

EWAS WORKING PAPER SERIES

ELDER OR MERELY OLDER? ENHANCING THE WELLBEING OF OLDER MÄORI IN AN AGEING MÄORI POPULATION

Tahu Kukutai
Department of Sociology
Stanford University

Working Paper 2

May 2006



Family Centre
Social Policy Research Unit
WELLINGTON NEW ZEALAND



Population Studies Centre
The University of Waikato
HAMILTON NEW ZEALAND

ENHANCING WELLBEING IN AN AGEING SOCIETY (EWAS)

*A programme of research funded by the Foundation for Research Science and
Technology; conducted by the Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit and the
Population Studies Centre at the University of Waikato*

The research reported in this working paper is part of the research programme *Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society* (EWAS), funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology and carried out in partnership by the Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit (FCSPRU) and the Population Studies Centre (PSC) at the University of Waikato.

Working papers can be obtained in pdf form from the EWAS website at <http://www.ewas.net.nz>

The views expressed in this working paper are those of the authors and do not reflect any official position on the part of the FCSPRU or the PSC.

© EWAS

Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit P.O. Box 31-050 Lower Hutt 5040 New Zealand www.familycentre.org.nz moulton.t@fc.org.nz	Population Studies Centre The University of Waikato Private Bag 3105 Hamilton 3240 New Zealand www.waikato.ac.nz/wfass/populationstudiescentre pscadmin@waikato.ac.nz
---	--

ISSN: 1177-4029

ELDER OR MERELY OLDER?
ENHANCING THE WELLBEING OF OLDER MÄORI IN AN
AGEING MÄORI POPULATION

Tahu Kukutai
Department of Sociology
Stanford University

ABSTRACT

In coming decades the Mäori population will undergo a palpable process of ageing. By 2021, one in eight Mäori (57,000) will be aged 65 years or older, compared to a mere one in 33 in 2001 (20,000). Strategies to optimise the wellbeing of a greatly expanded older Mäori population will need to be built on a sound understanding of what it means for older Mäori to be well, and of the pathways and barriers to achieving wellness. With these points in mind, this paper first reviews the diverse literature on wellbeing, from mainstream and Mäori perspectives, and proposes an integrated conceptual framework that reconciles the disparate approaches. Second, it surveys the empirical literature on older Mäori and identifies key issues that will bear upon their wellbeing as population ageing ensues. The material hardship of older Mäori and the shifting capacities of future cohorts to fulfill cultural roles and responsibilities emerge as particular challenges facing policymakers, and the families and communities of which older Mäori are a part.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks those who commented on early drafts of the paper including Sarah Hillcoat-Nallétamby, Jacques Poot, Peter King, and the Ministry of Social Development. Any contestable judgements and errors are entirely my own.

Keywords: Mäori population ageing, culturally defined wellbeing, connectedness, whare model

INTRODUCTION

Kaumātua are taonga of the whānau, hapu, and iwi structures. In their traditional formal role they are the guardians of wisdom, knowledge and traditions... Their role is to nurture the whānau, hapu and iwi with this knowledge. (Ministry of Health 1997:7)

In recent years the volume and scope of New Zealand research on ageing and the aged has expanded appreciably (e.g., Fergusson *et al.* 2001; Ministry of Health 1997; Ng and McCreanor 1999; Pool 2003; Ministry of Social Policy 2001), as has research into the various aspects of wellbeing (Love and Praat 2004; Ministry of Social Development 2005; Spellerberg 2001). Yet the specific nexus of Māori ageing and wellbeing remains a relatively under-examined area.¹ The need for additional research on the requisites of wellbeing for older Māori, along with their attitudes towards and experiences of ageing, is made pressing by demographic changes poised to unfold over the next 15 to 50 years. By 2021 it is estimated that one in every 12 persons of Māori ethnicity will be aged 65 years or more, compared to just one in 33 in 2001. In numeric terms, the number of Māori at older ages will increase from 20,000 in 2001, to 57,000 in 2021, reaching 160,000 by 2051 (Statistics New Zealand 1998, 2003).²

The impending growth of the older Māori population has significant social, cultural and fiscal implications for the nation. These range from standard policy considerations such as retirement provision, support services, and transfers of wealth, to less tangible aspects such as the quality of intergenerational relations and the cultural vitality of Māori communities. Recognising this, a central goal of the research project “Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society” (EWAS hereafter) is to increase knowledge about the factors likely to constrain and facilitate the wellbeing of older Māori over the next 50 years, and to foreshadow how these factors may be addressed by policy. As one of several EWAS discussion papers on New Zealand’s ageing society, this paper has the following objectives:

- 1) to provide an overview of the various conceptual approaches to wellbeing, and discuss how such approaches may be adapted to capture the diverse realities of older Māori;
- 2) to identify key substantive issues in Māori ageing and the wellbeing of older Māori;
- 3) to suggest how these issues might affect the wellbeing of older Māori in the future.

¹ While there are several ways to define the Māori population, this paper uses the term in specific reference to the Māori Ethnic Group (MEG), consistent with Statistics New Zealand’s projections. The MEG includes any person who reports Māori ethnicity in the census, either alone or in combination with some other ethnic group.

² The 2001-2021 figures are from Series 6 of the Māori population projections which assumes medium fertility, mortality, inter-ethnic mobility and net migration loss of 2,500.

1.1 Turning the focus towards an ageing Māori population

In planning for the imminent ageing of New Zealand's population, policy-makers have several reasons for focusing on Māori, beyond their special status as tangata whenua (original peoples) and the country's largest minority ethnic group. One is demographic. Historically higher levels of fertility and mortality mean the Māori population is considerably younger than the total New Zealand population, even though gains in longevity and reduced fertility are slowly narrowing the gap in median age.³ Structural ageing will not be as rapid, nor as striking for Māori as for the total New Zealand population, yet the number of elderly Māori will grow dramatically as the large birth cohorts from 1945-1965 reach retirement age from 2010.⁴ Pool (2003) has argued that this feature of Māori ageing is critical because, even if the Māori population remains comparatively youthful, policy-makers and Māori communities will need to attend to new challenges posed by a substantially greater number of older Māori.

A second noteworthy feature of Māori ageing is the material disadvantage of older Māori compared to non-Māori, and older Pākehā in particular (New Zealanders of European ethnicity). Older Māori are more likely, on average, to experience higher levels of hardship than their Pākehā counterparts, and to incur compounded disadvantage from multiple sources (Cunningham *et al.* 2002; Fergusson *et al.* 2001). Reliance on state assistance, lower levels of savings, and falling rates of home ownership are likely to constrain the future capacity of older Māori to transfer wealth across generations. The implications of this are sobering given that intergenerational transfers contribute significantly to individual wealth and tend to reinforce or amplify existing social cleavages (Xiao and Yany 2002).

