

Decolonizing family violence in Aotearoa New Zealand

Michael Roguski

Family violence is an endemic social and health-related concern in Aotearoa New Zealand (hereafter Aotearoa), incurring immense health, social, personal, and economic costs to immediate victims, children, whānau (extended family), families, communities, and society.¹ In 2016 alone, New Zealand Police investigated 118,910 incidences of family violence in a country with a population of approximately five million people (Family Violence Clearing House, 2017). The 2019 New Zealand Family Violence Survey noted that 30.9 percent of women reported lifetime intimate partner physical or sexual violence closely followed by 29.9 percent of men. Further, lifetime prevalence rates for two or more acts of intimate partner physical or sexual violence were 33.0 percent for women, and 19.3 percent for men (Fanslow et al., 2022). Data from national crime victimization surveys highlight that an estimated 74% of interpersonal violence offences are not reported to the New Zealand Police (Ministry of Justice, 2022).

Despite significant under-reporting, family violence has continued to increase (Family Violence Clearinghouse, 2017). Within this context, there has been a growing appreciation of the need to better understand, critically evaluate, and better respond to family violence. Globally, the imposition of dominant Western family violence theoretical frameworks on Indigenous communities have consistently been identified as problematic (Chartrand & McKay, 2006; Cooper & Wharewera-Mika, 2011; Cripps, 2011; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2010; Wilson et al., 2019). Māori scholars have critiqued the imposition of these dominant frameworks and concur that Western analytical models and intervention approaches have been largely ineffective for Māori (Kruger et al., 2004; Robertson, 1999).

The most prevailing theoretical family violence frameworks have arisen from feminist socio-political movements (Ali & Naylor, 2013) and the predominance of feminist family violence frameworks has been critiqued as imposing dominant Anglo-American epistemologies, reflective of specific cultural, socio-political, economic, individualized, and gendered perspectives (Cooper, 2012; Kruger et al., 2004). Salient, within the context of Aotearoa, are concerns that such culturally derived frameworks stress individualism and express specific Eurocentric understandings of gender, gender roles, relationships, and well-being that differ considerably from the centrality of collective identities shared by Māori and Pacific peoples (Cooper, 2012; Kruger et al., 2004; Rankine et al., 2017; Rua, 2015).

A second critique has focused on criminal justice responses to family violence as opposed to a wider public health response (Family Violence Death Review Committee, 2022; Roguski & Edge, 2021). Criminal justice responses have been criticized for privileging crisis interventionist responses over primary prevention considerations, which are more likely to achieve a significant reduction in family violence (Hassall & Fanslow, 2006). Furthermore, such criminal justice orientations are denoted by an individualized focus (Ali & Naylor, 2013; Armenti & Babcock, 2016; Taumaunu, 2020) that has questionable effectiveness beyond crisis intervention, effectively pathologizes perpetrators as criminals, and is unlikely to support the restoration of well-being or balance within relationships and within whānau (Kruger et al., 2004).² In addition, the entrenchment of criminal justice orientations has resulted in stigmatizing self-directed help-seeking, effectively creating a barrier to accessing early intervention support in Aotearoa (Roguski & Gregory, 2014) and acting counter to the cultural importance of accountability within whānau, hapū, and tribal structures (Balzer et al., 1997; Kruger et al., 2004).

It is noteworthy, however, that the above critiques generally reflect a singular focus that fails to position family violence responsiveness within a socio-political context. The need for a socio-political critique of State³ responsiveness to family violence is evidenced by three key strategic documents, each of which acknowledges inefficiencies within extant family violence responsiveness. First, the Productivity Commission's⁴ 2015 inquiry into the effectiveness of social services in Aotearoa identified significant inadequacies within social service provision. These inadequacies were often aggravated by competitive funding models with stringent eligibility criteria: a focus on crisis intervention rather than prevention and a lack of holistic service provision. Within a context of centralized decision-making, the New Zealand Productivity Commission (2015) recommended increased use of devolution⁵ of the social services system, defining devolution as “[t]he transfer of substantial decision-making power and responsibility to autonomous or semi-autonomous organisations with separate governance” (p. xii). Concerning Māori, the New Zealand Productivity Commission (2015) recommended:

Creating opportunities for Māori groups to exercise mana whakahaere [power to manage, governance, authority] in delivering social services has the potential to both improve outcomes and lead to more effective exercise of rangatiratanga [self-determination]. More devolution of commissioning decisions to Māori would help create such opportunities”.
(p. 335)

A second recommendation stated,

In making decisions about whether and how to devolve the commissioning and delivery of social services for Māori, government should be open to opportunities for Māori to exercise mana whakahaere. This should be based on the Treaty of Waitangi principles of partnership, and active protection of Māori interests and of rangatiratanga.
(p. 335)

The next significant document is the Auditor-General's release of the outcome of an audit of the government's Joint Venture for Family Violence and Sexual Violence – a cross-agency⁶ collaboration making agency chief executives collectively responsible for improving how government agencies work together to reduce family and sexual violence. A primary criticism arising from the audit was how the agencies work with Māori, citing a lack of clarity surrounding what partnership means and how partnership works in practice (Office of the Auditor-General, June 2021). This is a significant finding as partnership remains unrealized

despite the New Zealand government, in 2017, agreeing to recommendations arising out of the Productivity Commission Inquiry (Government of New Zealand, 2017).

