to be consistent with the philosophical premises of a Māori worldview; Māori knowledge creation and transmission processes; values specific to a Māori vision of social reality; and Māori beliefs in the interconnectedness of the individual, the family, kinship systems, the physical environment and 'te ao wairua' (the spiritual realm)* (Tait-Rolleston & Pehi-Barlow, cited in Dominelli, et al., 2001, p. 229).

Summary

The over-representation of Indigenous children within child welfare systems has been part of the impetus for the emergence of Indigenous social work theoretical frameworks – to decolonise western social work theories and practice and to hold to account the principles of our founding documents and basic human rights. Green and Baldry (2008) summarise this section well. They contend that Indigenous social work that is guided by Indigenous participation and experiences and has, at its heart, human rights and social justice, is required. Indigenous social work theory and practice developments are being generated by those working in this field. They go on to say aspects of this 'praxis' include recognition of the effects of invasion, colonialism, and paternalistic social policies upon social work practice with Indigenous communities; recognition of the importance of self-determination; contemporary Indigenous and

non-indigenous colleagues working in partnership; the impact of contemporary racist and neo-colonialist values; and rethinking contemporary social work values and practices. *"What is needed is a dialogical process amongst Indigenous and non-indigenous social workers"* (Gray & Fook, 2004, p. 627).

Green and Baldry (2008) point out that Indigenous Australians have successfully and harmoniously lived with and in their land since the Dreamtime and had developed extraordinary social and community skills − something which is rarely acknowledged. This could equally be applied to Māori in Aotearoa and other Indigenous peoples. Internationally it is recognised that where local culture is used as a primary source for knowledge and practice development, social work practice can become culturally appropriate, relevant and authentic (Gray, Coates & Yellow Bird, 2008). The notion of self-determination, partnership and indigenous rights that underpin contemporary culturally responsive social work practice in Aotearoa New Zealand can be traced back to the essence and spirit of the Treaty (Ruwhiu, 2009).

Section Five

Child Youth and Family Indigenous and Bi-cultural Principled (Strategic and Practice) Framework (IBPF)

*We need to look at the way this country was colonised, we need to look at what that colonisation means not just for Indigenous people but also for non-Indigenous people. We need to work out how we decolonise ourselves and I mean both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people (*Bennett, Zubrzycki & Bacon, 2011, p. 31*).*

Introduction

The Kaupapa Māori models reviewed in the literature thus far are collectively framed in te reo, are reflective of a Māori worldview (Te Ao Māori) of wellbeing and have been used across many social service jurisdictions. It The importance of Indigenous 'connectedness' is evident from the literature, as previously stated. Due to a range of complex factors described in all sections of this review, some mokopuna Māori are not safe within their whānau. Some of these factors have impacted on kinship parenting and support is not a current reality for many whānau Māori.

The process of urbanisation has also seen numbers of whānau being disengaged from their extended whānau networks, cultural beliefs and processes for caring for children (Cargo, 2008). Therefore, solutions require multi-layered approaches that aim to strengthen the conditions and cultural foundations that whānau require for mokopuna and whānau wellbeing (Cram et al., 2015; Eruera & Ruwhiu, 2014; Grennell, 2006; Kruger, et al., 2004; Robertson & Oulton, 2008). The frameworks described above are based on cultural foundations (Te Ao Māori) and are part of this multi-leveled approach. However, government and communities must work together to find solutions within these cultural foundations. This section will report on how Aotearoa New Zealand is tackling the over-representation of Māori mokopuna in our child welfare system and review some of the aspects of the IBPF and briefly report on the international literature in terms of the development and application of bi-cultural social work frameworks.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, a foundational understanding of tangata whenua and tauiwi histories together with a working knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are critical for advancing best Indigenous and bicultural social work practice (Aotearoa Association of Social Work Code of Ethics, 2013). Subsequently, Child, Youth and Family (CYF) commitment to progressing responsiveness to Māori became prominently embedded in their Mā Mātou Mā Tātou strategy (2010), building on the foundations laid by Puao-te-Ata-tu (1987) and the CYF Act (CYF Act 1989, revised Oct 2010).

However, if we look at the theoretical frameworks used within statutory social work practice we see that in the main they are constructed from western ideologies. These frameworks on their own have not advanced children's and their families' wellbeing −

evident from the number of mokopuna Māori in the child welfare system. Whilst there may been some movement within recent mainstream social work practice used in Aotearoa New Zealand; namely strengths- and evidence-based; child-centred and family-led and culturally responsive (Connolly & Smith, 2009), it may be the limited understanding of 'culturally responsive' practice and its application that has failed to shift the over-representation of Māori mokopuna in the system. Whilst there is an emphasis on evidence-based practice, effort and funding ought to be directed into evaluating Indigenous social work frameworks using Kaupapa Māori research methods (Bishop, 1996; Hollis-English, 2012; Walsh-Tapaiata, 2008). This next section will comment on the development and application of bi-cultural frameworks.

Bi-cultural frameworks

"The practice developments in Aotearoa New Zealand and the call to locate cultural understanding at the centre of practice are strongly connected to international trends where indigenous voices and visions are increasingly shaping the way that practice develops (Blackstock, 2007; Selby, 2007). There is an emerging openness to thinking about practice through an indigenous lens and this has not only impacted upon how social workers construct their practice but it has also shaped the larger policy frameworks within which social work is undertaken (Gray et al., 2008b). Central to these developments is the recognition that culture is complex and diverse and that responding fully to this requires an understanding of the relationship between context and practice" (Munford & Sanders, 2011, p. 64)

The expertise of tangata whenua and the frameworks that derive from traditional practices and worldviews have contributed to the growth of integrated practice frameworks. This has moved social work away from deficit approaches to a focus on positive development of communities and populations (Eketone, 2006). Te Whare Tapa Wha is a notable model (Durie, 1995) which has provided a holistic way of understanding health and wellbeing that has shaped practice and policy understanding across a broad base of social services (Sanders & Munford, 2011; Walsh-Tapiata, 2002). Before discussing the IBPF this review has looked at the literature on the implementation of co-constructed bi-cultural frameworks within other Indigenous and non-Indigenous social work practice locations.

In North America, a widespread consultation with welfare systems across thirteen jurisdictions (both state and non-state) was facilitated by the Casey Family Programs (see Millar, 2009 for full report). The aim was to reduce the number of children of colour within child welfare systems. The project came up with the following set of principles to effectively meet obligations for children and families at risk of experiencing disproportionality and disparate outcomes. These basic principles guided all policies, programs, practices, services, and supports: clear agency mission with respect to racial equity and bias; family-centred and culturally responsive; minimum level of intrusion; strengths-based framework; continuity of family and community

connections; open dialogue about race and racism; continuous assessment of policies and practices; advocacy for optimal resource alignment; cross-systems leadership and collaboration and community partnerships.

These principles were then translated into practice through seven component areas of a child welfare agency's work. A belief driving the project was that optimal improvements in the overall system of working with and supporting children and families who are involved with the child welfare system would occur when improvements in each of the following seven individual components were achieved:

1. Design agency mission, vision, values, policies, and protocols that support anti-racist practice.
2. Develop cross-systems leadership to address issues related to disproportionality and disparity in outcomes for children and families of colour in the child welfare system.
3. Collaborate with key stakeholders to support families in the context of their communities and tribes so as to safely divert them away from the child welfare system, whenever possible.
4. Create partnership between agency and community about child maltreatment, disproportionality, racism, and culture to focus on how communities can develop strategies to build the protective capacity of neighbourhoods, tribes, and families.
5. Train and educate agency staff and stakeholders about institutional and structural racism and its impact on decision making, policy, and practice.
6. Use cultural values, beliefs, and practices of families, communities, and tribes to shape family assessment, case planning, case service design, and the case decision-making process.
7. Develop and use data in partnership with families, communities, universities, staff, courts, and other stakeholders to assess agency success at key decision points in addressing disproportionality and disparate outcomes for children of colour in the child welfare system (Millar, 2009).

The consultation included agency and community leaders, workers and people who were receiving services from these agencies. As participating jurisdictions continued to develop these strategies, several themes emerged from their work efforts and reflections: centrality of culture, language, and values in practice; engagement of maternal and paternal relatives; centrality of extended family and support network; equitable and timely access to services and opportunities; interagency and between-systems accountability and transparency; effective community-based service providers and educational enrichment resources. Millar (2009) reported:

> *Participants … insisted that their ongoing investment in more deeply understanding the impact of structural racism and institutional bias was very much a part of their 'real system transformation work'. … Inherent in this experience …was a fundamental tension…a fundamental aspect of any*

meaningful attempt at reducing racial disproportionality and disparate outcomes must include a deliberate and thoughtful examination of both race and culture, and their impact on the individuals involved with this work, including professionals, families, and communities… understanding the complexity of these dynamics allows individuals to engage in self-reflection and thus a more critical and reflective child welfare practice… engaging in this critical and challenging process with their peers allowed participants to conceptualize a different and more culturally responsive way of working with and supporting children and their families (p. 45).

Ferris, Simard, Simard and Ramdatt (2005) report similar processes and outcomes (see Weechi-it-te-win Family Services: Utilizing a decentralized model of provision of bi-cultural services). Weechi-it-te-win Family Services is a community-oriented, community-based, Native staffed child and family service agency. Weechi-it-te-win serves 10 area First Nations communities located in the Rainy Lake District of Ontario. The agency was created out of the collective wisdom of the 10 Chiefs of the Rainy Lake Tribal Council. Its purpose was to assist and challenge mainstream child welfare agencies practice within the 10 First Nations communities and to give their people choices of traditional and/or mainstream support. Weechi-it-te-win's fundamental purpose is to revitalise the *Pimatiziwin* (good-life, wellbeing) of the communities served.

Operating under the mandate of the Chiefs, Weechi-it-te-win provides bi-cultural child protection and family support services. It uses a decentralised model of governance and management and emphasises personal and family healing as well as community capacity building. Their service provision and their development included a number of jurisdictions and has a similar structure to Child, Youth and Family and Iwi Social Services.