Cultural differences in attitudes towards ageing, and its allied roles and responsibilities, also require attention. Culture refers to the customs, practices languages, values and worldviews that define social groups (Ministry of Social Development 2005). In the model or ideal view of Māori society, ageing is framed as a positive life course transition that augments mana or prestige. To be older is to be an elder or kaumātua with the necessary experience, wisdom and cultural knowledge to fulfill well defined roles and responsibilities (Durie 1999).⁵ In this model view, the

³ The gap is closing but remains significant. By 2021 the median age for the MEG is expected to be 26.8 years (up from 22.1 years in 2001), compared with 40 years for the total NZ population (Statistics NZ 2003, Series 6). In 2021 persons aged 65 years or more will comprise 8% of the MEG but 22% of the European ethnic group.

⁴ Population or structural ageing refers to the increasing proportion of a population that is 65 years or more. Numerical ageing refers to the absolute number of people in a population that is 65 years or more. A population with at least 10 per cent of members aged 65 or more can be considered "old" (Pool 2003). It should be noted that the youthful age structure of the Māori population is not unique. Some Pacific Island ethnic groups, for example, also have youthful populations.

⁵ This paper is concerned with the wellbeing of Māori aged 60 years or older, only some of whom might be considered to be kaumātua. There are Māori men and women who, for reasons of cultural competence or necessity, assume the role of kaumātua at a relatively young age, but such persons are beyond the scope of this paper.

whānau or family plays a key role as both recipient and giver of support, consistent with cultural values that emphasize interdependence, reciprocity and the importance of kin relations. Taken together, these elements contrast sharply with the deficit paradigm of ageing that emphasizes the dependency, vulnerability, isolation and limited capacities of older persons (Moody 2002).

However, the extent to which the cultural archetype of “elder when older” reflects the modal or typical experience of older Māori is unclear. Recent research has pointed to significant socio-economic and cultural diversity between Māori generally (Chapple 2000; Crothers 2002; Kukutai 2004), and older Māori specifically (Cunningham *et al.* 2002; Durie 2003). Many older Māori may not only lack cultural expertise, but also meaningful ties to other Māori people, organisations, and communities. Nor is whānau support in older age assured. In some urban areas for example, older Māori occupy beds in residential homes at the same rate as Pākehā (Richmond *et al.* 1995). The potential disjuncture between the model and modal older Māori therefore needs to be borne in mind when designing policy approaches that seek to enhance the wellbeing of Māori individuals and groups. This issue will be addressed in more detail later in this paper. First, an overview of the major approaches to conceptualising and measuring wellbeing is undertaken.

2. WELLBEING IN THE CONTEXT OF MĀORI AGEING

2.1 General approaches to the conceptualisation and measurement of wellbeing

The wellbeing of a nation and its citizens is widely accepted as a desirable outcome of social policy. There is less of a consensus however, on the optimal approach for defining, measuring, and enhancing wellbeing, and over the years an enormous literature on wellbeing has amassed. Within the literature, several distinctions may be drawn between objective, subjective, material and non-economic aspects of wellbeing. Objective wellbeing refers to observable factors that are independent of individual subjectivity. Examples include income, physical health, and participation in familial and community activities. Subjective wellbeing refers to feelings and perceptions that people have about self, those around them, their personal circumstances, and broader societal institutions (Kahneman and Krueger 2006). In the literature these two sorts of wellbeing are conceptualised in terms of *domains* that, in turn, are operationalised as *indicators* that enable the monitoring of improvement or deterioration over time. Indicators are usually measured at the level of the individual and aggregated to provide insights into the wellbeing of collectivities such as families, communities, and societies. For the purposes of clarity, the distinction between subjective, objective, material, and social wellbeing are employed.

2.1.1 Material wellbeing

In the past the prosperity of societies was measured through indices of income such as Gross Domestic Product, representing the values of goods and services produced in a nation. Such measures identified boundaries separating more and less developed countries, but did not account for sources of variation in resources within countries. Contemporary measures of wealth, poverty, and economic standards of living (hereafter SoL) have gone some way towards

addressing this gap. Indirect approaches to SoL approximate living standards by measuring one or more of its correlates such as income or expenditure. A direct approach treats living standard as a latent variable that can be captured via observed measures for a range of specified domains. The Ministry of Social Development opted for the latter approach in its recent study of the living standards of older New Zealanders (see Fergusson *et al.*, 2001). A key outcome of the study was the index of material wellbeing, a composite measure based on outcomes across the following domains:

- ownership restrictions
- social participation restrictions
- economising
- serious financial problems
- standard of living
- income adequacy

Focusing solely on the material aspects of wellbeing is limited in the sense that it ignores the potential importance of social and psychological dimensions. It does however, provide a clearly defined scope for policy intervention and insights into the distribution of economic resources across different social groupings (e.g. based on ethnicity, gender, and social class). Subjective assessments of material conditions may also be incorporated into indirect SoL approaches. The MSD study, for example, measured economic restrictions relating to ownership etc., as well as individuals' perceptions of their living standard and adequacy of income.

2.1.2 Social wellbeing

Separate from approaches that only address the material basis of wellbeing are those concerned with the broader rubric of social wellbeing. Social wellbeing is somewhat difficult to circumscribe because it encompasses all aspects of life that are valued within a given society (Ministry of Social Development 2005). Measures of social wellbeing may include economic and non-economic resources, as well as subjective feelings and assessments. The annual Social Report undertaken by MSD identifies ten domains of social wellbeing and a set of targets or desired outcomes for each. The domains are:

- health
- knowledge and skills
- paid work
- economic standard of living
- civil and political rights
- cultural identity
- leisure and recreation
- the physical environment
- safety
- social connectedness.

Social connectedness

The last domain of social connectedness has received much attention in New Zealand over the past decade (King and Waldegrave 2003; Robinson 1997, 1999, 2002; Robinson and Williams 2001; Statistics New Zealand 1997). This reflects

international recognition of the importance of social networks, relationships, norms, and trust for individual wellbeing, group cohesion, and the overall quality of a society (Coleman 1994; Putnam 2000). Many factors have an impact upon individuals' sense of connectedness and belonging in communities, and the extent to which they can co-ordinate and co-operate with other to their mutual benefit. The framework for the measurement of social capital in New Zealand identified four domains that contributed to the development of strong communities (Spellerberg 2001). They were:

- behaviours (e.g., social participation, giving);
- attitudes and values (e.g., trust, attitudes towards others, beliefs about self);
- population groups (e.g., ethnic makeup of a community, household composition);
- organisations (e.g., number, structure, links and networks).