In December 2021, the New Zealand government launched a national sexual and family violence elimination strategy called *Te Aorerekura* (Joint Venture, 2021). This third document includes 40 actions that reinforce a “whole of government response” (Joint Venture, 2021, p. 2) and to varying degrees, references collaborative community relationships, inclusive of Māori. What is evident, however, is that the Strategy privileges the authority and pre-eminence of government ‘leading’ responses to family and sexual violence. Such pre-eminence is evidenced by government agencies being held responsible for the various actions, coupled with a smattering of paternalistic references to devolution of decision-making and funding to local communities. In this sense, devolution is reflective of an authoritative relationship whereby the status quo of State control is maintained. For example, the Joint Venture (2021) states that:

[A high-trust, collaborative and respectful relationship] requires government to devolve **some** [emphasis added] decisions and funding to communities while retaining clear responsibility for improving what government is accountable for delivering.

(p. 17)

That the Strategy reflects a continued colonial legacy is further evidenced by the national implementation of *Te Tokotoru*, an ecological model of prevention and well-being that the Strategy has adopted as a means of enhancing interagency primary prevention collaboration (Hagen et al., 2021). The unilateral adoption of *Te Tokotoru* risks negating existing Iwi and hapū-defined systems of healing (*matauranga Māori*). There is equal concern that actions surrounding the strengthening of wāhine Māori (Māori women) leadership and succession planning effectively place the onus on cultural leadership and development at the hands of the State. Similarly, the development of a State-defined workforce capability framework risks minimizing skills, knowledge, and experience of Māori who fall outside of State-defined approval criteria. Overall, however, while the strategy makes considerable reference to partnering with communities and Māori, such partnership is reflective of a parallel hegemonic discourse whereby the State is consistently placed in a pre-eminent position of authority.

It is noteworthy that the imposition of State-perpetuated structures requires communities, including Māori, to respond to family violence in a prescribed, State-endorsed, manner, reinforced by government funding arrangements, eligibility criteria, and regular audits. Such colonial mechanisms are counter to *te ao Māori* (Māori epistemologies) that exist within hapū (subtribes) and Iwi (tribal) structures and are in direct opposition to *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (The Treaty of Waitangi), an international treaty signed with the British Crown in 1840 that guaranteed Iwi *tino rangatiratanga*⁷ (sovereignty) whereby Iwi were guaranteed the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages, and all their property and treasures.

Within this context, this chapter seeks to provide an Indigenous-sociopolitical analysis of family violence responsiveness. I draw on three case studies of community-based specialist kaupapa Māori (for Māori, by Māori) organizations to understand how their journey and adherence to *te ao Māori* (Māori epistemologies), beliefs and practices can underscore the eradication of family violence. It is argued that the predominance of State-led responses to family violence is erroneous and is a mechanism of sustained colonization. Within this framework, the State has positioned itself as an agent of control and it is this positioning that drives a host of inefficiencies, which effectively maintain the status quo.

Such critique is especially prudent in light of the impact of the nation’s colonial history, which has resulted in an overrepresentation of Māori in relation to reported family violence

(see, e.g., Family Violence Death Review Committee, 2022) and excessive incarceration of Māori, with Māori representing approximately 49 percent of the sentenced and 54.2 percent of the remand prison population (Department of Corrections, 2022). Moreover, such critique is urgently required given the State's assumption that it is best positioned to respond to family violence. This chapter actively rejects this assumption, as there is considerable evidence that family-related abuse was absent from pre-colonial Aotearoa (Salmond, 2017), that family violence and abuse is, in general, an artefact of colonization (Family Violence Death Review Committee, 2020), and that State actions often mimic the behaviour of offenders (Family Violence Death Review Committee, 2022).

Methods

The study employed a qualitative holistic multiple case-study design as described by Yin (2003) and informed by an Indigenous Māori-centred methodology. The case studies focus on three kaupapa Māori organizations that are widely acknowledged as exemplars of holistic, whānau-focused service provision, and that have had considerable success responding to, and preventing, family violence in their respective communities.

The use of a holistic multiple case-study design provides an opportunity to place the perspectives and experiences of three organizations as central to the research and to explore the various perspectives within each organization, in accordance with specific cultural understandings, namely *te ao Māori*.