Many iwi Māori have developed Memorandums of Understanding with Child, Youth and Family in regard to the care and placement of their mokopuna Māori, to build on the impetus of keeping mokopuna within their culture and assisting whānau to re-connect to their whānau networks and culture, and acknowledging the importance of this for mokopuna wellbeing. Knowledge from community (whānau, hapu and iwi, non-government social service providers, etc) consultations that document experiences of Māori and their interactions with the welfare systems is an important source of information for policy makers, funding sources and practitioners. It highlights how services need to be developed and delivered in ways that are culturally respectful and safe (Walsh-Tapaiata, 2008). The government Whānau Ora initiative has gone some way to gaining this knowledge and to facilitating service providers in providing better services to their own communities in their own self-determining ways (see Te Puni Kokiri, June 2013):

"Gathering whānau stories using a whānau-centred research approach is an information source that enables whānau to directly contribute information,

insigths and solutions to the continued development of evidence-based whānau-centred initiatives and service provision towards whānau ora" (Eruera, Tukukino, King, Dobbs, & Maoate-Davis, 2013, p. 12).

In Australia, Bennett, Zubrzycki and Bacon (2011) interviewed Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal social workers who are experienced and well-regarded by Aboriginal communities. The key questions asked were: How do Aboriginal social workers work with Aboriginal people and communities? How do non-Aboriginal social workers work with Aboriginal people and communities? And what do both groups of workers recognise as being culturally sensitive and appropriate social work practice? These interviews provided insights into what sustains these workers and how they integrate a range of knowledge, values, and skills in their work. The research findings suggest that experienced Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal social workers prioritise the development of relationships with their Aboriginal clients and communities, which were characterised by reciprocity, the integration and valuing of Aboriginal and western worldviews, and the application of micro skills such as deep listening and stillness. From this they developed a practice framework that is applicable to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal social workers who want to work alongside Aboriginal people across a range of practice contexts (see Bennett, Zubrzycki & Bacon, 2011 for the full study).

At the heart of this framework is *"cultural respectful relationships and cultural courage"* (p. 33), with four key components: journey of self, knowledge, values and skills. Bennett et al. (2011) contend that through the *"development and maintenance of culturally respectful relationships social workers are able to undertake meaningful work with Aboriginal people. Deep, humble listening creates an opening for information sharing, collaborative knowledge development, and honest communication"* (p. 34). They suggest that social workers need to earn trust and respect with the community, which takes time due to the history and ongoing practices of colonisation. They describe cultural courage as *"the process whereby the worker recognises that the destination is the being with, not the doing to"* and for non-Aboriginal workers this means having an ability to understand how their own cultural background, privilege, values, and assumptions impact on how they relate to people. For Indigenous workers, developing cultural courage involves the need to reflect on their own experiences of racism and history of colonisation and how this impacts on their work (Zubrzycki & Bennett, 2006). They conclude that these workers need support from colleagues and managers, so that they have the capacity to work with complex identities, roles, and boundary issues that influence and impact on their practice (Bennet et al., 2011). Internationally, it is recognised that where local culture is used as a primary source for knowledge and practice development, social work practice can become culturally appropriate, relevant and authentic (Gray, Coates & Yellow Bird, 2008).

The CYF Indigenous and Bi-cultural Principled (Strategic and Practice) Framework (IBPF) for working with Māori

This section starts with a summary of the development and overview of this framework, including its four strategic goals, the three key overarching principles and then a description of each of the eight principles/cultural imperatives for application.

A high proportion of the whānau Child, Youth and Family (CYF) work with are Māori and CYF is committed to improving its responsiveness. An indigenous and bi-cultural framework provides foundation principles to guide practice in all CYF activities with Māori (Eruera & Ruwhiu, 2013). Munford and Sanders (2011) contend that within the Aotearoa New Zealand context, working with Māori cultural processes to identify the ways in which they contribute to and strengthen mainstream practice has created more effective approaches to providing family and whānau support.

> *The bicultural approach which combines the knowledge and practice that both Māori and tauiwi bring to the helping relationship allows workers to develop culturally sensitive and responsive practice. A key for practitioners in seeking to create 'change-ful-environments' is being able to work with culturally embedded narratives and to understand how these can be harnessed in the helping relationship* (p.74)*.*

CYF's commitment to progressing responsiveness to Māori is foundational in the Mā Mātou Mā Tātou strategy as previously discussed. It highlights the obligations and responsibilities of all staff towards the development of quality tangata whenua (indigenous) and tauiwi (bi-cultural) principles, frameworks, policies, processes and practices for working with mokopuna and whānau Māori (Ereura & Ruwhiu, 2013). As part of progressing the responsiveness to Māori, Principal Advisors were appointed to the Chief Social Workers office to inform and develop progressing the Mā Mātou Mā Tātou strategy (see CYF Strategic Plan, 2012-2015 for full discussion). The four key strategic priorities were identified as.

1. Strengthen quality practice for working with Māori
2. Support the progress of relationships for working with Māori
3. Develop strategies to promote and advance leadership and innovation for working with Māori
4. Support the implementation of the Children's Action Plan to contribute to active participation, responsiveness and improved outcomes for Māori.

In order to ensure continued development of strong, sustainable and consistent CYF practices for working with Māori the key priority for the Principal Advisors Māori was to lead the co-construction of an Indigenous and Bi-cultural principled practice framework to guide Child, Youth & Family in all areas of work (internal document, 2013). Engagement and strengthening relationships both internally with staff at all levels and externally among stakeholders to obtain a shared vision, support and momentum is important to progressing the 'working with Māori strategies'.

There has been extensive participation in National CYF activities and forums with senior management, the National Office Māori Staff Reference Group, Te Potae Kohatu Māori (Māori leadership governance group), the Regional Directors and Operational Managers Forums, Regional Practice Advisors forum, Te Ngāhere Tautoko (Residences Māori Leadership Group) and ongoing relationships with the five regional teams. Residences and more than 45 sites have been visited to galvanise support from all staff towards a cultural change and paradigm shift in CYF responsiveness to working with Māori.

There has been a reinforcement of external sector relationships with key stakeholders; professional bodies, tertiary providers, government departments, service providers and others. To advance the development of the IBPF one-day regional hui have been held in five of the CYF regions with both tangata whenua and tauiwi staff. The main purpose of these hui was to gather practitioners' exemplars of how the principles of IBPF are applied to practice through statutory social work processes and through best practice examples, and to learn about barriers and resources required for implementation of the framework. The following questions were posed to enable Māori or Tauiwi stakeholders to contribute to the development of the framework: What are the core principles that guide your practice when working with Māori? When and how do you apply these principles into your work? How will we know they are effective? What outcomes you have achieved through use of these principles?

The recent CYF internal review on their practice (CYF, 2014) suggests that the principles of the Act that underpin and promote best practice for working with Māori are reinforced by the importance of four key aspects: maintaining and strengthening mokopuna and whānau connection with whakapapa was critical; promotion of active and inclusive whānau, hapu and iwi participation in decision-making processes for mokopuna challenged professional paternalism; the centricity of mokopuna participation in determining their future wellbeing was based on their voices being heard and acted on and, finally, consideration about undergoing timely culturally appropriate processes reflected obvious differences and challenges in case management when working with mokopuna and whānau Māori:

> "…*a multi-level strategic approach is required that strengthens both internal organisational systems and practices as well as CYF external working relationships to incorporate the strengths and potential within Iwi and Māori communities, the social services sector and multi-agency obligations to mokopuna and whānau Māori. To consolidate CYF effective, sustainable strategies, the plan must be: underpinned by the principles of the Act, embedded through organisational policy and systemically reinforced through the operating model, supported as a targeted investment priority and implemented through culturally-relevant practices. These strategies are highlighted by the following priorities. The development of an indigenous and bi-cultural CYF principled practice framework will underpin all of the working*

with Māori strategies, both organisational and practice. From this foundation a range of activities will be systemically embedded into organisational policies, processes and then implemented into practice. At a philosophical level the principles will ensure that Māori values guide and contribute to the thinking about CYF core work, for example tangata whenua perspectives on mokopuna safety, wellbeing and child rearing. (Principal Advisors Māori, internal document, 2014).

Overarching principles of the framework

Conceptualising the statutory social work role for working with Māori has been underpinned by three significant principles: **Tiaki Mokopuna** – the roles, responsibilities and obligations to make safe, care for, support and protect our children/young people within healthy families and whānau, from all forms of abuse (Eruera, King & Ruwhiu, 2006). Taiki Mokopuna integrates four functions described as key to the care and upbringing of mokopuna Māori: the significance of whakapapa; children belong to whānau, hapu and iwi; rights and responsibilities for raising children are shared and children have rights and responsibilities (Pitama, Ririnui & Mikaere, 2002). **Mana ahua ake o te mokopuna** – the potentiality and absolute uniqueness (inherent and developed) of our children/young people (Barlow, 1995; Pere, 1988). **Te Ahureitanga –** the distinctiveness of being Māori. Reclaiming Māori worldviews that are valid, legitimate, self-determining and diverse (Mead, 2003; Paniora, 2008; Ruwhiu, 2013; Ruwhiu, 2009). This reemphasises the importance of finding solutions locally and accepting the strength of diversity in those findings.

A CYF indigenous and bi-cultural principled practice framework has been deemed important because it will:

- Provide foundational principles for working with Māori (tangata whenua)
- Acknowledge the importance of both tangata whenua and tauiwi approaches for working with Māori
- Support tauiwi with their obligations and contribution to working with Māori using bi-cultural approaches
- Recognise and enable rohe (regional) distinctiveness and diversity in practice
- Highlight the contribution of the statutory social work role toward 'tiaki mokopuna'
- Support capacity, capability and resource development for CYF to work with mokopuna and whānau Māori
- Assist with and strengthen meaningful relationships with Manawhenua and Māori communities
- Improve outcomes for mokopuna and whānau Māori engaged in our service.

(CYF Information Sheets, 2013)

The eight practice principles

The eight kaupapa Māori practice principles that are being used for the IBPF have been identified from working internally with Te Potae Kohatu Māori (CYF National Māori Leadership Governance Group), and nationally with the 11 regional kaimahi Māori rōpū (a total of more than 700 Māori CYF staff) through wananga to identify what kaupapa Māori principles they use in their statutory social work with mokopuna and whānau Māori.

These eight principles have been adopted: *te reo Māori, whakamanawa, whakapapa, kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga, tikanga, rangatiratanga, wairuatanga.* There has been external consultation with kuia and kaumatua, elders and their cultural expertise will help to deepen the conceptual understandings in CYF.

This section outlines some of the 'meanings' embedded in these principles within a social work practice context. The 'meanings' of these principles have been sourced from personal communications, national literature and from practitioners. The author acknowledges – *ma te tuakana ka totika te teina, ma te teina ka totika te tuakana. It is through the older siblings that the younger ones learn the right way to do things and it is through the younger siblings that older ones learn to be tolerant* – she is the younger sibling, therefore, these are her understandings of the principles − of which there are many and all are interconnected.