While much of the local research on social connectedness has been undertaken with the general public in mind, there are likely to be specific concerns and issues that arise for older people generally, and for older Māori in particular. For example, the inclusion or exclusion of older Māori from community and civic life may be determined by a different set of factors than for older non-Māori or younger Māori. Experiences with discrimination at the personal and institutional levels might engender lower levels of trust.⁶ The extent to which social connectedness is valued may also vary at different stages of an individual's lifecycle.

From a conceptual standpoint, Robinson and Williams (2001) have argued that a model of social capital that focuses on networks created outside the family may fail to capture key differences in how social capital in Māori communities is structured. From their perspective, there is no clear separation between family and community in Māori society because "extended family relationships are the basis for all other relationships" (p. 55). Thus, an approach that focuses on institutions has limited relevance for Māori because relationships may be built more around informal than formal associations.

Satisfaction and happiness

Along with a greater interest in the *quality of society vis-à-vis* social connectedness, policy-makers have also turned their attention to individuals' subjective feelings and assessments about their *quality of life*.⁷ The questions most frequently asked in surveys of subjective wellbeing relate to life satisfaction and happiness (Cummins *et al.* 2003; Diener 2000; Diener and Suh 2000; Kahneman and Krueger 2006). In the United States for example, the General Social Survey asks: "Taken all together, how would you say things are these days? Would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?" The recent Social Wellbeing survey asked similar questions about New Zealanders' overall happiness and

⁶ The Social Report 2005 reported much lower levels of generalized trust among Māori and Pacific peoples compared to peoples from other ethnic groups.

⁷ The term "quality of life" (as distinct from quality of society) is often used to denote a broad matrix of emotional, psychological, material, and physical domains (Flanagan 1978). Quality of life may also be used in a more limited sense to describe health status.

satisfaction, along with feelings about trust, isolation, and satisfaction with their work-life balance.

Because life satisfaction and/or happiness are seen as important dimensions of wellbeing, policy-makers are not only interested in overall levels of satisfaction, but also in what it takes to make people satisfied, and whether ‘what it takes’ varies depending upon socially salient characteristics such as ethnicity and age. Diener (1984) has argued that judgments of life satisfaction are made by combining assessments of positive or negative feelings or emotions in a person’s life with an assessment of how well their life measures up to their aspirations and goals. The mediating role of aspirations may help to explain the apparent dissonance between self-reported satisfaction and observed conditions. It is not an uncommon finding that older people give a more positive self-assessment of their health and life satisfaction than would be expected given their observed health status or living standard (Fergusson *et al.* 2001; Reid *et al.* 2003; Moody 2002). One possible interpretation is that satisfaction is achieved at a lower level of health or material wellbeing because older people perceive a certain level of discomfort as natural. Being healthy may also be a matter of feeling good and being able to cope with everyday life, rather than having good health in the biomedical sense.

Because aspirations and assessments are influenced in part by cultural context, we might ask whether the subjective wellbeing of older Māori depends on satisfaction with the domains generally valued by non-Māori. Put another way, are the requisites of happiness or satisfaction for older Māori, on average, different than those for older persons from other ethnic groups? Māori and Pākehā are often cast as cultures that respectively value people as opposed to possessions, and the collective as opposed to the individual. Taken at face value, this would imply that older Māori require less wealth and greater interaction with whānau to attain a level of life satisfaction equal to that of older Pākehā.

A dearth of empirical evidence means such questions remain largely unanswered, and the extant evidence is equivocal. The Social Wellbeing survey, for example, found no significant ethnic differences in levels of overall life satisfaction, in spite of marked variation in objective indicators. Measurement issues aside, one might surmise from this that Māori have different criteria and judgments about what constitutes a good life.⁸ On the other hand, the MSD study on living standards found that older Māori and non-Māori tended to attribute similar levels of importance to a range of essential ownership and social participation items (Cunningham *et al.* 2002). For example, 89 percent of Māori and non-Māori ranked participation in family/whānau activities as ‘important’ or ‘very important’. There was however, less agreement about the importance of non-essential items such as owning a dishwasher

⁸ Considerable caution is required when interpreting subjective wellbeing measures. Responses to questions about happiness and satisfaction can be affected by situational context, mood, and internal variation in how responses such as ‘very happy’ are interpreted. Indeed, problems of reliability and instability have fostered concerns about whether satisfaction and happiness are appropriate yardsticks for wellbeing in the context of social policy (see Love and Praat 2004). While there are various strategies for overcoming measurement problems (Kahneman and Krueger 2006), there are still intrinsic limits to using cross-sectional data to posit causal relationships between dimensions of wellbeing (e.g. analysing life satisfaction as the outcome of a set of factors such as income and social connectedness).

and items considered important in Māori society, such as the ability to contribute koha (e.g. gift giving), were excluded from the survey.

When necessities such as adequate food and shelter are met, happiness and satisfaction would seem to depend on intangible factors such as relationships, a sense of purpose, and the fulfillment of socially defined obligations. However, the specific content of obligations etc., and the extent to which they are valued, may vary across groups.

2.2 Māori models of wellbeing

Given that most of these mainstream approaches to wellbeing were developed overseas and adapted to the New Zealand context, a recurring question is whether they are relevant for describing and measuring the wellbeing of Māori (for an in-depth discussion about social wellbeing and Māori models of wellbeing, see Love and Praat 2004). Concern about cultural appropriateness has seen the development of several Māori models of wellbeing, mostly from within the health sector.

2.2.1 *Whare Tapa Whā*

One model of Māori wellbeing that has been influential in many fields including mental health, public health, youth offending, and counseling is *Whare Tapa Whā* (Durie 1994). In this model, wellbeing is contingent upon a balance of physical (te taha tinana), emotional/psychological (te taha hinengaro), spiritual (te taha wairua), and family/community wellbeing (te taha whānau). The metaphor of a whare or house is rooted in the idea of interdependency of internal and external dimensions. If one side of the house is damaged, the remaining walls, and thus the overall structure is weakened.

The whare model resembles general frameworks of wellbeing in that it treats wellbeing as a property of individuals that can be approximated by subjective and objective indices across four key domains. Its uniqueness stems from its holistic nature that makes inter-domain equilibrium a necessary condition for wellbeing; the use of concepts such as wairua deemed important in Māori culture; and the assumption that the components of wellbeing are culturally specific for persons of Māori descent who identify as Māori. Other Māori models of wellbeing such as *Te Wheke* (Pere 1988) and *Nga Pou Mana* (Royal Commission on Social Policy 1988), have much in common with the whare model including the emphasis on wairua and whānau. A shared assumption is that through whānau, “health and wellbeing is transformed from an individually located construct to a shared and social phenomenon” (Love and Praat 2004:11).