Each of the three participating organizations is based in the North Island of Aotearoa. *Tū Tama Wahine o Taranaki Incorporated* (*Tū Tama Wahine*) is a kaupapa Māori organization based in the city of New Plymouth, in the Taranaki region. It has approximately 30 staff, 26 of whom are Māori or Pasifika. Rather than defining itself as a service provider, *Tū Tama Wahine* stresses that it is a kaupapa Māori common good organization. *Tūhoe Hauora* is a kaupapa Māori health provider based in the town of Tāneatua, approximately 30 kilometres from the city of Whakatane in the Bay of Plenty region. The organization comprises 42 staff, all of whom are Māori and 95 percent whakapapa (identify/trace genealogically) to Ngāi Tūhoe. Finally, *Manaaki Tairāwhiti*, an Iwi-led initiative based in the Gisborne area, comprises government and community organizations collaborating to devolve the commissioning of social services to the community.

Fifteen people from the three organizations participated in a series of in-depth interviews. Three case studies were developed from the interviews and participants were provided with drafts and were invited to amend or extend where necessary, either through verbal or written feedback. Approved case studies form the basis of this chapter's findings.

Findings

Case study participants shared journeys of first engaging in, and then entrenching, *te ao Māori* responses to the eradication of family violence. Aspects of these journeys have been grouped thematically in terms of resistance against State control, kaupapa Māori responsiveness, *tino rangatiratanga*, holistic whānau responses, and prevention and early intervention.

Resistance against State control

Participants described that, from the mid-1980s, State institutional racism supported the widespread adherence to agency and service responses, and staff having to operate within Eurocentric

models of prevention and intervention. These State models were devoid of a whānau-centric focus and failed to acknowledge the importance and right of Māori to work within their own cultural understandings. As described by a participant from Tū Tama Wahine, the areas of health, education and justice were, and continue to be, perceived as “not only compartmentalizing of whānau but also compartmentalizing of the individual themselves within whānau”. Participants further described the government as entrenching individuals and their whānau within government agencies, either through entry into the criminal justice system or through State interference through such agencies as Oranga Tamariki.⁸ These responses have had deleterious effects on whānau, capturing whānau (families) in cycles of negative labelling and dependence on State intervention (e.g., Royal Commission Inquiry into Abuse in Care, 2020).

Within this context, each organization described a journey of having acknowledged that government dictates and associated programmatic requirements were ineffective in responding to family violence and have intentionally developed approaches that are in direct opposition to such dictates.

Beginning in the late 1980s, Tū Tama Wahine arose from the acknowledgement of high rates of family violence amongst Māori whānau in their region and a recognition of significant service gaps that resulted in a failure to address the violence and its antecedents. In addition, it developed in opposition to Western conceptualizations of offending and victimology and actively opposed structural factors contributing to colonization, oppression, injustice, racism, and the many acts of violence of the colonial State upon Indigenous peoples. Within this context, the causes of family violence are acknowledged as historical, intergenerational, and multi-causal.

Tū Tama Wahine stressed that demarcations such as ‘service provision’ reflect transactional and client-restricted encounters, a type of interaction that reduces the ability of staff to adequately respond to whānau and can result in whānau relying on an organization rather than engaging in a process of whānau development. Within this context, Tū Tama Wahine developed a holistic service delivery strategy centred around whānau development. The strategy comprises ten streams, some of which focus directly on whānau development, such as family violence, social work, parenting support services, tamariki (children) and rangatahi (young people), korero awhi (counselling and advocacy), and whānau ora services. The remaining streams are embedded within an Indigenous community development framework and include community development, tikanga and cultural advice, housing, and research.

Tūhoe Hauora was established in 1991 in opposition to the continued negative portrayal of Māori in an array of government agency-related statistics and that entry into many of these government agencies had a negative impact on the individual and whānau. In this sense, Tūhoe Hauora realized that alternative ways of responding to family violence were needed and developed a therapeutic model underpinned by mana motuhake – the self-determination of Iwi, hapū, and whānau.

Beginning in 2016, Manaaki Tairāwhiti, led by the chairperson of each of the two local Iwi and comprising local members of 11 national government agencies, identified a need to address social-sector inefficiencies and gaps in service provision arising from government issue-specific initiatives. Such inefficiencies had resulted in siloed service provision and a focus on crisis intervention rather than prevention. These inefficiencies contributed to a variety of intergenerational issues, and a high proportion of families in Tairāwhiti were reported to be “living in crisis and passing that crisis on to their tamariki [children] and mokopuna [grandchildren].” Rather than a therapeutic model, Manaaki Tairāwhiti sought to dismantle State structures that have acted as a barrier to responding to and reducing family violence. Within this context, Manaaki Tairāwhiti identified the need to devolve social-sector commissioning to the community and

ensure that social-sector policy and service provision are interconnected. The emphasis on local decision-making is contrary to predominant, and conventional, issue-specific contracting and service delivery frameworks (New Zealand Productivity Commission, 2015).