These concepts are difficult to translate into English and have many different layers of meaning hence any explanations are incomplete (Ekatone & Walker, 2013). The understandings of **whakapapa** and **tikanga** have been discussed in previous sections, including their inter-connectedness to the remaining principles discussed below.

Te Reo

Central to engaging with Māori is the ability to increase the use of the Māori language appropriately and respectfully throughout all engagements with mokopuna and whānau. The power of language to inform, describe and construct behaviour is implicit in all cultures. Te reo is considered a crucial kaitiaki (carer) of Māori thinking and how it fashions and energises behaviour. It initiates entry-points to deeper readings of Māori positions for, *'Man cannot tune in so to speak when he is incapable of responding to the vibrations of the language'* (cited in Sorrenson, 1986). It signals that while, *'language is the mediating force of knowledge; it is also knowledge itself'* (Spring, 1975, p. 62). This is the 'potentiated' power within language, activating cultural obligations, images and passions within its members (Pohatu, 2003). These vibrations "emphasise the dynamic inter-relationships between language, thinking, behaviour and lived reality of Māori, crucial elements for cultural reproduction" (Pohatu, 2003).

Nepe (1991) acknowledged Māori language is *'a living medium of communication, a vital strand in the transmission of Kaupapa Māori knowledge'* (1991, p. 55). Pihama

describes te reo me ōna tīkanga as a central element of Kaupapa Māori theory. She says that the *positioning of te reo me ōna tīkanga as central in Kaupapa Māori theory is not simply a theoretical statement but it is a part of the lived realities of many Māori people* (2001, p. 115, cited in Hollis-English, 2012).

This element is derived out of the importance of understanding the role they play as everyday aspects of the lives of Māori people and not just a theoretical statement. This element developed through an acknowledgement of the language loss Māori experienced within the education system of the 1800s and 1900s and a commitment by many Māori families to support their fluent speakers and commit to the development and involvement in Kura Kaupapa Māori. From Pihama's views, Kaupapa Māori theory encourages the use and understanding of te reo Māori and tīkanga Māori for the benefit of Māori whānau and community development:

> "…*each phrase within te reo is then considered kaitiaki of a unique body of knowledge...this reinforces the cultural intent and purpose of Te Ao Māori. Te reo Māori holds definitions, explanations, and angles to encourage reflective interpretation and for use in our activities. The ongoing requirement is to develop understandings of the connections that exist between Māori phrases, their bodies of knowledge, thinking and how they undertake their commitment to and with one another…these can support a vigorous, cultural enquiry and representation of any kaupapa, their sets of relationships with their behaviours. Multiple choices for Māori may then be yielded as we engage in and define the state of our relationships*" (Pohatu, 2003, p. 3).

Within its use and application in social work practice practitioners give these examples: *"I can get to the hard stuff in a respectful manner by using te reo…couldn't do that with English…some words and meanings you just can't translate…whānau know you are being respectful when you use te reo…like you know what it's like"* (personal communication Māori Social worker in Schools, 2015). For those social workers (both Māori and non-Māori) who are not fluent in te reo, having some understanding of its importance has shown to enhance their practice: *"…only know a few words but see the opening up of whānau…especially at whānau hui…older members…"* (*personal* communication Iwi Māori Community worker, 2015). *"I'm not Māori but work with Māori whānau…and have lived here all my life so have some understanding of te reo…and protocols…try and use these…sure that helps me to engage better…be accepted, they know my whānau anyway"* (personal communication non-Māori social worker).

The use of te reo acknowledges respect and cultural identity and actively promotes tikanga practices in all activities. It has been articulated on many occasions that the window to a culture is through its language (Eruera & Ruwhiu, 2013). For mokopuna Māori this window needs to be supported to be kept open:

> *"Kei roto i tō tātou reo tētahi rongoā. Kei te āhua o te reo, kei te wairua o te reo. Mā tō tātou reo e mirimiri te wairua me te hinengaro. There is healing within our*

language. It is in the way we speak and the spirit in which it is spoken. Let us use our language to massage our spirit, our soul and our emotions" (Milne, 2001).

Whakamanawa

This principle needs to be broken down into three inter-linked concepts: 'Whaka' means to cause something to happen − to change and effect change. When joined with 'Mana' it is about fully understanding the true potential of a person by encouraging the 'strengthening of their own prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, self-esteem, spiritual power, and charisma' and together with 'Wa', the challenge is that these changes can be done in time, in season or in other words, in a definite space. 'Whakamanawa' highlights concepts like encouragement, inspiring and instilling confidence to achieve and freedom. This bears great significance in dealing with mokopuna Māori and should be paramount in our consideration of mokopuna ora and whānau ora (CYF, Assessment gateway access online, 15/05/2015).

In discussions with social workers about their understanding of this principle it was considered as a 'strengths-based principle' in that social workers believed their job was to facilitate change within whānau by providing tools (connection to whakapapa, te reo, identity) to challenge and change behaviour with respectful support. *"Like many of our whānau know what they should be doing…they need to awhi to do it…they know…just not on their own…help them see a different light"* (personal communication, Māori social worker, 2015) and *"Man this is a difficult one…our kids get trodden down at school…at home… don't go to the Marae…on the phones all the time…we need to lift them up…make them feel okay about being Māori…and their bloody parents…less problems then*" (personal communication, Māori community worker, 2015). The use of whakamanawa (encouragement) and manaakitanga (caring and compassion) Durie and Hermansson (1990) state that, *"it is not so much trying to get people to talk about how they are feeling, but making sure they are actively looked after when they are distressed"* (p. 114).The principle of Whakamanawa needs to be applied at an organisational level to reinforce the value and the rights of Māori and to assist in the decolonisation of social work practice.

> *"Articulating world-views as categorised through layers of possibilities fashioned by Māori thought is central to the process of re-launching Māoritanga into every engagement that we are part of. In this way, Māori deliberately participate in the decolonising process, enabling us to maintain clarity of our cultural resolve and contract. In this way, the line from a traditional karakia assumes a central consequence in the guiding and encouraging of Māori today, 'Whiwhia ou ngakau, ou mahara, kia puta ki te whaiao ki te ao marama' – your hearts and minds (passions and intellect) can receive strength and direction to fulfil your purpose (enlightenment)"* (Pohatu, 2003, p. 14).

Kaitiakitanga

This principle highlights the roles people take on board to enact guardianship, stewardship and trusteeship of things entrusted into their care. The focus of statutory social workers is about understanding fully the importance of 'trust' in such a role. The Act highlights that kai-tiaki-tanga role is built on being caretakers of, protectors of, sentinels of best indigenous and bicultural practice and engagement with mokopuna and whānau Māori (CYF, internal document, 2013). The role of kaitiakitanga − "*to facilitate transformation through kaitiakitanga*" is interpreted as: Kai facilitate a pathway to understanding; Tiaki nurturing, caretaker role, guardianship and Tanga action, role modelling (Iwikau, 2011). Kaitiakitanga is an example of the potential within Te Ao Māori. It is an essential element of 'Māori Cultural Order' and with reflection, a crucial tenet of good social work practice. At its most basic yet most profound level, kaitiakitanga is about fulfilling the vital obligation for 'taking care of'. Placing kaitiakitanga obligations within Te Ao Māori requirements of safe space, respectful relationships, absolute integrity and wellbeing which lays out the environment upon which taking care of can be constantly assessed (Pohatu, 2003).

Kaitiakitanga is also about building and looking after relationships and can support practitioners with understanding relationships and wellbeing when interacting with Māori. Pōhatu (2005) advances the argument that cultural underpinnings of whenua and whakapapa are imperative to ensure cultural transmission and acquisition. Āta has also been described as a key element of ngā take pū (principles) and is seen as a behavioural and theoretical strategy for building and maintaining relationships.

> "*This principle is particularly relevant to the analysis of Māori social work practice and experiences as it helps to understand how these domains function and interconnect, [and] suggest cultural approaches of how they may be safely navigated*" (Pōhatu, 2005, p. 2).

Williams and Cram (2012), when discussing the environment, have defined Kaitiakitanga as the practice of spiritual and physical guardianship based on tikanga. The root word is 'tiaki' which includes aspects of guardianship, custodial responsibilities, stewardship, care, and wise management. They suggest that Kaitiakitanga is an 'active' rather than 'passive' guardianship or custodianship and it confers obligations rather than a right to make decisions, and places obligations to make wise decisions:

> "*The role of kaitiaki in the decision-making process was often given to tohunga who, in conjunction with rangatira from various whānau groups and tribal rūnanga, who would prescribe tapu and ritenga. Kaitiakitanga is inextricably linked to tino rangatiratanga. The principles and practices created that meet the goal of mauri maintenance are called tikanga. These principles were created on recognition of the four planes of reality: te taha tinana, te taha hinengaro, te taha wairua, and te taha whānaungatanga*" (p. 10).

Kamira (2003) makes an important observation of this principle when discussing Māori data collected and its uses and contends that Kaitiakitanga, (and the person or group who performs the kaitiakitanga role – Kaitiaki), implies guardianship, protection, care and vigilance of data about Māori that is collected, stored and accessed. It introduces the idea of an inter-generational responsibility and obligation to protect and enable the use of mechanisms such as tapu and rahui (Kamira, 2003). She adds that it is important that members of governance or kaitiaki groups have an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities within which kaitiakitanga perspectives are grounded.

Iwikau (2011) proposes that kaitiakitanga is about the quality of relationships, the engagement and level of engagement within these relationships and how she interprets, analyses and defines her personal role within kaitiakitanga: the knowledge which is selected to learn from, the environment chosen to learn in and the people that are engaged with in her learning. "*What I did not realise at this point was how kaitiakitanga was the key to transform my learning and pathway*" (p. 26).

Every time any element of kaitiakitanga is included into any kaupapa, the kaupapa and its energies, 'invite in' the energies of those elements. Here is the 'ka hao te rangatahi' intent revisited. It proposes that reflective methods are crucial to the successful co-option of Māori cultural capital and in this instance, elements of kaitiakitanga.

> "*This reflectiveness implicit in the 'hao' notion (to aspire and have aspirations in this context) also requires the undertaking of intentionally trawling for options that can be remade to more precisely respond to obligations and issues faced. Unless this happens, the transformative and ethical possibilities within kaitiakitanga will always remain in our individual 'margins'. Until there is a conscious willingness to utilise kaitiakitanga in our daily reality, its depths too will always remain, 'over there' in social work application, in this context*" (Pohatu, 2003, p 15).