2.2.2 *Individual and collective wellbeing*

The emphasis on communality and interdependency in Māori models underscores the need for an approach to wellbeing that acknowledges the importance of collective wellbeing. The typical approach to building evidence about collective wellbeing is to aggregate individual level data to the sub-population group and to investigate the relationship between variables. The outcome of the target group then becomes the sum of its parts.

This kind of approach can provide useful insights in that individual outcomes (e.g. health status) may be examined within the context of group-level outcomes (e.g. median health status of whānau members). Yet inferring a collective status from aggregated data also has limitations. Wellbeing is not just the sum of individual

experience and attributes, but exists in the quality of concrete relations between individuals and institutions.

There are several ways by which the wellbeing of Māori institutions may be captured. For example, Durie *et al.* (2003) have suggested that the vibrancy of Māori communities might be approximated by the number of organisations they comprise (e.g. active marae, sports clubs, Māori committees), their level of functionality, and the quality of relations between them. Using parent-child dyads, whānau wellbeing may be captured through indicators of the quality of relationships (e.g. how older Māori are cared for), concrete expressions of solidarity (e.g. the presence of a whānau trust); and subjective assessments of whānau wellbeing and support.

A benefit of constructing separate measures of individual and collective Māori wellbeing is that it enables the relations between them to be empirically examined. If individual and collective wellbeing are tightly coupled, wellbeing at any one level should be reasonably predicted by wellbeing at some other level. By employing multiple levels of observation we might find that whānau wellbeing is strongly associated with the wellbeing of Māori individuals, but that community wellbeing is insignificant. Insofar as policy is concerned, this would suggest that a more fruitful point of intervention would be at the level of the whānau. To some extent this is already an underlying assumption in social policy. The Government's Māori Health Strategy *He Korowai Oranga* focuses on whānau wellbeing as the cornerstone of individual and collective Māori wellbeing (Ministry of Health 2004).

With respect to older Māori, the model view outlined earlier suggests a strong association between the wellbeing of older Māori and the communities in which they reside. This is because kaumātua have important functional and symbolic roles with regard to the transmission of tikanga (customs), kaupapa (rules and reasons), and whakapapa (ancestry). Durie has argued that without kaumātua leadership a Māori community would be “the poorer and, at least in the eyes of other Māori, unable to function effectively or to fulfil its obligations” (1999:102). If this is the case, and ultimately this is an empirical question, then policies that enhance the wellbeing of older Māori would have positive effects for the broader community.

Finally, it is worth noting that employing aggregation to derive average outcomes for the average group member often means that inadequate attention is paid to heterogeneity. This is of small consequence when the life circumstances and experiences of group members are reasonably homogeneous (eg. elderly Māori up to the 1950s), but becomes more important if heterogeneity increases, as has been the case for Māori generally. If policy is designed to meet the needs of the greatest number of older Māori, attention to the distribution, as well as the modal values of wellbeing will be necessary.

2.3 Reconciling general and Māori-specific approaches to wellbeing

A common challenge facing policy-makers is where they should focus their attention, given their limited resources, the needs of different groups, and the multiple dimensions of wellbeing. Because minority ethnic groups are oftentimes one of several target groups for which information is sought, they tend to be subsumed within a general framework that does not allow for the recognition of culturally specific concepts. While a generic approach has the advantage of enabling group comparisons across dimensions of wellbeing that are generally valued by all

members of a society (e.g. health), it often fails to capture those aspects of wellbeing that are valued by a specific group (e.g. access to cultural institutions).

In addressing the inherent tension between generic and culturally specific approaches, Durie *et al.* (2003) make a distinction between participation and achievement *of Māori* in New Zealand society (te ao whānui) and participation and achievement *as Māori* in Māori society (te ao Māori). They argue that any assessment of Māori progress (or, in this case, wellbeing) should not only depend on generic indicators of wellbeing (e.g. standard of living), but also measures that indicate the degree to which Māori “share in the benefits of the Māori world” (3). Following this, an integrated framework for the conceptualisation and measurement of the wellbeing of older Māori is shown in Figure 1. It draws on select elements of Durie *et al.*'s (2003) framework for monitoring Māori outcomes and the MSD's social wellbeing framework.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Several clarifying points can be made with respect to this framework:

- although te ao whānui and te ao Māori are distinguished here for conceptual purposes, in reality they are interconnected (not separate) spheres. Because of this, the dimensions of wellbeing in New Zealand society and in Māori society are likely to be interdependent, as illustrated by the two-way arrow. Outcomes on one side (e.g. high Māori cultural skills in terms of Māori language fluency), can be associated with outcomes on the other (e.g. high mainstream knowledge in the form of educational attainment);
- there is no *a priori* judgment about which kind of outcomes and participation are most important. If multiple dimensions are captured across te ao whānui and te ao Māori, there are many alternatives for investigating the relationship between variables. This facilitates empirical analysis of the circumstances and aspirations of older Māori, and the extent to which the model of “elder when older” reflects typical Māori experience;
- rather than subsume all things Māori under the broad rubric of “cultural identity”, three domains are identified: Māori identity (e.g. self-naming; tribal affiliation), Māori knowledge and skills (e.g. ability to speak te reo Māori; knowledge of marae protocol), and Māori connectedness (e.g. participation in whānau networks). They broadly capture the ideational, behavioural, and relational aspects of Māori ethnicity;
- while individual wellbeing is the focal point, it is connected to, and interdependent with, collective wellbeing. The latter may be defined in terms of whānau, community, or iwi etc.

3. KEY THEMES ON MĀORI AGEING AND WELLBEING

Having considered the conceptual basis of wellbeing and its relevance for Māori individuals and collectivities, this section provides a selective review of the recent empirical literature on the wellbeing of older Māori. Much of the recent evidence comes from two sources: 1) the MSD living standards study which included a survey of 3 060 New Zealanders aged 65 years and older, and a separate survey of 542 Māori aged 65 to 69 years (see Cunningham *et al.* 2002; Fergusson *et al.* 2001);

and, 2) the 1996 Oranga Kaumātua study of 397 Māori men and women aged 60 years and older (Te Pūmanawa Hauora 1997). The first study contained nationally representative samples. The sample for the second study was drawn using a network sampling method and was biased towards ‘model’ rather than ‘modal’ older Māori. Five broad themes are identified from the literature and discussed in turn. They are:

- demographic dynamics and the implications for policy;
- barriers to service utilisation;
- whānau and intergenerational relations;
- the material disadvantage of older Māori, and;
- cultural diversity.