Such local agency collaboration has been enabled by a government mandate for Tairāwhiti to explore novel approaches to addressing whānau needs. The mandate was given in 2016 after Manaaki Tairāwhiti was recognized as a place-based initiative, a central government response to the growing body of evidence that collective approaches are required to address the needs of the nation's most at-risk children and families. Being recognized as a place-based initiative was especially enabling because the initiative focused on bringing together local decision-makers and practitioners from social agencies, Iwi, and NGOs to walk alongside whānau to identify presenting issues and test innovative approaches within the community. As such, the mandate has enabled collaboration and collective action across government agencies.

Importantly, each organization exercised tino rangatiratanga in not only rejecting State dictates but by developing their own responses to the various presenting issues. Further, in accordance with the independent authority of each Iwi, tino rangatiratanga is reflected in the right of each Iwi to develop responses based on their own matauranga-a-Iwi (tribal knowledge).⁹ Within this context, participants commonly referenced a reclamation of the rights of Iwi, and Māori in general.

Kaupapa Māori responsiveness

Participants commonly referenced aspects of cultural reclamation in their descriptions of how their organizations responded to whānau needs. Of significance, cultural reclamation occurred while simultaneously rejecting conventional Eurocentric constructions, such as Eurocentric intervention and feminist models of victim-perpetrator conceptualizations, both of which were viewed as reinforcing a criminal justice and individualized response (see Roguski & Edge, 2021). Rather, each organization stressed the importance of tino rangatiratanga, holistic whānau responses, prevention and early intervention, and Indigenous community development as central to their whānau responsiveness.

Our approach was around working with whānau, which included the men, they are part of the whakapapa [genealogy] and we can't leave them at the door. I had fundamental difference around what tauīwi organisations perceived feminism to be, what I perceive feminism to be, and what it means about empowering families.

(Tū Tama Wahine participant)

Tino rangatiratanga

Across the organizations, tino rangatiratanga and mana motuhake were described as foundational to whānau empowerment and whānau being positioned to make their own informed decisions, a commitment that is in contrast with whānau experiences of being disempowered by government agencies (see Roguski, 2020 for a description of supported whānau decision-making).

In addition, the organizations exercised tino rangatiratanga through a variety of strategies, reflective of Indigenous community development. For example, contrary to predominant issue-specific contracting and service delivery frameworks, Manaaki Tairāwhiti identified the need to devolve social-sector commissioning to the community and ensure that social-sector policy and service provision are interconnected. Devolution was founded on a principle of tino rangatiratanga that has been operationalized through two inextricably linked strategic intents.

First, appropriate community-based derived support – framed around whānau empowerment and decision-making – will lead to transformational change and, ultimately, tino rangatiratanga of whānau. Next, of equal significance, whānau tino rangatiratanga is contingent upon the tino rangatiratanga of Tairāwhiti. The emphasis on tino rangatiratanga of the Tairāwhiti area counters conventional central government policy and programme delivery that has been developed outside of the area and imposed without consultation, and often, contrary to community-identified needs. Rather, tino rangatiratanga of the Tairāwhiti area acknowledges that local leaders and stakeholders are best positioned to identify and develop their own unique solutions.

From its inception, Tū Tama Wahine acknowledged that the needs of Māori in the Taranaki region need to be addressed through whānau development while simultaneously engaging the wider community in a process of change. In this sense, Tū Tama Wahine adopted a dual focus on service delivery and community participation. Tino rangatiratanga is exercised through Indigenous community development whereby communities respond to their own needs. Such acknowledgement is a shift from a reliance on agency and service provider intervention. An example of such a shift is the organization's recent release of its violence prevention strategy, He Pūnaha Hohou Rongo, which centres on a regional commitment across hapū and Iwi to work together to address family violence.

They've [communities] got to be there at some point. The community, all our communities. Saying, we've got this, we know, we understand this, we have to do something about it. That's where we want to get with our communities.

(Tū Tama Wahine participant)

Tūhoe Hauora stressed the importance of being actively embedded within its community. In this sense, community embeddedness acknowledges the intersection of staff and community and serves as a mechanism of continued support of whānau within a community setting. Importantly, continued exposure to staff, when staff are regarded as respected community members, removes barriers associated with support engagement. Such commitment was contrasted against conventional approaches that commonly adhered to strict levels of professional distance between communities and practitioners.