Manaakitanga

The emphasis of **manaakitanga** is on understanding that as the person displays acts of support, care, hospitality and protection to others, reciprocity comes in the form of collaborative mutually beneficial human interactive engagements. The concept, 'aki' is used to emphasise action that urges people on, encourages and induces them to manifest actions/acts of kindness and hospitality. As mentioned previously, 'Tanga' reflects the collectivity and some have referred to this as indigeneity. In essence, when attached to Mana-aki, it acknowledges that these acts of kindness and hospitality are deeply engrained in our psyche. When involved in huge debates, conflict, difficulty, trauma, the conceptual principle of manaakitanga can help in moving through the associated tapu of an issue or situation to noa and vice versa (see Tate, 2010 for an explanation of tapu and noa in this context).

Social work practitioners need to be supported with resources and policies to enact real manaakitanga with mokopuna and whānau Māori as aspects of mokopuna safety and healing are advanced (internal document, 2013). Within the social work context manaakitanga provides caring for and providing service to enhance the mana of others.

Munford and Sanders (2011) contend that manaakitanga tells us to pause, to reflect and to make sure that when we are engaging with others that it is done in a respectful and careful way, honouring what parties bring, even in times of tension. *"When manaakitanga is part of the kaupapa it ensures that people are welcomed and given a safe place to stand"* (p.73), enhancing their mana. They give examples of demonstrating care by saying manaakitanga ensures that practical things like providing food sit alongside the working relationship. The process of sharing food and the time that is devoted to this demonstrates care and concern.

When whānau come into an agency that has incorporated manaakitanga into their practices they are more likely to feel a sense of belonging and recognition, and less likely to feel defensive and alienated (Munford & Sanders, 2011). Because it is inclusive and respectful, manaakitanga contributes to the creation of a positive stage upon which the intervention can unfold:

> "*Manaakitanga is about enacting our responsibility as providers of care and support in tangible ways that actively demonstrate the nature of the support partnerships we want to create with families; caring for the whole person is a critical part of this and attending to hospitality is a simple way of demonstrating this*" (p. 74).

They explain that because it is inclusive and respectful, manaakitanga is about enacting our responsibility as providers of care and support in tangible ways that actively demonstrate the nature of the support we want to create with families; caring for the whole person is a critical part of this and attending to hospitality is a simple way of demonstrating this.

Ruwhiu, 2009 suggests that:

> "*Māori social values are expressed in terms of collective action and responsibility (Patterson, 1992). Central value concepts identified by commentators (Metge, 1995; Metge & Durie-Hall, 1992) include aroha (love in the widest sense, sympathy/empathy); manaakitanga (hospitality, caring, sharing, and respect); awhinatanga (help and assistance to relieve and embrace); utu (reciprocity and balance in social relationships); and tiakitanga (guardianship and nurturance). Social values such as these suggest Māori enhance personal self-worth and social obligation through practices of giving within the collective context rather than in the personal accumulation of wealth*".

Understanding how manaakitanga is practised in diverse environments enables practitioners and agencies to develop strategies for promoting culturally responsive practice. The processes used to engage with others, to hear and respect their stories, and to find ways to work with our differences, provide a platform for practitioners to learn how to develop their own culturally sensitive practice. The processes used to assist us in finding more respectful ways to connect with whānau and to embrace the many ways of knowing, strengthens and enriches our social work knowledge and practice (Gray et al., 2008a, p. 267).

The social workers discussions concur with this. "…*need to feel not under the hammer…it's about how you would treat your own whānau…my whānau has problems too…the dad might have mucked up but…has to feel he has some good in him…no point won't get far without a bit of manaaki…we might get somewhere then…have a cup a tea and talk"* (personal communication, Māori social worker, 2015).

Manaakitanga can provide a framework for managing challenging relationships and encounters within social work practice. Kruger et al. (2004) add to this when discussing abuse within whānau by saying that it also encompasses use of tikanga. Tikanga takes time to re-establish where it has been misused. In the immediate response of the practitioner must be concern for the safety of the whānau, women and children. Tikanga should be the basis of safe practice. The use of tikanga does not mean glossing over the act of violence or abuse. It means confronting it and using cultural processes like manaakitanga (thoughtfulness, benevolence, and respect) and whānaungatanga to model functional ways of resolving the impacts of abuse on whakapapa.

Wairuatanga

Wairuatanga often manifests itself, or its degree of influence, through tikanga, cultural integrity, mātauranga Māori, and cultural sensitivity (Williams & Cram, 2012). Like the previous principles, 'Wairuatanga', is made up of three interrelated concepts. 'Wai' – water or life source is simple to explain. Water gives sustenance and much needed nourishment to all life forms, including people. 'Rua', translates numerically to the number two or second. Subsequently, a direct translation of wairua is the second water or second source of life. Often this second water source is referred to as our spiritual source or spirit. 'Tanga', magnifies the collective consciousness of being, feeling, thinking and acting Māori. When these concepts are combined into 'Wairuatanga', the definition encompasses Māori ideologies, Māori philosophies, Māori values and beliefs, Māori paradigms, Māori worldviews, Māori perspectives, Māori theoretical conceptualisations, Māori theories, frameworks and models of practice.

In this light, wairuatanga provides a cultural critique of Māori ways of viewing and making sense of the world we live in. Williams & Cram (2012) suggest *"What works in bi-cultural settings is for participants to recognise cultural authenticities in their own*

right and to allow the positive qualities of the human spirit to achieve reciprocity and a state of balance or 'ea'" (p.53).

Hollis (2006) explains, to Māori social and community practitioners of the importance of assessing wairuatanga, due in part to its ability to provide diagnostic understanding around such things as 'deprivation, tension, dependency and conflict'. Wairua describes the connection between the spiritual and physical dimensions.

> *"The spiritual and physical bodies were joined together as one by the 'mauri'; the manawa ora (or life essence which is imbued at birth) which gives warmth and energy to the body so that it is able to grow and develop to maturity"* (Barlow, 2008, p. 152).

Wairua is not easy to define as it is intangible and is often experienced as feelings. Wairua can sometimes be described in terms of the energy levels that a person projects, such as 'she has a nice wairua'. Wairua may be subject to damage through abuse, neglect, violence, drugs and rape (Mead, 2003). When considering the issues that may bring whānau to be talking with social workers it is important to acknowledge wairua and its importance in relationships and connections between people. It is also pivotal in the facilitation of healing processes (Eruera & Dobbs, 2010). Personal communications with social work practitioners support the difficulty in defining wairuatanga, and while agreeing with its importance within social work practice, social workers found it difficult to articulate what they did. One social worker said, *"like you can just feel that there is something not right…it's a feeling…suppose you just respond…I don't know…"*.

Rangatiratanga

Traditionally, **rangatiratanga** generally resided with the chief or Rangatira. However, Rangatiratanga also applied to the collective. It was as much a statement about collective rights to participate in decision making, as it was an assertion of the right of the Rangatira to make decisions on behalf of the iwi and/or hapū. Tino rangatiratanga is an expression of chiefly authority, inherent sovereignty, and legitimacy based on mana and tikanga, including the right to permit or deny others. It can also be used as a basis for self-determination at the iwi, hapū, whānau, or individual level.

Many people also equate tino rangatiratanga as having systems and processes in place to give control to planning an individual's or an organisation's destiny (Williams & Cram, 2012, p. 63). As a composition word, this principle also combines three other concepts: 'Ranga', 'Tira' and 'Tanga'. 'Ranga' is defined as raising something up, or setting something in motion and also infers sites of engagement and investigation. 'Tira' can mean ray or beam of light. Together the word 'Rangatira' gathers both definitions to provide insight around those who are esteemed noble, well off or revered by others. Tangata whenua leadership styles and approaches are also described here. Rangatira (both male and female) were viewed in chiefly state with qualities ranging from integrity, negotiation abilities, prosperity, to other skillfully acquired expertise,

knowledge and wisdom deemed of high value by whānau, hapū, and iwi Māori (CYF internal document, 2013).

Rangatiratanga as a noun includes descriptive words and definitions such as, sovereignty, chieftainship, the right to exercise authority, advance chiefly autonomy, and selfless service that reinvigorates whānau, hapū, iwi rights to self-determination and self-management. In addition, 'tino rangatiratanga' has also been referred to in modern times as advancing the attribute of 'absolute integrity' within one's sphere of influence as a leader of substance. For practitioners in the statutory environment, it is essential that they are aware and respectful of various levels and variety of leadership (iwi leadership) to those inherent in whānau and hapū. There are times where leadership is evidenced by being at the front, leading from behind, working with others collaboratively or being a figurehead, to name a few. Part of the process of identifying who are the leaders within a whānau often involves understanding the influence they have in evolving wellbeing of mokopuna and whānau Māori (CYF internal document, 2013).

Tino rangatiratanga is a recurring theme throughout studies of Puao-te-Ata-tu and the Treaty of Waitangi in Māori social work development (Hollis-English, 2012).

> *"A social worker has many roles within the realms of this framework, but the first and foremost principle is to take responsibility and allow the self-empowerment (tino rangatiratanga) of whānau, hapū, iwi by whānau, hapū and iwi"* (NZASW. 2006, p. 9).

In this regard, the tino rangatiratanga of whānau, hapū and iwi (families, sub-tribes and tribes) is the aim of Māori social workers, who use social work organisations as their template and ground their aims in the Treaty (Hollis-English, 2012). In a social work context rangatiratanga is achieved through ensuring that Māori live as Māori (Durie, 2003). Tino rangatiratanga is also relevant to social work practice in terms of practitioners enabling the rangatiratanga of whānau to develop, particularly in relation to various types of Māori whānau (Bradley, 1995).

Māori organisational theories are both underpinned by de-colonialism and by traditional notions of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination), manaakitanga (care for people), aroha (love, respect) and wairuatanga (spirituality) (Hollis-English, 2012):

> "*They are both reactive and pro-active in the sense that they have adapted to the colonial environment within Aotearoa /New Zealand. At the same time they have maintained many of the fundamental theories of traditional Māori society*" (p. 62).

> "*We are a resilient people, a proud people…We can assert and restore to ourselves our rangatiratanga (sovereignty)*" (Turia, in Selby, 2005, p. 109).