3.1 Demographic dynamics and the implications for policy

Demographic dynamics such as population ageing are key drivers of social policy. In New Zealand and in other developed countries, much attention has been paid to the specter of structural ageing, and its economic and social implications. Pool has argued that our national preoccupation with structural over numerical ageing “favours Pakeha and disfavours Māori” (2003: 35). This is because Māori population ageing for at least the next 25 years will be driven mostly by numerical change, as the large 1945-1970 birth cohorts reach older ages. When compared to the total New Zealand population, the MEG will remain structurally youthful, even as the number of older Māori dramatically increases. The difference will be especially evident among the “old old”. By mid-century, people aged 85 years and over will make up about a fifth of all New Zealanders aged 65 years or more, but will remain a relatively small proportion of older Māori aged 65 or over.

Pool predicts that the influx of larger cohorts at older ages will have severe impacts on Māori communities by 2021, including increased demands on service providers and families. Pressure on services will derive not only from a greater number of older Māori, but also from their potentially limited financial capacity. By 2021, older Māori will be among those who were disproportionately affected by the restructuring of the late 1980s/early 1990s, and who later became “discouraged workers”⁹. The capacity to build equity is therefore likely to vary across cohorts. Māori who were in their early 20s during the 1980s still have time to recoup some of their losses before reaching retirement, but the next two decades will be critical. In short, many Māori may not take into retirement the amount of equity that most New Zealanders expect to have at old age. Accordingly, Pool concludes that policy will need to be flexible enough to meet the needs of large cohorts at key life-cycle stages, and to roll back provisions once demand ebbs.

While an increase in the number of older, disadvantaged Māori raises legitimate concerns about service provision and fiscal burden etc., there are also positive impacts to be considered. One is the potential for the sharing of cultural responsibilities in communities where kaumātua have been in short supply. Until relatively recently, the potential for older persons to contribute to family and community wellbeing has barely figured in policy discourse (although this has long been an implicit assumption within Māori families and communities). The deficit

⁹ Discouraged workers are jobless people who are available for work but who are not actively seeking it because they believe they have poor prospects of finding a job. They are not among the measured number of unemployed, who are part of the measured labour force.

view of ageing is slowly changing with the introduction of the Government's Positive Ageing Strategy (Ministry of Social Policy 2001) and other strategies facilitating 'ageing in place' and 'ageing well'. And there is good reason for this paradigmatic shift. Older New Zealanders enjoy an unprecedented quality of health compared to their predecessors, largely due to changes in lifestyles and technology (Ministry of Social Policy 2001). This is important for policy areas such as health expenditure, where it is health status rather than age itself that tends to drive health care demand, albeit that the two are highly correlated (Bryant *et al.* 2004).

Improvements in health and life expectation are certainly positive goals, but they also have implications for the future viability of state-sponsored superannuation – an issue that has been the focus of ongoing debate in many developed countries with ageing populations. It is worth noting that despite these improvements, significant gaps persist in the life expectation of Māori and non-Māori at all ages (Statistics NZ 2004). Based on deaths in 2000-2002, a newborn Māori girl could expect to live 73.2 years and a newborn Māori boy 69 years. For non-Māori baby girls and boys, life expectation was 81.9 and 77.2 years respectively. In the context of the superannuation debate, it has been argued that early mortality disadvantages Māori because it reduces the rate of return by lowering lifetime benefits relative to contributions (i.e. taxes). Increasing the age of entitlement to 70 would compound Māori disadvantage because even fewer Māori, particularly Māori men, would live long enough to reap the benefits.

Gaps notwithstanding, it is somewhat misleading to make an argument for lower returns on the basis of life expectation at birth. Because life expectation varies with age, a more appropriate comparison would be to compare life expectation among those eligible to receive a pension. In 2000-2002, Māori women and men who survived to the age of 70 could expect to live, on average, an additional 12.3 and 10 years. For non-Māori women and men it was and 16.2 and 13.3 years respectively. A disparity exists, but one that is markedly smaller than that for life expectation at birth.¹⁰

In planning for an ageing Māori society, it has also been noted that the responsibility lies not only with policy-makers and government agencies, but with Māori themselves through whānau, iwi, and organisations such as tribal rūnanga (councils). In some respects these institutions are well placed to deal with the challenges of an ageing population because of historical practices promoting the integration of older Māori into broader community support structures. One way in which Māori organisations may contribute to the future wellbeing of their older members is by helping to mediate conflict between work, family, and cultural obligations (Durie 1999). The role of kaumātua requires a high level of commitment and active participation in community affairs such as tangihanga (funerals) and hui. Such commitments can be financially and physically taxing, especially in communities where there is a dearth of suitably qualified men and women. Although cultural obligations and sharing are seen as voluntary acts grounded in norms of reciprocity (Robinson and Williams 2001), this need not preclude remuneration in the form of a stipend or non-cash benefit (e.g. low rent, petrol vouchers). Many communities currently have informal arrangements that assist kaumātua, but a more

¹⁰ At age 65, the average life expectation was 16.9 and 12.7 years for Māori women and men; and 20.2 and 15.1 years for non-Māori men and women.

systematic form of compensation may be required in order to make it easier for older Māori to perform a role that provides broader community benefits.

3.2 Barriers to service utilisation

Related to the issue of service provision is the issue of service utilisation, specifically in the vital area of primary and secondary health care. The evidence on the accessibility, affordability, and cultural appropriateness of existing health care services for Māori suggest several areas for improvement.

In reviewing health service utilisation among Māori, Hirini *et al.* (1999) concluded that the “inverse care law” – where those most in need of care were the least likely to receive it – applied to older Māori. Using data from a nationwide study of the health and service utilisation of older New Zealanders, they found that older Māori had a higher level of reported health care need than their non-Māori peers, but reported a lower rate of health service utilisation. The exception was accident and emergency use and hospital admissions. The Oranga Kaumātua study also found a relatively low uptake of disability support among participants, although two thirds reported having a major or minor disability (Te Pūmanawa Hauora 1997).

There are several possible explanations for lower Māori utilisation rates. One is a low level of trust in mainstream health provider institutions. This may derive from unfamiliarity with the formality and rules of bureaucracy (Spellerberg 2001), or a lack of confidence in the ability of formal institutions to provide culturally appropriate care (Hirini *et al.* 1999; Ministry of Health 1997). Feelings of alienation may be more keenly felt by older Māori, because of negative experiences with a public health sector that pre-dated efforts to institute cultural responsiveness.