One of the things about community, that I'm hugely passionate about, is you make an extra effort in this work if you live in that community because you want that to be the best community. So, you're going to get into the very best that you can to embrace your community and give them every opportunity for our kids to actually thrive.

(Tūhoe Hauora participant)

Notably, government strategies, such as Te Aorerekura, negate such Iwi and area-specific strategies and privilege the voice of government over that of hapū and Iwi. While Te Aorerekura makes some provision for place-based initiatives, there is no provision for devolution of decision-making to organizations or regions. In this sense, operations are impacted by central government dictates and there is little room for regions to make locally defined amendments.

Holistic whānau responses

Each of the organizations adopts a whānau-centric focus to address the needs of an individual while simultaneously addressing the needs of the whānau. Holistic whānau responses are reflected in each organization rejecting conventional issue-based service responses (e.g., such

as discrete service provision surrounding alcohol and other drug use) in favour of a whānau development, recognizing that whānau is the key social structure within Māori society. In this sense, whānau are viewed and responded to in their entirety; and the health and well-being of the individual are inextricably linked to the health and well-being of the whānau unit. A commitment to addressing the needs of the whole whānau, rather than the ‘identified patient’ stands in stark contrast to common conventional individualized service delivery.

The conventional therapeutic approach is simply a referral from a government agency. “Can you do alcohol and drug counselling with this person?” That’s it. And we say, “Kāo [no], not only are we going to work with the individual, but we’re going to work with their family because we will affect no change whatsoever if we’re just working with the individual”.

(Tūhoe Hauora participant)

Notably, the organizations reject simplistic and discrete compartmentalizations, such as family violence, and instead focus on whānau hauora (family health). Manaaki Tairāwhiti, for example, actively rejected conventional targeted service provisions, such as family violence or addiction counselling. Such compartmentalizations have severely limited the ability of whānau to access support, as predetermined eligibility criteria have often acted to exclude individuals and whānau failing to meet levels of need required for intervention. Such a shift in focus represents an acknowledgement of the deleterious impacts of transactional service models in favour of transformative, and holistically framed, support interactions that privilege whānau problem-solving and positive change.

We don’t believe in the targeting approach. We think that the current system is so targeted that “there is this support” for specific problems deemed to be serious enough that the government wants to pay someone to do something about it. But that is not usually at the prevention end of the continuum. It is usually once the horse has bolted that it’s an identified problem that someone tries to address. We want to test doing the opposite of that. We want to provide help with whatever problem whānau ask for help with.

(Manaaki Tairāwhiti participant)

Prevention and early intervention

A central focus on whānau development has resulted in an emphasis on prevention and early intervention. Early engagement with children and whānau has become increasingly important from a prevention viewpoint; whereby one Manaaki Tairāwhiti participant stated: “a referral to the organisation essentially indicates missed opportunities before the escalation of presenting issues”.

Prevention and early intervention are regarded as essential, as the health and well-being of whānau can only be achieved by preventing them from entering ‘the system’ and thereby preventing cycles of reliance, disempowerment, and negative labelling. Arising from this commitment to prevention, each organization engages whānau at the earliest opportunity to ensure that presenting issues do not escalate to the point of agency involvement.

Our prevention interpretation is based on intervention opportunities to work with a whānau pre-agency involvement or stopping them from going to any government department for any reason.

(Tūhoe Hauora participant)

Our research in relation to child rearing and resiliency really led us to an avenue where we decided we're getting to whānau too late, and actually, the place where we needed to be was in schools. And so we started doing things like our social workers in schools, children's programmes or our attendance service.

(Tū Tama Wahine participant)

Challenges

Both social service organizations, Tū Tama Wahine and Tūhoe Hauora, described their ability to fully realize tino rangatiratanga as compromised by a reliance on government contracts and associated funding requirements.

You know, we can't actually put our hand on our heart and say, we practise mana motuhake wholeheartedly because we're funded by government, so it takes away mana motuhake straight away because we're bound by contracts and outputs.

(Tūhoe Hauora participant)

Inflexibility and dictates of government contracts preclude the organizations from being able to respond to whānau need in ways that the organizations view as more pertinent. Such arrangements restrict the allocation of staff to roles, which may be incongruent with whānau and community needs. In this regard, both organizations asserted that devolved funding arrangements would enable the organization to respond to whānau need appropriately.

We should be able to get bulk funding and be empowered to make our own decisions about where the need is because needs change.

(Tūhoe Hauora participant)

Manaaki Tairawhiti identified the inability to direct change within member agencies as a significant challenge. Specifically, agency leaders have been prevented from consistently engaging in system improvement methodology because they were required to implement national policies and operational changes. Next, a lack of staff with a dedicated system improvement mandate has prevented the full realization of a system improvement focus. Finally, COVID-19 has had a significant impact. The need to implement new COVID-19 national policies has required unprecedented levels of resources which have prevented staff from addressing changes at a local level.