Within the application of these principles, 'cultural identity' of mokopuna needs to be considered further, that is, how mokopuna define themselves. Martin (2002) writes about overlapping identities for minority ethnic young people in Aotearoa that reflect mainstream, ethnic and sub-culture allegiances. For example, a Māori young person may speak English at home, attend a school which is total immersion Māori education and identify through a sub-culture with black American hip-hop music and culture. In this example Māori, English and African-American influences may lead to confusion in the development of a social identity and expectations for a Māori young person.

From her study about the cultural identity of rangatahi Māori, Borrell (2005) reminds us of the strengths and diversity that exists within this population. She suggests that services must recognise and respond to rangatahi to ensure that divisions are not created between those who are seen as 'culturally connected' and those who are not. Within her study many urban rangatahi aspired to have greater cultural connection but experience barriers to doing so. She says:

> *"Establishing a 'secure' Māori identity based solely on particular criteria of Māori culture (te rēo Māori, tikanga, marae, etc...) continues to be problematic for some Māori. Those who are not seen as connected in this way are often defined by what they are seen as lacking, hence terms such as disconnected, distance, detached and disassociated"* (p. 8).

Removing those barriers is an important role for child welfare services and more importantly for social work practitioners. This section has given some further explanation and ideas to and for the application of these principles within social work practice. The outcomes of the implementation of the IBPF has the potential to maintain and strengthen mokopuna and whānau connection with whakapapa by increasing competence, effectiveness and resourcing and to support whānau, hapu and Iwi placements. Supporting Iwi aspirations and the principles of the Act to have mokopuna reconnected may also promote and enable their early participation in CYF processes and ultimately support reducing the number of mokopuna Māori entering or staying in statutory care. Important to this is active and inclusive whānau, hapu and Iwi participation in decision making processes through increased use of Māori constructs such as whānau hui/hui a whānau. Effective cultural practices throughout the implementation of the Family Group Conference process will advance positive outcomes and improved experiences of CYF service by Māori. The centricity of mokopuna participation in determining their future wellbeing requires practitioners to have strong engagement and interpersonal skills for working with mokopuna. Not only should this enable practitioners to balance the tensions between child centred and whānau focused practice but more importantly the voices of mokopuna are clearly articulated (Eruera & Ruwhiu, 2014). Any research and evaluation of the implementation of this framework needs to include those of mokopuna. "Without their voices we will fail them" (Dobbs, 2005).

Summary

The kaupapa of the IBFP framework concurs with the national and international literature on addressing the over-representation of Indigenous children in the child welfare system. The co -construction of the bicultural social work framework methods utilised by CYF for the engagement, consultation and development of the IBPF is also supported within the national and international literature as shown above (Bennett, Zubrzycki & Bacon, 2010; Cram, 2012; Durie, 2011; Ekatone, 2006; Ekatone & Walker, 2013; Green & Baldry, 2008; Munford & Sanders, 2009; Ruwhiu, 2009, 2013; Ferris, Simard, Simard & Ramdatt ,2005; Hollis-English, 2012; Millar, 2009; Walsh-Tapaiata, 2008; Young et al., 2014). It is not surprising that these overarching principles and frameworks are similar to other indigenous peoples as Māori share similar histories of colonisation and also seek to regain self-determination and social work practice that reflects an Indigenous worldview of wellbeing.

Conclusion

"…the belief that transformation for whānau must be informed and sustained by whānau themselves. Furthermore, under the right conditions, support and resources, whānau have potential to effect their own positive change towards wellness…." (Moananui-Makirere, et al, 2014 p. 10)

The over-representation of Indigenous children and their families in the child welfare systems both nationally and internationally is alarming. The effects of colonisation, structural risks, systemic and racial bias within the state child welfare system have all contributed to this over-representation. The forced and unnecessary removal of children (Blackstock, 2008) has resulted in multi-generational trauma and the erosion of many indigenous cultures, land, language, customs and the practice of traditional safety factors for mokopuna. These historical conditions have had contemporary consequences. It is important for all jurisdictions to collect reliable administrative data to better plan and provide child welfare services that best fit the needs of their populations and context (Thorburn, 2007). It is also important for all jurisdictions to evaluate their policies and practices and work collaboratively to assist in the reduction of Indigenous over-representation. This cannot be done without Indigenous peoples and their communities.

There are a number of challenges for the child welfare system in addressing over-representation and disparate outcomes in a meaningful and impactful way. Indigenous people including Māori are and have been the motivators for change within the child welfare system. Legislative changes have assisted in this process, and there has been significant increase in the level of investment over time. Government has a role in supporting vulnerable whānau to care for their mokopuna, the challenge is how to do this more effectively. Effective contemporary frameworks for addressing Indigenous children's welfare and wellbeing are essential (Libesman, 2013).

The over-representation of Indigenous children within child welfare systems has been part of the reason for the emergence of Indigenous theoretical frameworks within social work practice, assisting in the 'decolonisation' of practice (through an Indigenous worldview of wellbeing) and promoting Indigenous self-determination. Recognition of human rights within child welfare frameworks can help to facilitate recognition and inclusion of Indigenous understandings in responses to Indigenous children and young people's welfare and wellbeing (Cram, 2015; Libesman, 2013; Millar, 2009; Staniforth, et al., 2011; Yellow Bird, 2013). The notion of self-determination, partnership and indigenous rights that underpin contemporary culturally-responsive social work practice in Aotearoa New Zealand can be traced back to the essence and spirit of the Treaty (Ruwhiu, 2009). Western/mainstream frameworks on their own have not been successful when working with whānau Māori.

Using co-constructed Indigenous and non-indigenous knowledge and frameworks within social services has the potential to mitigate the impacts of the past and ensure that tiaki mokopuna can be realised. In Aotearoa New Zealand, the co-construction of the proposed IBPF has ensured engagement and consultation with social work

practitioners, managers and national office staff, both Māori and non-Māori within CYF and more importantly with communities, whānau, hapu and iwi, and a broad range of social services providers, both statutory and non-statutory.

The kaupapa of the IBPF framework promotes the potential to maintain and strengthen mokopuna and whānau connection with whakapapa. It supportswhānau, hapu and iwi placements alongside iwi aspirations and the principles of the Act to see mokopuna reconnected. It helps enable their early participation in CYF processes and ultimately supports reducing the number of mokopuna Māori entering or staying in statutory care. Important to this mahi is the active participation of whānau, hapu and iwi in decision-making processes.

Many iwi are in the position to work with statutory social services to provide care and protection for mokopuna. However, funding needs to be provided to support iwi in doing this. Social work practitioners need support to jointly accomplish this. If the aim of a child protection intervention is to protect children and families long term, it must be undertaken within their meaning making frameworks (perspectives, theories and practice) which are grounded in their own pukeroro (real narratives from within) (Eruera, 2013; Walker, 2012).

Finally, it is important to note that the majority of Māori children and young people are not maltreated but are loved and nurtured (Te Puni Kokiri, 2010, cited in Dobbs & Eruera, 2014) within their whānau and are connected to their whakapapa.

References

Allan, J., Pease, B. & Briskman, L. (2003). *Critical Social Work: An introduction to theories and practices.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin Academic.

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers. (2006). *Te Komako: Social Work Review.* Christchurch: ANZASW.

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW). (2008). Code of Ethics. Christchurch: ANZASW.

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW). (2013). Code of Ethics. Auckland: ANZASW.

Banks, S. (2001). *Ethics and Values in Social Work.* Houndmills: Palgrave.

Barlow, C. (2005). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whānaungatanga.* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Blackstock, C. (2009). The occasional evil of angels: learning from the experiences of Aboriginal peoples and social work. *First Peoples Child and Family Review*, 4(1), 28–37.

Blackstock, C. (2008). *Reconciliation means not saying sorry twice: Lessons from child welfare in Canada. From truth to reconciliation: Transforming the legacy of residential schools*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Blackstock, C. (2007) The breath of life versus the embodiment of life: indigenous knowledge and western research, in *Indigenous Voices, Indigenous Visions*, pp. 67–79.

Blackstock, C. (2003). First Nations child and family services: Restoring peace and harmony in First Nations communities. In K. Kufeldt & B. McKenzie (Eds*.), Child Welfare: Connecting Research Policy and Practice (pp. 331–342)*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Blackstock, C., Trocmé, N., & Bennett, M. (2004). Child welfare response to Aboriginal and Caucasian children in Canada: A comparative analysis. *Violence Against Women*, 10(8), pp. 901–916.

Blackstock, C., &Trocmé, N. (2005). Community-based child welfare for Aboriginal children: Supporting resilience through structural change. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 24, pp. 12–33.

Blailock, A., Kiro, C., Belgrave, M., Low, W., Davenport, E., & Hassall, I. (2002). *When the invisible hand rocks the cradle: New Zealand children in a time of change*. Innocenti Working Papers, No. 93.

Bell, H. S. (2006*). Exiting the matrix: Colonisation, decolonisation and social work in Aotearoa: Voices of Ngati Raukawa ki te tonga kaimahi whānau* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University.

Bennett, B., Zubrzycki, J. & Bacon, V. (2011). What Do We Know? The Experiences of Social Workers Working Alongside Aboriginal People, *Australian Social Work*, 64(1), pp. 20–37.

Borell, B. (2005). Living in the City Ain't so Bad: Cultural identity for Young Māori in South Auckland, in J. H. M. Liu, T. McIntosh, & T.; Teaiwa (Eds.)*, New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations,* pp. 191–206. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Bowser, B. & Jones, T. (2004). Understanding the over representation of African Americans in the child welfare system: San Francisco.

Bradley, J. (1995). Before you tango with our whānau you better know what makes us tick: An indigenous approach to social work. *Te Komako: Social Work Review*, 7(1).

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, J. (2000). *Care and Protection is About Adult Behaviour.* The Ministerial Review of the Department of Child Youth and Family Services. Report to the Minister of Social Services and Employment, Hon Steve Maharey. Wellington.

Calma, T. (2008). *Social Justice Report 2007*. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. Sydney, NSW.

Cargo, T. (2008). *Māori experiences of delivering the Incredible Years parenting programme (Reflections).* Auckland: Werry Centre.

Carriere, J. (2005). Connectedness and Health for First Nation Adoptees. *Paediatrics and Child Health,* 10(9), pp. 545–548.

Chandler, M. J., & Lalonde, C. E. (1998). Cultural continuity as a hedge against suicide in Canada's First Nations. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 35(2), pp. 193–211.

Child, Youth and Family. (2006*). Children at increased risk of death from maltreatment and strategies for prevention.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development.