A second potential factor is poor information and knowledge about entitlements. Here, social networks are important. Having an abundance of “weak ties” or acquaintances that bridge social networks can facilitate access to new and important sorts of information (Granovetter 1983). These bridges are particularly important in dynamic environments, such as the public health sector, where there are frequent changes in rules and service provision. While the social networks of Māori have not been well studied, the anecdotal evidence suggests older Māori are often embedded in constrained, dense networks comprising similar others. Having an abundance of close friends or kin (e.g. “strong ties”) works well on occasions when support is required, but reduces the likelihood of garnering new information (King and Waldegrave 2003).

It has also been suggested that Māori prefer informal or alternative forms of care via kinship networks and community-based services (Durie 1994; Hirini *et al.* 1999). Thus, “family, tribal and community networks may take priority over functional contracts with specified agencies such as health, education or welfare” (Robinson and Williams 2001:56). In the Oranga Kaumātua study however, most participants used GP services, and over 70 percent stated no preference for a Māori over a non-Māori service provider.

Finally, while Government has expended significant effort in broadening the range of Māori and community-based health providers, iwi-based health surveys have found that Māori still have difficulty accessing existing services. Among the perceived barriers are geographical location, lack of financial resources, and unavailability of services (cited in Hirini *et al.* 1999). For older Māori, accessibility is likely to be very important because they are more likely than young Māori, and non-Māori of all ages, to live in rural areas (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999). With an

expanding number of older Māori, sustained efforts will be required to ensure that barriers to service uptake are identified and addressed, and that the services offered are both accessible and affordable.

3.3 Whānau capacities and inter-generational relations

An important implication of an ageing Māori society is how it will impact upon, and be supported by, inter-generational relations. As distinct from the transfer of wealth, the focus here is on the quality of relationships that offer support in old age. In the mainstream literature, such relations are typically conceived as exchanges or transactions that either enhance solidarity or generate conflict. Research in the solidarity tradition highlights shared values, normative obligations, and enduring familial ties, while the conflict tradition highlights isolation, caregiver stress, and family problems. A third approach underscores the ambivalence that parents and adult offspring may feel towards each other as a consequence of how inter-generational relationships are structured. Specifically, ambivalence may exist between the “desire of parents and (adult) children for help, support, and nurturance; and countervailing pressures for freedom from the parent-child relationship” (Lüscher and Pillemer 1998:11). An adult child who assumes the role of caregiver may feel a sense of closeness to a dependent parent, but also feel resentment or stress because of the financial and emotional burden placed upon them. The parent, in turn, may feel ambivalent about receiving care, given the limited scope for reciprocity.

For older Māori with a high level of cultural capital (eg. tribal knowledge, language expertise etc.), the potential for reciprocity may be greater, because their knowledge and guidance is valued in a way that makes the exchange more equitable. This is especially likely if the parent also provides guidance and support to mokopuna. Indeed, several studies have found that older Māori contribute in important ways to the family and community. Three quarters of the older Māori in the Oranga Kaumātua study had provided support for other whānau members, including accommodation, support during illness, and leadership in learning and speaking te reo Māori. In turn, between one third and one half of participants had received care from whānau when necessary. In the living standards study, two thirds of single older Māori and nearly half of older Maori couples had received help from their extended whānau in maintaining their car or house, or with simple household chores.

The importance of inter-generational relations is amplified given Māori population ageing, altered dependency ratios, and the competing demands that may arise when adult children are supporting both an ageing parent and their own children. A relevant issue is whether these dynamics will place additional strains on whānau, or be readily accommodated within existing arrangements. A recent study found the kinds of support given by middle-aged New Zealanders to an ageing parent and an adult child tended to be complementary, rather than competing. Children living in separate households received predominantly financial help from their parent, while elderly parents were much more likely to receive help with daily tasks (Hillcoat-Nallétamby and Dharmalingam 2002). It is unclear however, whether the same dynamics would adhere in cases where all three generations lived in the same household – a scenario that, for reasons of culture, economics, and demographics, is much more likely for Māori and Pacific peoples, than for other ethnic groups. A future challenge will be to capture the broader networks of kin support beyond

simple parent-child dyads, to see how the interplay of familial relations, including conflicting normative structures, has an impact upon individual and collective wellbeing.

3.4 Material disadvantage

One of the key issues that future policies for the aged will need to address is the comparative economic disadvantage of older Māori. On average, elderly Māori experience greater deprivation than older non-Māori, reflecting the general pattern of disparity between Māori and non-Māori at all ages. The living standards study found significant differences in the mean material wellbeing scores of Māori and non-Māori, with material hardship three or four times higher amongst older Māori.¹¹ An ethnic difference remained after factors such as income, savings, and accommodation costs were taken into account, although these factors explained much of the variation.

That ageing is not a leveler of ethnic disparities reflects the tendency of the aged to carry with them the impacts of earlier policies and experiences. Compared to older non-Māori, and Pākehā in particular, Māori generally carry less equity into retirement for reasons that include disrupted work histories, whānau obligations, and lower paying jobs. Most rely on state provision, and face high accommodation costs relative to older Pākehā. The living standards study clearly showed the multi-dimensional nature of Māori disadvantage. The level of material wellbeing was not contingent on a single factor such as income, but reflected the cumulative effects of factors including current financial circumstances (eg. saving and investment levels, accommodation costs), household composition (eg. marital status), exposure to past and present economic stresses, and socio-demographic background. For some Māori, there was the additional factor of family formation because raising many children tends to engender economic disadvantage that carries over into old age.¹² The importance of this and other pre-retirement factors highlights the limitations of using cross-sectional data to understand the endpoint of the life cycle.

The risk of financial hardship in old age is especially high for older Māori women. Elsewhere, researchers have pointed to the effects of ‘double jeopardy’ – when the additive or interaction effects of ethnicity and gender increase the risk of deprivation (Moody 2002). In New Zealand, the higher age-specific death rates for male Māori means most Māori surviving partners are women. For widowed Māori women, their single status, combined with other social and economic factors (e.g., work history) means they are more likely to be impoverished than either married women generally, or widowed Māori men. The potential for inequality also arises with regards to caring demands. Older Māori women often have charge of mokopuna (grandchildren), in addition to being the whānau figurehead if the elder male has died (Ministry of Health 1997). For this sub-group, the prospect of shifting from universal state-sponsored superannuation to a contribution-based system may have especially serious implications given their diminished capacity for self-support.

¹¹ The non-Māori comparison masks some other ethnic differences. Older Pacific Islanders, for example, were disadvantaged relative to Pākehā /Others and Māori.

¹² Although the Total Fertility Rate (TFR) for Māori has decreased dramatically since 1970, it is still significantly higher than the Pākehā TFR (2.6 versus 1.8).