We can gather the whānau voice, aggregate the information and point to where people frequently have trouble getting help. But we can't compel the agencies to change the system, or release staff to work on the problem.

(Manaaki Tairawhiti participant)

We are trying to work on things in our community but there are things that come in over the top. So, the agencies get pulled back into business as usual. This means the application of the system improvement methodology may not be consistently applied.

(Manaaki Tairawhiti participant)

Participants suggested that these challenges could be circumnavigated if there was a cross-agency agreement to ringfence Tairawhiti as a geographical area to test innovative practice.

The best-case scenario would be for Tairāwhiti to be ringfenced so that participating local agencies could have the freedom to look at things that are not working well in their system, and test making changes. By ringfencing us you remove the pressures from central government, like knee jerk reactions, that can impact on frontline staff.

(Manaaki Tairāwhiti participant)

Discussion and conclusion

The launch of Te Aorerekura was greeted with considerable fanfare, signalling what the State described as a holistic and community-embedded response to family violence. However, the Strategy represents only a guise of holistic and community embeddedness and, therefore, furthers the continued imposition of State control and enforcement structures at the expense of Indigenous responsiveness and rangatiratanga.

Given the deleterious impact of colonialism in Aotearoa (see, e.g., Moewaka Barnes & McCreanor, 2019) and the fact that family violence developed as a consequence of colonization, it is paradoxical for the State to assume that it is best positioned to address family violence. Hence, State-driven non-Indigenous responses to family violence need to be treated with caution.

A Te Tiriti o Waitangi-informed response to family violence negates the State's continued positioning as the paramount authority instead of a partnership between Iwi and Crown, the acknowledgement of tino rangatiratanga, te ao Māori, and the independent authority of Iwi and hapū, inclusive of their own matauranga-a-Iwi. Threaded throughout these pillars of Indigenous partnership is the need for the State to surrender its reliance on Western conceptualizations, such as compartmentalized understandings of family violence, and be willing to accept the efficacy of Indigenous responses that address the collective needs of the whānau, the intergenerational impact of colonization, and the importance of cultural reclamation and early intervention and support.

Significantly, the three case studies highlight that kaupapa Māori organizations have the skill and knowledge to address presenting issues and there is ample evidence to support that these Māori-led responses have been highly successful. Notably, however, these successes have occurred because of each organization's determination and despite the State's efforts to control family violence responses.

The greatest challenge faced by the three organizations is a lack of trust from the State.

The two social service organizations, Tū Tama Wahine and Tūhoe Social Services, have funding arrangements that are tied to specific State requirements. These organizations described the need for the State to trust them to work with whānau and respond to whānau-identified needs. In this vein, trust means that the State ceases to impose paradigms, such as Te Tokotoru, eligibility criteria, and client encounter numbers, and allows the organizations to function within their own systems of healing. Rather than service provision-related barriers, the greatest challenge faced by Manaaki Tairāwhiti, in comparison, is the State's lack of trust to enable the place-based initiative to function innovatively and outside of policy and operational dictates that reinforce individualized crisis responses that exist within a siloed structure.

Given the 2015 findings of the Productivity Commission, such a lack of trust is incomprehensible and is reflective of successive governments' entrenched racism (Mutu, 2019). The State has failed to demonstrate a willingness to explore and take action on what devolution

might mean, and how Iwi, hapū and kaupapa Māori organizations might partner with the State. As evidenced by Te Aorerekura, the State has adopted the guise of a partnership while effectively asserting control.

The experiences of the three participating organizations highlight the urgent need for the State to first acknowledge that its continued control of family violence responsiveness is negatively impacting Māori in response to whānau. Second, there is a need for the State to engage in conversations with hapū, Iwi, and kaupapa Māori providers about what devolution means and how, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori might be able to partner with the State in such a way that Māori exercise tino rangatiratanga, inclusive of matauranga-a-Iwi.

If the State continues to privilege its position as an agent of control, State strategies, such as Te Aorerekura, will continue to ignore partnership and instead cast the State as paternalistic. In addition, the status quo, fraught with a myriad of inefficiencies will continue and the support needed – as defined by whānau – will fail to be provided. Moreover, our growing incidence rates of family violence will not be adequately addressed. The State's control, paternalism, and inaction are evidence that the State engages in sustained colonization and marginalization of Māori.