Child, Youth and Family, Strategic Plan, 2012- 2015. Accessed online 21 April 2015.

Child, Youth and Family. (2014). *Workload and Casework review: Qualitative review of social worker caseload, casework and workload management.* Office of the Chief Social Worker. Wellington.

Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No, 11. (2009). CRC/C/GC/11, para 11.

Connolly, M. (1999). *Effective participatory practice: family group conferencing in child protection.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Connolly, M. (2007). Practice frameworks: Conceptual maps to guide interventions in child welfare. *British Journal of Social Work*, 37, pp. 825–837.

Connolly, M. & Smith, R. (2010). Reforming child welfare: an integrated approach. *Child Welfare*, 89(3), pp. 9–31.

Connolly, M. & Harms, L. (2013). Social Work: Context and Practice, 3rd Edition, (Eds). Oxford Press.

Cooper, E., & Wharewera-Mika, J. (2009). *Māori child maltreatment: A literature review*. Auckland, New Zealand: TeKahui Mana Ririki.

Cooper, E., & Wharewera-Mika, J. (2011) Healing: Towards an understanding of Māori child maltreatment, In McIntosh, T. & Mulholland, M. (Eds.). *Māori and social issues* (pp. 169-187), Wellington: Huia.

Cram, F. (1997). Developing partnerships in research: Māori research and Pākehā researchers. *SITES*, 35, pp. 44–63.

Cram, F. (2001) Rangahau Māori: Tona Tika, Tona Pono. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand: Concepts, practice, critique.* Auckland: Longman. pp. 35–52.

Cram, F. (2012). *Safety of subsequent children—Māori children and Whānau. A review of selected literature.* Wellington, New Zealand: Families Commission.

Cram, F. (2014). Measuring whānau wellbeing: A commentary. *MAI Journal: A New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, 3(1), pp. 18–32.

Cram, F. (2006). Talking Ourselves Up. *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship.* Special supplement – Marginalisation, pp. 28–45.

Cram, F. & Pitama, S. (1997). *Evaluation of Māori Family Violence Programmes.* Comissioned by Te Puni Kōkiri, Wellington. Prepared in conjunction with the James Henare Māori Research Centre, University of Auckland.

Cram, F., Pihama, L., Jenkins, K. & Karehana, M. (2001*). Evaluation of Programmes for Māori Adult Protected Persons Under the Domestic Violence Act 1995*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

Cram, F., Gulliver, P., Ota, R., & Wilson, M. (2015). Understanding over-representation of Indigenous children in child welfare data: an application of the Drake risk and bias models. *Journal of Child Maltreatment*, Vol 20(3) pp. 170–182.

Cripps, K., & McGlade, H. (2008) Indigenous family violence and sexual abuse: Considering pathways forward. *Journal of Family Studies*, 14, pp. 240–253.

Daoud, N., Smylie, J., Urquia, M., Allan, B., & O'Campo, P. (2013). The contribution of socio-economic position to the excesses of violence and intimate partner violence among Aboriginal versus non-Aboriginal women in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 104, pp. 278–283.

Dell, C. & Lyons, T. (2007). *Harm Reduction Policies and Programs for Persons of Aboriginal Descent.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.

DeMaille, R. (1984). The sixth grandfather: Black Elk's teachings given to John G. Neihardt. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dettlaff, A. J. (2013). The evolving understanding of disproportionality and disparities in child welfare. In J. E. Korbin & R. D. Krugman (Eds.), *Handbook of child maltreatment* (pp. 149–168). New York, NY: Springer.

Dobbs, T. (2005). Insights: Children and Young People speak out about family discipline. Save the Children, New Zealand. Wyatt & Wilson: Christchurch.

Dobbs, T. (2015). Talking to children. Social Workers in Schools Training Manuel. Te Aupouri Social Services.

Dobbs, T. & Eruera, M. (2014*). Kaupapa Māori wellbeing framework: The basis for whānau violence prevention and intervention.* Auckland, New Zealand: New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, University of Auckland.

Dominelli, L., W. Lorenz & S. Halyuk (Eds.). (2001). *Beyond Racial Divides: Ethnicities in Social Work Practice.* Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

Drake, B., Jolley, J., Lanier, P., Fluke, J., Barth, R.& Johnson-Reid, M. (2011). Racial bias in child protection? A comparison of competing explanations using national data. *Pediatrics,* 127, pp. 471–478.

Duncan, G., & Worrall, J. (2000). Window on the world. Social policy and social work in New Zealand. *European Journal of Social Work*, 3(3), pp. 283–295.

Durie, M.H. (1994). *Whānau, family and the promotion of Health*. Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Durie, M. (1995) *Whaiora, Māori Health Development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiora Māori Health Development*, 2nd ed. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: the dynamics of Māori health.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā kāhui pou launching Māori futures*. Wellington, N.Z.: Huia.

Durie, M. (2012). Māori concepts of wellbeing: Intervening with Māori children, young people & families. Invercargill 20 July, Compass Seminars.

Durie, M. & Hermansson, G. (1990). Counselling Māori People in New Zealand [Aotearoa]. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling,* 13, pp. 107–118.

Durie, M. & Kingi, Te K. R. (1997) *A Framework for Measuring Māori Mental Health Outcomes. A report prepared for the Ministry of Health*, Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North. p 28.

Durie-Hall, D. & Metge, J. (1992). Kua tutu te puehu, kia mau: Maaori aspirations and family law, in M. Henaghan, & B. Atkin (Eds), *Family Law Policy in New Zealand.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Eckenrode, J., Powers, J., Doris, J., Munsch, J & Bolger, N. (1988). Substantiation of Child Abuse and Neglect Reports. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 56 (1), pp. 9–16.

Eketone, A. (2006) Tapuwae: a vehicle for community change, *Community Development Journal,* 41 (4), pp. 467–480.

Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of Kauapa Māori directed practice. *MAI Review*, 1. Target Review.

Eketone, A. & Walker, S. (2013). Kaupapa Social Work Research, in Mel Gray, John Coates, Michael Yellow Bird and Tiani Hetherington (Eds.), *Decolonizing Social Work*. London: Ashgate Publishing, pp. 259–70.

Ehrenreich, B. & English, D. (2005*). For her own good.* New York: Anchor.

Ermine, W. (2004). *The ethics of research involving indigenous peoples: Report of the Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre.* Regina: Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre.

Errico, S. (2007). The draft UN Declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples: An overview. *Human Rights Law Review*, 7(4), pp. 741–755.

Eruera, M. (2005). *He Korero Korari. Supervision for Māori: Weaving the past, into the present for the future* (Unpublished Master's dissertation). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Eruera, M. (2012). He korari, he kete, he korero. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 24, pp. 12–19.

Eruera, M., Dobbs, T., King, L., Maoate-Davis, S., & Tukukino, M. (2013). *Korero mai e te whānau.* Te Puni Kokiri, Wellington.

Eruera, M., King, L., & Ruwhiu, L. (2006). *Ko te tiaki a te mokopuna, Te tiaki o te whakakpapa, Hei oranga whānau: Whānau well-being assessment tool.* For New Zealand Child Youth and Family.

Ferris, P., Simard, E., Simard, G., & Ramdatt, J. (2005). *Promising practices in First Nations child welfare management and governance: Weechi-it-te-win Family Services: Utilizing a Decentralized Model in the Provision of Bi-Cultural Services.* First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada.

Fournier, S. & Crey, E. (1997). *Stolen from our embrace: the abduction of First Nation children and the restoration of Aboriginal communities.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Freeman, M. (1994). Time to stop hitting our children. *Childright*, 28, pp. 9-10

Fluke, J., Ying-Ying Yuan, et al. (2003). Disproportionate representation of race and ethnicity in child maltreatment: Investigation and victimization. *Children and Youth Services*, 25, pp. 359–374.

Fluke, J., Shusterman, G., Hollinshead, D., & Yuan, Y. T. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of repeated child abuse reporting and victimisation: multistate analysis of associated factors. *Child Maltreatment*, 13, pp. 76–88.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Auckland: Penguin Books.

Gray, M., Coates, J. & Hetherington, H. (2008a) Hearing indigenous and local voices in mainstream social work, in M. Gray, J. Coates & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *Indigenous Social Work around the World: Towards Culturally Relevant Education and Practice*, pp. 257–269. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing.

Gray, M., Coates, J. & Yellow Bird, M. (Eds.) (2008b). *Indigenous Social Work around the World: Towards Culturally Relevant Education and Practice.* Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing.

Gray, M., Coates, J. & Yellow Bird, M. (2008c). Introduction, in M. Gray, J. Coates & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *Indigenous Social Work around the World: Towards Culturally Relevant Education and Practice,* pp. 1–10. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing.

Gray, M., & Fook, J. (2004). The quest for a universal social work: Some issues and implications. *Social Work Education*, 23, pp. 625–644.

Grennell, D., & Cram, F. (2008). Evaluation of Amokura: An indigenous family violence prevention strategy. *MAI Review*, 2, Article 4.

Green, S. & Baldry, E. (2008). Building Indigenous Australian Social Work. *Australian Social Work*, 61(4), pp. 389–402.

Grier, E. (2005). Aboriginal children in limbo: A comment on R. vs R.T. *Saskatchewan Law Review,* 68, pp. 435–453.

Gilgen, M. (1991). *Te Roopu O Te Whānau Rangimarie O Taamaki Makaurau: A Maaori Model for Non-Violence.* A Thesis in Partial fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Psychology. University of Auckland.

Harris, F. (2007). *(Re)-constructing Māori children as achieving learners:* a thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Canterbury. Thesis (PhD), University of Canterbury.

Hassall, I. (1996b), Origin and Development of Family Group Conferences. In A. Hudson, G. Morris, G. Maxwell & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Family Group Conferences: Perspectives on Policy and Practice.* Annandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

Harvey, G. (Ed.). (2002). *Readings in indigenous religions.* London; New York: Continuum.

Health Select Committee. (2013). Health select committee inquiry into improving child health outcomes and preventing child abuse with a focus from pre-conception until 3 years of age. Wellington: New Zealand Parliament.

Henaghan, R. (1997). New Zealand and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: A lack of balance. In M. Freeman (Ed.), *Children's Rights: A comparative perspective,* Chapter 9, (pp. 165−196). England: Dartmouth Publishing Company.

Henare, M. (1988). Ngā Tikanga Me Ngā Ritengā o te Ao Māori: Standards and Foundations of Māori Society. Wellington.