It should be noted, however, that while ethnic disparities exist within the aged population, older persons still tend to be financially better off in terms of wealth than those in the working age population (Fergusson *et al.* 2001). This might seem counter-intuitive to the popular perception of the elderly as a vulnerable group, but makes sense when one considers that older persons have had more time to acquire resources, and that transfers of wealth tend to flow from older to younger generations, rather than vice versa. For policy-makers, it suggests the need to identify specific ways in which the aged are disadvantaged, and the likely factors underlying differences between, as well as within, groups.

3.5 Cultural diversity of older Māori

A recurring theme in the literature is that being culturally secure is a valued outcome or end in itself. The Social Report for example, lists the protection and valuing of Māori culture among the desired outcomes for cultural identity (Ministry of Social Development 2005). Cultural security is also valued as a means to other dimensions of wellbeing. In Māori and mainstream models, strong cultural identity, cultural competence in terms of knowledge and skills, and cultural connectedness, are framed as resources that enhance personal and collective wellbeing (Gee *et al.* 2003; Ministry of Health 1997; Ministry of Social Development 2005). Although rarely articulated, it is often implied that low cultural competence and a weak cultural identity are barriers to personal wellbeing, either because they serve as a basis for social exclusion from networks etc., and/or engender feelings of inadequacy. Yet there are few empirical studies that have actually investigated the relationship between these different dimensions of wellbeing, and the existing evidence tends to be patchy and sometimes inconsistent.

For example, a recent survey of 825 Māori aged 30-79 years drew on the framework of *whare tapa whā* to investigate the relationship between several domains of wellbeing, including life satisfaction, social inclusion, and fluency and satisfaction with *te reo Māori* (Gee *et al.* 2003). Controlling for other factors, satisfaction with *te reo* was found to be positively associated with life satisfaction. Self-reported fluency in *te reo* was also positively associated with other aspects of cultural involvement (e.g. *marae* participation). The authors concluded that raising Māori language fluency may improve life satisfaction.

Although being culturally secure may well have benefits for individuals' personal sense of wellbeing and their relationships, it also seems to be linked with a higher risk of material disadvantage. The living standards study, for example, found a clear trend for a more secure Māori identity to be associated with reduced material well-being.¹³ Older Māori with a secure cultural identity had greater exposure to a host of adverse factors including low income, limited savings and investments, high accommodation costs, greater exposure to past and present economic stress, and a

¹³ The study used a measure of cultural identity developed by researchers from the longitudinal study of Māori households *Te Hoe Nuku Roa*. The measure is a weighted aggregate of scores on seven indicators including *te reo Māori*, *whānau* involvement, knowledge of *whakapapa* (genealogy), and self-identification. Based on their score, individuals are categorised as having either a secure, positive, or notional Māori cultural identity (Cunningham *et al.* 2002). The notion of cultural identity employed in that study is far broader than the more limited ideational notion of identity used in the Figure 1 framework.

larger number of children (Cunningham *et al.* 2002). Although this was likely to rely, in turn, on historical processes such as poor history of asset accumulation and poor health, it was unclear why this association with cultural identity should exist. This conundrum reflects other research on Māori generally, that has found negative associations between material wellbeing and indicators of Māori identity (usually self-reported ethnicity), but no definitive causal mechanisms.

That aspects of wellbeing in te ao Māori are both positively and negatively associated with other dimensions of social wellbeing (te ao whānui), highlights the challenges that policy-makers face in developing services to meet the varied needs of older Māori. The extent to which future generations of older Māori will be integrated into Māori networks, have knowledge of, or even value Māori culture, has implications for the sorts of needs they are likely to have, and the policy approaches best suited to meet them. Important here is the disjuncture between the model (traditional) and modal behaviour of older Māori, and whether the gap will grow or contract.

Given diversity, one of the questions that arises is whether future older Māori elderly will have the necessary skills or desire to assume kaumātua roles (Durie 1999). While older Māori tend to have the highest levels of language proficiency, they are also over-represented among those who are disinterested in Māori language and culture (Gee *et al.* 2003; Te Puni Kōkiri 2002a). The next generation of older Māori may be even less culturally endowed. In the first wave of the longitudinal study of Māori Households, Te Hoe Nuku Roa, only 13 percent of the cohort aged between forty and sixty years were native speakers, and a third spoke no Māori at all. Moreover, a third had no contact at all with a marae, compared to just one tenth of over sixty year olds (Durie 2003:159).

Beyond 2030, the cultural profile of older Māori may change again as it is swelled by those who came of age during the language and cultural initiatives of the so-called Māori renaissance. A national survey of language use found almost half of young Māori aged 15-24 had some degree of proficiency in te reo, somewhat higher than those aged 25-34 years (Te Puni Kōkiri 2002b). Although language is a marker of Māori ethnicity, older Māori who are unable to speak it are not necessarily precluded from participating in Māori cultural life. In the absence of te reo, however, one would have to maintain strong kin ties, and have some degree of cultural knowledge, to participate as a kaumātua. Information about the extent of social inclusion of older Māori in Māori communities, the nature of their participation, and their attitudes towards it, would be useful in planning how to enhance the social wellbeing of older Maori in coming decades.

4. FINAL COMMENTS

This paper has reviewed the conceptual and empirical literature on ageing and wellbeing with three objectives in mind: 1) to identify how the various approaches may be adapted to capture the diverse realities of older Māori; 2) to identify key substantive issues in Māori ageing and the wellbeing of older Māori; 3) to suggest how these issues might affect the circumstances of future older Māori.

The strategy has been to cast a wide net rather than home in on a specific dimension of wellbeing. In reality, however, it is often impracticable for policy-oriented research to address wellbeing in its entirety, and the scope is usually

narrowed to one or two dimensions such as material standard of living or social connectedness. Justifications for these decisions take into account factors such as available resources, population need, policy imperatives, political receptiveness, and the existing knowledge base. This said, the purpose of this paper was not to set the scope of EWAS research, but to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the literature in order to guide future research through focus groups, case studies, and a national survey scheduled for 2006/2007. To assist in this latter task, the following section identifies questions for each of the key areas identified.

4.1 Defining and measuring Māori wellbeing

There are many different ways to conceptualise and measure wellbeing, both within the mainstream and Māori literature. This paper has advocated an integrated approach that conceives of wellbeing as constituted of outcomes within New Zealand society broadly, and Māori society specifically. It recognizes that the relative importance of outcomes in these broad domains will vary between older Māori. Material, non-economic, subjective, objective, and collective dimensions of wellbeing are all seen as important.