Notes

- 1 In 2015, it was estimated that the Government spent more than \$1.4 billion annually addressing the consequences of family violence (Office of the Auditor-General, 2021).
- 2 Feminist theoretical orientations have shaped the most prevalent intervention responses to family violence. The most notable are based on the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP), also known as the Duluth Model (Ali & Naylor, 2013; Armenti & Babcock, 2016) and have been particularly influential in the development of responses to family violence in Aotearoa New Zealand (Crichton-Hill, 2001; Rankine et al., 2017; Robertson, 1999; Slabber, 2012). The model rests on an analysis of violence as founded in the gendered imbalance of power and control, enacted towards women by men (Kruger et al., 2004), and seeks a reduction of violence through a criminal justice response with punitive consequences incurred for individual perpetrators and through the provision of desistance education programmes for perpetrators (Pence, 1983).
- 3 The author chooses to capitalize State throughout the chapter to emphasize the encapsulated power.
- 4 The Productivity Commission is an independent Crown entity tasked with undertaking in-depth inquiries on Government-selected topics. The Commission's 2015 inquiry into the effectiveness of social services in Aotearoa was initiated because a raft of inefficiencies associated with the way government agencies commission and purchase social services; the result of which is a social service system that has been precluded from responding holistically to presenting needs and a focus on crisis interventions to the detriment of prevention and early intervention. The Commission is bound and guided by the New Zealand Productivity Commission Act 2010.
- 5 The Commission defined devolution as "The transfer of substantial decision-making power and responsibility to autonomous or semi-autonomous organisations with separate governance" (Productivity Commission, 2015, p. xii).
- 6 Comprising Accident Compensation Corporation, the Department of Corrections, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Social Development, the New Zealand Police, Oranga Tamariki, Te Puni Kōkiri, and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
- 7 Tino rangatiratanga and mana motuhake refer to the sovereignty of Iwi Māori. Of note, Iwi differ according to which term is used. For example, Ngāi Tūhoe tend to refer to mana motuhake.
- 8 Oranga Tamariki is also known as the Ministry of Children and is the State childcare and protection agency.
- 9 Mātauranga ā-iwi, tribal knowledge, operates within tribal context – "it is premised on the tribal knowledge forms that are unique to the differing tribal identities" (Doherty, 2012, p. 33).

References

- Ali, P.A., & Naylor, P.B. (2013). Intimate partner violence: A narrative review of the feminist, social and ecological explanations for its causation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*, 611–619.
- Armenti, N.A., & Babcock, J.C. (2016). Conjoint treatment for intimate partner violence: A systematic review and implications. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice, 5*, 109–123.
- Balzer, R., Haimona, D., Henare, M., & Matchitt, V. (1997). *Māori family violence in Aotearoa*. Te Puni Kōkiri. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Chartrand, L., & McKay, C. (2006). *A review of research on criminal victimisation and first nations, Metis and Inuit Peoples 1990 to 2001*. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/aj-ja/rr06_vic1/rr06_vic1.pdf
- Cooper, E. (2012). *Mokopuna rising: Intervention in whānau violence*. [PhD thesis, University of Auckland] <https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/19218>
- Cooper, E., & Wharewera-Mika, J. (2011). Healing: Towards an understanding of Māori child maltreatment. *Journal of Māori and Social Issues, 1*, 283–301.
- Crichton-Hill, Y. (2001). Challenging ethnocentric explanations of domestic violence: Let us decide, then value our decisions – a Samoan response. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 2*, 203–214.
- Cripps, K. (2011). Indigenous family violence: From emergency measures to committed long term action. *Australian Indigenous Law Review, 11*(2), 7–18.
- Department of Corrections. (2022). *Inmate ethnicity by institution*. <https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/statistics/corrections-volumes-report/past-census-of-prison-inmates-and-home-detainees/census-of-prison-inmates-and-home-detainees-2003/2-inmate-numbers-by-institution/2.4-inmate-ethnicity-by-institution>
- Doherty, W. (2012). Ranga framework – He raranga kaupapa. In T. Black, D. Bean, W. Collings & W. Nuku (Eds.), *Conversations on Mātauranga Māori* (pp. 15–36). New Zealand Qualifications Authority.
- Family Violence Clearing House. (2017). *Data summaries 2017: Snapshot June 2017*. <https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/nzfvc.org.nz/files/Data-summaries-snapshot-2017.pdf>
- Family Violence Death Review Committee. (2020). *Sixth report. Te pūrongo tuaono: Men who use violence. Ngā tāne ka whakamahi i te whakarekerekere*. https://www.hqsc.govt.nz/assets/Our-work/Mortality-review-committee/FVDRC/Publications-resources/FVDRC6thReport_FINAL.pdf
- Family Violence Death Review Committee. (2022). *Seventh report. A duty to care. Me manaaki te tangata*. <https://www.hqsc.govt.nz/assets/Our-work/Mortality-review-committee/FVDRC/Publications-resources/Seventh-report-transcripts/FVDRC-seventh-report-web.pdf>
- Fanslow, J.L., Malihī, Z., Hashemi, L., Gulliver, P., & McIntosh, T. (2022). Prevalence of interpersonal violence against women and men in New Zealand: Results of a cross-sectional study. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 46*, 117–126.
- Government of New Zealand. (2017). *Government response to the Productivity Commission report on more effective social services*. <https://www.productivity.govt.nz/assets/Documents/9c5ad80787/Government-responses-to-recommendations-v2.pdf>
- Hagen, P., Tangaere, A., Beaton, S., Hadrup, A., Taniwha-Paoo, R., & Te Whiu, D. (2021). *Designing for equity and intergenerational wellbeing: Te Tokotoru*. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f1e3bad68df2a40e2e0baaa/t/619d6ee9ce2a4c268892b683/1637707507280/TeTokotoru_Oct_InnovationBrief_2021.pdf
- Hassall, I., & Fanslow, J. (2006). Family violence in New Zealand: We can do better. *The New Zealand Medical Journal, 119*, 1–4.
- Joint Venture. (2021). *Te Aorerekura: National strategy to eliminate family violence and sexual violence*. <https://violencefree.govt.nz/national-strategy/#moemoea>
- Kruger, T., Pitman, M., Grennell, D., McDonald, T., Mariu, D., Pomare, A., Mita, T., Maihi, M., & Lawson, K.T.A. (2004). *Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework. An updated version of the report from the former Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence*. https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/transforming_whanau_violence.pdf
- Ministry of Justice. (2022). *New Zealand crime and victims survey. Results drawn from cycle 4 (2020/21) of the New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey*. <https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/NZCVS-Cycle-4-Core-Report-Section-7-Reporting-to-the-Police-fin.pdf>
- Moewaka Barnes, H., & McCreanor, T. (2019). Colonisation, hauora and whenua in Aotearoa, *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 49*, 19–33.
- Mutu, M. (2019). “To honour the treaty, we must first settle colonisation” (Moana Jackson 2015): The long road from colonial devastation to balance, peace and harmony. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 49*(1), 4–18.