Hetherington, T., Gray, M., Coates, J, & Yellow Bird, M. (2013), in Mel Gray, John Coates, Michael Yellow Bird and Tiani Hetherington (Eds), *Decolonizing Social Work.* Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing.

Hollis, A. (2006). *Puao-te-Ata-tu and Māori Social Work Methods.* Thesis in partial fulfilment of the MSW. Dunedin: Family and Community Studies, University of Otago.

Hollis-English, A. (2012). *Māori social workers: Experiences within social service organisations* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Dunedin: University of Otago.

Hollis-English, A. (2012). Puao-te-Ata-tu: Informing Māori social work since 1986. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 24(374), pp. 41–48.

Hunn, J.K. (1961). *Report on Department of Māori Affairs: with statistical supplement, 24 August 1960.* Wellington: Government Printer.

Jackson, M. (1988). *The Māori and the Criminal Justice System: A New Perspective: He Whaipaanga Hou.* Wellington, NZ: Department of Justice

Jackson, M. (1992). The Treaty and the world: the colonisation of Māori philosophy. In G. Oddie & R. Perrett (Eds.), *Justice, ethics and New Zealand Society*, pp. 1–10. Auckland, New Zealand, Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, K., & Harte, H. M. (2011). *Traditional Māori parenting: An historical review of literature of traditional Māori childrearing practices pre-European times.* Auckland, New Zealand: Te Kahui Mana Ririki.

Kamira, R. (2003). Te Mata o te Tai – the edge of the tide: rising capacity in information technology of Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand, *The Electronic Library*, 21 (5), pp. 465–475.

Keddell, E. (2007). Cultural identity and the Children, Young Peoples and their Families Act 1989: ideology, policy and practice. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 32, pp. 49–71.

Keenan, D. (1995). Puao-te-Ata-tu: A brief history and reflection. *Te Komako*: *Social Work Review*, 7(1), pp. 11–29.

Kingsley, J., Townsend, M., Henderson- Wilson, C., & Bolam, B. (2013). Developing an exploratory framework linking Australian Aboriginal Peoples' connection to country and concepts of wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,* 10, pp. 678–698.

Kimelman, Justice, E. (1982). *No quiet place. Review Committee on Indian and Metis Adoption and Placements.* Manitoba Community Services. Review Committee on Indian and Metis Adoption Placements.

King, P., Young-Hauser, A., Li, W., Rua, M., & Nikora L.W. (2012). Exploring the nature of intimate relationships: A Māori perspective. *The Australian Psychologist.* 24(1), pp. 86–95.

Koziol-McLain J., Rameka M., Giddings L., Fyfe E., Gardiner J. (2007). Partner violence prevalence among women attending a Māori health provider clinic. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(2), pp. 143–148.

Kruger, T., Pitman, M., Grennell D, McDonald, T., Mariu, D., Pomare, A., Mita, T., Maihi, M. & Lawson-Te Aho, K. (2004). Transforming whānau violence: A Conceptual Framework: An updated version of the report from the former Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence.

Lansdown, G. (1994). Children's rights. In B. Mayall (Ed.), *Children's Childhoods*: *Observed and Experienced*, Chapter 2, (pp. 33–44). London: Falmer Press.

Lawson-Te Aho, K. (1998). *A Review of Evidence: A Background Document to Support Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki: Strengthening Youth Wellbeing: New Zealand Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy.* Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development.

Lerner, G. (1987). *The creation of patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Libesman, T. (2013). *Decolonising Indigenous child welfare: comparative perspectives.* 1st edition, Routledge, Oxford and New York.

Love, C. (2002). Māori perspectives on collaboration and colonisation in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand child and family welfare policies and practices. In *Partnerships for children and families project*. Wilfred Laurier University, Ontario, Canada. Accessed online 27 May 2015.

McDonald, D. (1998*). Social Work in Aotearoa New Zealand: An Introduction*. Auckland: Addison Wesley Longman.

Māori Reference Group for the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. (2013). *Programme of action for addressing family violence: 2013–2018*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development.

Māori Reference Group for the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. (2013). *E Tu Whānau-ora: Programme of Action for Addressing Family Violence 2013-2018.* Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Māori Reference Group for the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. (2009). *E Tu Whānau-ora: Programme of Action for Addressing Family Violence 2008-2013.* Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Malezar, B., & Sim, C. (2002). *Issues for teacher preparation in Indigenous studies: benefits of teaching Indigenous Australian studies in a cross-cultural context.* Paper presented at the AARE Conference, 1-5 December. Australia.

Martin, J. (2002) Organizational Culture: Mapping the Terrain. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mason, K., Kirby, G. & Wray, R. (1992*). Review of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989: Report of the Ministerial Review Team to the Minister of Social Welfare.* Wellington: Department of Social Welfare.

Mataira, P. (2008). 'Sitting in the fire': An indigenous approach to masculinity and male violence: Māori men working with Māori men. *Te Komako, Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers, 20*(4).

Mead, S. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values.* Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whaanau in the modern world,* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Mikaere, A. (1995). *The balance destroyed: The consequences for Māori women of the colonisation of tikanga Māori.* Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Mikaere, A. (1999). Colonisation and the imposition of patriarchy: A Ngati Ruakawa women's perspective. *Te Ukaipo*, 1, pp. 34–49.

Milne, M. (2001). Nga Tikanga Totika mo te Oranga Hinengaro, Oranga Wairua. Best practice guidelines for Kaupapa Māori Mental Health services.

Millar, O. (2009). *Reducing racial disproportionality and disparate outcomes for children and families of color in the child welfare system. Breakthrough series collaborative.* Casey Family Programs. Series number: 004

Ministry of Social Development (2007). *The Scale and Nature of Family Violence in New Zealand: A Review and Evaluation of Knowledge.* Wellington.

Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Development of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao-te-Ata-tu (Daybreak).* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Development of Social Welfare.

Ministry of Health. (2002*). Family Violence Intervention Guidelines: Child and Partner Abuse.* Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Moananui-Makirere, J., King, L., Eruera, M., Tukukino, M. & Maoate-Davis, S. (2014). Te Ara Whakapikoranga. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, 26*(1), pp. 10–19.

Moyle, P. (2014). A model for research for Māori practitioners. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 26(1), pp. .29–38.

Munford, R. & Sanders, J. (2011). Embracing the diversity of practice: Indigenous knowledge and mainstream social work practice. *Journal of Social work Practice*, 25 (1), pp. 63–77.

Munford, R. & Nash, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Social Work in Action.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

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

Nash, M. (2001). Social work in Aotearoa New Zealand. Its origins and traditions. In M. Connolly (Ed), *Social Work in New Zealand. Contexts and practice*, pp. 32–43. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Nash, M. (2009). Histories of the social work profession. In M. Connolly & L. Harms (Eds). *Social Work. Contexts and Practice,* (2nd ed), pp. 363–377. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Smith, J., Dunn, A., Frerer, K., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Ataie, Y., Atkinson, L., & Lee, S.H. (2007). *Child welfare services reports for California*. Retrieved May 12 2015 from California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) (berkeley.edu)

Nepe, T. (1991). *E Hao E Tēnei Reanga Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna*, unpublished MA Thesis. Auckland: Auckland University.

New Zealand Government. (2012). *White paper for vulnerable children*. Wellington: New Zealand Government.

Nicholls, J. (1998). Taa Te Ao Māori – A Māori World View. He Tuhinga Aronui: *The Journal of Māori Writings.* 2(1), pp. 60–72.

O'Donoghue, K. (2003). *Restorying social work supervision*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Oliver, W.H. (1988). Social Policy in New Zealand: An historical overview, in the *Royal Commission on Social Policy*, 1, pp. 5–44.

Osterling, K.L., D'Andrade, A., & Austin, M. J. (2010). Understanding and addressing racial/ethnic disproportionality in the front end of the child welfare system. In M. J. Austin (Ed.), *Evidence for child welfare practice*, pp. 9–30. New York, NY: Routledge.

Patterson, J. (1992). *Exploring Māori Values*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Penehira, M., Green, A., Smith L.T & Aspin, C. (2014). Māori and Indigenous views on R & R: Resistance and resilience. *MAI Journal, 3*(2), pp. 96–110.

Pere, R.R. (1984). Te Oranga o te Whānau: The health of the family. In *Hui Whakaoranga: Māori health planning workshop proceedings,* Hoani Waititi Marae, Auckland, 19–22 March 1984. Wellington: Department of Health.

Pere, R. (1988). Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *Women and education in Āotearoa,* 1, pp. 6–19. Wellington: Port Nicholson Press.

Pere, R.T. (1991). *Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom, Ao Ako.* Global Learning, New Zealand.

Pihama, L. (2001). *Tīhei Mauri Ora: Honouring Our Voices. Mana Wahine as a Kaupapa Māori Theoretical Framework.* Auckland: University of Auckland.

Pihama, L., Cram, F. & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26, pp. 30–43.

Pihama, L., Jenkins, K., & Middleton, A. (2003). *Literature Review: Family Violence Prevention for Māori Research Report.* Auckland: University of Auckland.

Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, J. & Lee, J. (2004). A Literature Review on Kaupapa Māori and Māori Education Pedagogy, a report prepared for ITP New Zealand, International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education, Auckland.

Pitama, D., Ririnui, G., & Mikaere, A. (2002). *Guardianship, custody and access: Māori perspectives and experiences.* Wellington: Ministry of Justice & Department of Courts.

Pohatu, T.W. (2003). *Māori World-views: Source of Innovative Social Work Choices.* Retrieved online 23 April 2015.

Pohatu, T.W. (2005). *Āta: Growing respectful relationships.* Retrieved online 17 April 2015.

Rimene, C., Hassan, C. & Broughton, J. (1998). *Ukaipo. The place of nurturing: Māori women and childbirth.* Dunedin: University of Otago.

Robertson N. & Oulton H. (2008). *Sexual violence: raising the conversations, a literature review.* Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Rose, S. (2012). Gender violence: Using culture as a resource in the process of decolonisation. *Te Awatea Review: The Journal of Te Awatea Violence Research Centre, 10*(1 & 2), pp. 3−7.

Ross, R. (2006). *Returning to the Teaching: Exploring Aboriginal Justice.* Toronto, Canada: Penguin Books.

Ruwhiu, L.A. (1995). Home fires burn so brightly with theoretical flames. *Te Komako Social Work Review, 7*(1), pp. 21−24.

Ruwhiu, L. (1999). *Te puwaitanga o te ihi me te wehi. The politics of Māori social policy development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University.

Ruwhiu, L. (2001). Bicultural issues in Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work. In M. Connolly (Ed.), *New Zealand Social Work: Contexts and Practice.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Ruwhiu, P.T. & Ruwhiu, L. (2005). Ko te pae o te atua mai i nga whakaaro hohonu nei, hei oranga mo te ira tangata. In *Te Komako Social Work Review, 17*(2), pp. 4−19.

Ruwhiu, L. (2009). Indigenous issues in Aotearoa New Zealand. In M. Connolly, & L. Harms (Eds). *Social work contexts and practice,* 2nd Edition, pp. 107-120. Australia: Oxford University Press.

Ruwhiu, L. (2013). Making sense of Indigenous issues in Aotearoa New Zealand. In M. Connolly, & L. Harms (Eds). *Social Work: Contexts and Practice,* 3rd Edition, p. 135. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Ruwhiu, L., Ashby, W., Erueti, H., Halliday, A., Horne, H. & Paikea, P. (2009*). A Mana Tāne Echo of Hope: Dispelling the illusion of whānau violence − Taitokerau Tāne Māori speak out*: Amokura Family Violence Prevention Consortium.

Ruwhiu, L., & Eruera, M. (2013). Ngā karangaranga maha o te ngākau o ngā tūpuna. Tiaki Mokopuna. Ancestral heartfelt echoes of care for children. In *Indigenous Knowledges: Resurgence, Implementation and Collaboration*. Winnipeg: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Selby, R. (Ed.). (2005). *Walking the talk: A collection of Tariana's papers.* Otaki, N.Z.: Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa.

Selby, R. (2007) Editorial, in *Indigenous Voices, Indigenous Visions*, pp. 3–5.

Sinha, V., Trocmé,N., Fallon, B., MacLaurin, B., Fast, E., Thoms-Prokop, S. & Richard, K. (2011). *KiskisikAwasisak: Remember the children. Understanding the over-representation of First Nations children in the child welfare system*. Ontario, Canada: Assembly of First Nations.

Sinclair, R. (2002). *The neocolonialism of anti-oppressive Social Work: challenging the invisible paradox.* Unpublished paper.

Sinclair, R. (2004). Aboriginal social work education in Canada: decolonizing pedagogy for seventh generation. *First Peoples Child and Family Review, 1*(1), pp. 29−61

Sivell-Ferri, C. (1997). *The Four Circles of Hollow Water*. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of the Solicitor General:

Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit. (2014*). Effective parenting programmes: A review of parenting programmes for parents of vulnerable children.* Wellington, New Zealand: Families Commission.

Sorrenson, M. (1986). *Na To Hoa Aroha,* Volume One, Auckland University Press.

Spring, J. (1975). *A Primer of Libertarian Education*. Free Life Editions, New York.

Smith, A. (2005). *Conquest: Sexual violence and American Indian genocide.* Cambridge: South End Press.

Smith, A.B. (2000). Children's rights: An overview. In A.B. Smith, M. Gollop, K. Marshall, K. Nairn (Eds.), *Advocating for Children: International Perspectives on Children's Rights*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Smith, G.H. (1990). The Politics of Reforming Māori Education: The transforming potential of Kura Kaupapa Māori, in H. Lauder & C. Wylie (Eds.). *Towards Successful Schooling,* pp. 73−87. London: The Falmer Press.

Smith, G. (1997). The development of kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis. Unpublished PhD thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Smith, G. (2012). Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. Interview with Te Kawehau Hoskins and Alison Jones. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *47*(2), pp. 10-20.

Smith, L. (2008). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* New York: Palgrave.

Smith, L. (2006). Researching in the margins: issues for Māori researchers – A discussion paper. In C. Aspin (Ed.), *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship* (pp. 4–27). Auckland: University of Auckland.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* New York: Zed Books.

Spratt, T. (2008). Possible futures for social work with children and families in Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States. *Child Care in Practice, 14*(4), pp. 413–427.

Stanley, G. (2000), Cultural Dilemmas, Cultural Realities, *Social Work Now,* August. Child, Youth & Family Services.

Staniforth, B. (2010). Past, present and future perspectives on the role of counselling in social work in Aotearoa New Zealand. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Massy University, Auckland, New Zealand.

Staniforth, B., Fouche, C. & O'Brien, M. (2011). Still doing what we do: Defining social work in the 21st century. *Journal of Social Work, 11*(2), pp. 191–208.

Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 Census quick statistics about Māori*. Retrieved from www.stats.govt.nz.

Sullivan, R., & Charles, G. (2010). Disproportionate representation and First Nations child welfare in Canada. *Research to Practice Network*: Victoria: Canada.

Tan, N. & Dodds, I. (2002). (Eds.). *Social Work around the world*, Vol. 11. Berne: International Federation of Social Workers.

Tangaere, A. (1997). Māori human development learning theory. In P. Te Whaiti, A., McCarthy & M. Durie (Eds.). *Mai i rangiatea: Māori wellbeing and development*, pp. 46–59. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Tate, H. (1993). Unpublished paper titled presented to a Māori Community Workshop. The Dynamics of Whānaungatanga.

Tate, H. (2010). *Towards Some Foundations of a Systematic Māori Theology (He Tirohanga Anganui Ki Etahi Kaupapa Hohono Mo Te Whakapono Māori)*. PhD. Thesis, Melbourne College of Divinity, Melbourne, Australia.

Tait-Rolleston, W. & Pehi-Barlow, S. (2001). A Māori Social Work Construct, in: Dominelli, L., Lorenz, W., and Soydan, H. (Eds.): *Beyond Racial Divides: Ethnicities in Social Work*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing.

Thorburn, J. (2007). *Globalisation and child welfare: some lessons from a cross-national study of children in out-of-home care*. Norwich, UK: University of East Anglia, School of Social Work and Psychosocial Studies.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2010). *Arotake Tūkino Whānau: Literature review on family violence*. Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri (2013). Whānau Ora: Action Research/Pipiri/June: Accessed online 30 May 2015: www.tpk.nz/mi/in-focus/whānau ora/

Tidbury, C. (2009). The over-representation of indigenous children in the Australian child welfare system, *International Journal of Social Welfare, 18*(1), pp. 57−64.

Trocmé, N., MacLaurin, B., Fallon, B., Knoke, D., Pitman,L., & McCormack, M. (2006). *Mesnnmimk Wasatek: catching a drop of light: Understanding the over-representation of First Nations children in Canada's child welfare system: An analysis of the Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect* (CIS-2003). Ottawa: First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada.

Trocmé, N., Fallon, B., MacLaurin, B., & Shangreaux, C. (2005). The experience of First Nations children coming into contact with the child welfare system in Canada: The Canadian Incidence Study on reported child abuse and neglect. In *First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada*. In Wen:de: we are coming to the light of day, pp. 60–86. Ottawa: First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada.

Trocmé, N., Knoke, D., & Blackstock, C. (2004). Pathways to the over-representation of Aboriginal children in Canada's child welfare system, *Social Service Review*, (December), pp. 577–600.

Trocmé, N., MacLaurin, B., Fallon, B. Daciuk, J. Billingsley, D., Tourigny, M., Mayer, M., Wright, J., Barter, K., Burford, G., Hornick, J., Sullivan, R., & McKenzie, B. (2001). *Canadian incidence study of reported child abuse and neglect: final report*. Ottawa, ON: Health Canada.

Tsey, K. (2008). The control factor: a neglected social determinant of health. *The Lancet, 372* (9650). p. 1629.

UNICEF. (2013). Innocenti Digest No 11: Ensuring the rights of Indigenous children. Florence, Italy: Innocenti Research Centre and UNICEF.

Walsh-Tapiata, W. (2002) 'Editorial', *Te Komako, Social Work Review*, vol. xiv, no. 2, pp. 1–2.

Walsh-Tapiata, W. (2003). A model for Māori research: Te whakaeke i te ao rangahau o te Māori. In R. Munford & J. Sanders (Eds.) *Making a difference in families: Research that creates change, pp*. 55−73. Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without end* (Rev. ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Walker, S. (2012). The teaching of Māori social work practice and theory to a predominantly Pākehā audience. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, *24*(3&4), pp. 65−74.

Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Māori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *9*(4), pp. 331−344.

Webber-Dreardon. (1997). Mātua whakapai tou Marae, ka whakapai ai i te Marae o tangata: first set in order your own Marae before you clean another*. Te Komako: Social Work Review.* Christchurch, N.Z.: New Zealand Association of Social Workers.

Whiteside, M., Tsey, K., & Cadet-James, Y. (2011). A theoretical empowerment framework for transdisciplinary team building. *Australian Social Work, 64*(2). pp. 228−232.

Williams, L.R.T. & Cram, F. (2012). *What works for Māori. Synthesis of selected literature.* Wellington: Department of Corrections.

Wirihana, R. & Smith, C. (2014). Historical trauma, healing and well-being in Māori communities. *MAI Journal, 3*(3), pp. 97−210.

Wesley-Esquimaux, C.C., & Snowball, A. (2010). 'Viewing violence, mental illness and addiction through a wise practices 'lens'. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 8, pp. 390–407.

Woolley, S.L. (2009). The rights of indigenous children around the world—still far from a reality. *Archives of Diseases in Childhood*, 94, pp. 397–400.

Yellowbird, M. (2013). Preface: United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples through Indigenous Eyes, in Hetherington, T., Gray, M., Coates, J, & Yellow Bird, M. (2013). *Decolonizing Social Work*. Mel Gray, John Coates, Michael Yellow Bird and Tiani Hetherington (Eds.). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.

Young, S., McKenzie, M., Omre, C., Schjelderup, L. & Walker, S. (2014). What can we do to bring the sparkle back into this child's eyes? Child Rights/Community Development Principles: Key elements for a strengths based child protection practice. *Child Care in Practice,* 20, pp. 135–54.

Young, S., McKenzie, M., Omre, C., Schjelderup, L. & Walker, S. (2014). Practicing from theory: thinking and knowing to "do" child protection work. *Social Science*, 3, pp. 893−915.

Yuen, A. & White, C. (2007). *Conversations about gender, culture, violence and narrative practice.* Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Zubrzycki, J., & Bennett, B. (In collaboration with an Aboriginal reference group) (2006). Aboriginal. In E. Wing Hong Chui & J. Wilson (Eds.), *Best Practice in the Fields of Social Work and Human Services Australians,* pp. 192−210. Annandale, NSW: Federation.