- New Zealand Productivity Commission. (2015). *More effective social services*. <http://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/social-services-final-report-main.pdf>
- Office of the Auditor-General. (2021). *Working in new ways to address family violence and sexual violence*. <https://oag.parliament.nz/2021/joint-venture/docs/joint-venture.pdf>
- Pence, E. (1983). The Duluth domestic abuse intervention project. *Hamline Law Review*, 6, 247–275.
- Rankine, J., Percival, T., Finau, E., Hope, L.T., Kingi, P., Peteru, M.C., Powell, E., Robati-Mani, R., & Selu, E. (2017). Pacific peoples, violence, and the power and control wheel. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(18), 2777–2803.
- Robertson, N. (1999). Stopping violence programmes: Enhancing the safety of battered women. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 28(2), 68–78.
- Roguski, M. (2020). The reclamation of whānau decision-making in the context of child welfare. A case study of Iwi-led family group conferences. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 13(2), 86–100.
- Roguski, M., & Edge, K. (2021). Thinking differently about family violence: Shifting from a criminal justice response to a recovery orientation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 341–353.
- Roguski, M., & Gregory, N. (2014). *Former family violence perpetrators' narratives of change*. Kaitiaki Research and Evaluation.
- Royal Commission Inquiry into Abuse in Care. (2020). *Tāwharautia: Pūrongo o te Wā. Volume II*. <https://www.abuseincare.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Abuse-in-Care-Volume-Two.pdf>
- Rua, M. (2015). *Māori men's positive and interconnected sense of self, being and place* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. The University of Waikato.
- Salmond, A. (2017). *Tears of Rangi: Experiments across worlds*. Auckland University Press.
- Slabber, M. (2012). *Community-based domestic violence interventions*. https://www.corrections.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/10721/COR_Community_Based_Domestic_Violence_Interventions_WEB_2.pdf
- Taumaunu, H. (2020, November 11). *Calls for transformative change and the District Court response* [Norris Ward McKinnon annual lecture]. <https://www.districtcourts.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Publications/2020/Norris-Ward-McKinnon-Annual-Lecture-2020-Mai-te-Po-ki-te-Ao-Marama.pdf>
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2010). *Arotake tukino whānau: Literature review on family violence*. <https://www.tpk.govt.nz/documents/download/262/tpk-family-violence-literature-review.pdf>
- Wilson, D., Mikahere-Hall, A., Sherwood, J., Cootes, K., & Jackson, D. (2019). *E tū wāhine, e tū whānau: Wāhine Māori keeping safe in unsafe relationships*. https://niphmhr.aut.ac.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/330302/REPORT_E-Tu-Wahine,-E-Tu-Whanau-Wahine-Maori-keeping-safe-in-unsafe-relationships.pdf
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research design and methods*, Vol. 5 (3rd ed). Sage.