Questions:

- What do older Māori perceive as requisites to personal wellbeing in retirement?
- What do older Māori perceive as the barriers to personal and whānau wellbeing?
- What is the strength and nature of the relationship between the wellbeing of individual older Māori and the wellbeing of groups within which they are embedded (eg. whānau, marae; neighbourhood)?
- What aspirations do older Māori have for themselves in terms of economic security; social connectedness (both with mainstream and Māori institutions); whānau life; and culturally defined roles?

4.2 Social connectedness

Social connectedness refers to features of social organisation such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit. For Māori, social connectedness comprises formal associations with organisations outside the whānau, and informal associations within kinship networks. The following questions relate to issues of connectivity, reciprocity, discrimination and trust.

Questions:

- What is the extent and quality of informal associations that older Māori have with other Māori? (e.g. working in the kitchen of the local marae).
- What is the extent and quality of formal associations that older Māori have with Māori organisations? (e.g. marae committee; Māori health provider); and mainstream organisations? (e.g. voluntary associations, ratepayer associations).
- What are the barriers, either real or perceived, to participation in Māori and mainstream social networks?
- What are the expectations for reciprocity in terms of sharing time, resources, knowledge etc.?
- What level of trust do older Māori have in other Māori people and institutions and in people and institutions that are not Māori?

- To what extent do older Māori perceive themselves as having been targets of discrimination, and how are these perceptions related to levels of trust?
- How do older Māori feel about their level of social connectedness, both to Māori communities, and to other kinds of social institutions?

4.3 Demographic issues

Numerical ageing, the greater risk of widowhood for Māori women, over-representation in isolated rural areas, changed dependency ratios, and the diminished capacity of “discouraged workers” are all issues that are likely to bear upon the wellbeing of older Māori until mid-century. Given historical path dependencies (i.e. where contemporary conditions tend to be the outcome of historical processes), the analysis of Māori wellbeing may very well call for a cohort approach.

Questions

- To what extent is wellbeing likely to vary across birth cohorts of Māori?
- What are the implications of cohort differences for the provision of services, both formal and informal?
- What support systems are available to Māori affected by the restructuring of the 1980s? To what extent have they been able to recover their losses in the decade prior to retirement?
- Given that the majority of Māori live in urban areas, to what extent do Māori envisage returning to their rural roots (eg. tribal areas) for retirement? If they do, what are their expectations regarding available support?

4.4 Service utilisation

Given the “inverse care law” (that those most in need of support are the least likely to receive it), concerns about low Maori utilisation rates of health and other kinds of support services remain. Areas to be addressed include affordability, accessibility, the cultural appropriateness of services, institutional discrimination, and perceived barriers.

Questions:

- How satisfied are Māori with the quality of service they receive, both in terms of care and cultural sensitivity?
- What are the barriers, real and perceived, to service utilisation among Māori?
- What kinds of preferences do older Māori have with regard to primary and secondary health care?
- How do older Maori rate their experiences with mainstream and Maori providers of health care and other kinds of support services?
- What are the key sources of information about entitlement and service availability and how reliable are they?

4.5 Whānau capacity and intergenerational relations

The primacy of whānau in Māori society, as well as cultural expectations of caring and reciprocity suggests that whānau may be well equipped to deal with the challenges of an ageing Māori population. However, intergenerational conflicts, diminished whānau capacities and work-caring conflicts (e.g. caring for children and parents) may also create additional stresses in years to come.

Questions:

- What kinds of living arrangements (e.g. multi-generational; own home) do Māori see as desirable in their retirement?
- What kinds of kin-related support networks beyond the immediate whānau (e.g. beyond siblings, spouse and children) are likely to be available?
- How do older Māori feel about receiving and providing different kinds of support?
- How do older Māori see themselves as contributing to the wellbeing of their children, grandchildren etc.?

4.6 Material wellbeing

There is resounding evidence that older Māori face a higher risk of material hardship than older New Zealanders in general. The nature of Māori material deprivation tends to be cumulative and multi-dimensional, involving factors such as lower saving and investment levels, higher accommodation costs, a higher risk of being single, and exposure to past and present economic stresses.

Questions:

- How do older Māori feel about their capacity to cope financially following retirement?
- To what extent is the expectation of labour force participation in older ages a result of choice or necessity?
- What is the relationship between regional or context-specific variation in the wellbeing of Māori and context-specific factors such as community cohesion?
- How are specific aspects of Māori culture (e.g. identity; cultural competence; networks) and aspects of material disadvantage related?

4.7 Cultural roles

Recent research has shown considerable cultural diversity between older Māori. Whether cultural heterogeneity will increase with an expanding number of older Māori, and how this might impact personal and collective wellbeing, are key issues. While Māori communities will have larger pools of persons from which to draw kaumātua, it is not known whether there are sufficient midlife Māori who either possess valued skills, or are prepared to acquire them before they reach kaumātua age.

Questions:

- What are the specific structural conditions and individual circumstances that constrain or encourage older Māori to take on the role of kaumātua?
- What kinds of incentives will be most effective in ensuring that persons with the potential to be kaumātua take on this role?
- To what extent is cultural security in terms of identity, practices, knowledge, and connectedness necessary to ensure older Māori feel good about themselves?
- How will the cultural profile of older Māori change over the next 15 to 45 years?
- What do older Māori perceive to be barriers to achieving cultural security in old age (e.g. to be able to speak Māori or acquire tribal knowledge)?
- How different is the modal older Maori from the model older Māori? Is this difference likely to grow or contract over the next 15 to 45 years?

References

- Bryant, J. *et al.* 2004. "Population ageing and Government health expenditures in New Zealand, 1951-2051". New Zealand Treasury Working Paper 04/14.
- Chapple, S. 2000. "Māori socio-economic disparity", *Political Science* 52(2):101-115.
- Coleman, J. 1994. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Crothers, C. 2002. *A sociographic perspective: Some ways of being Māori. Well-being and disparity in Tamaki-makaurau*. Vol 2. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Cummins, R., R. Eckersley, J. Pallant, J. van Vugt, & R. Misajon. 2003. "Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index", *Social Indicators Research* 64(2):159-90.
- Cunningham, C., M. Durie, D. Fergusson, E. Fitzgerald, B. Hong, J. Horwood, J. Jensen, M. Rochford, & B. Stevenson. 2002. *Nga ahuatanga noho o te hunga pakeke Māori: Living standards of older Māori*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Diener, E. 2000. "Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index", *American Psychologist* 55:34-43.
- _____. 1984. "Subjective well-being", *Psychological Bulletin* 95(3):542-75.
- Diener, E. & E. M. Suh. 2000. *Culture and subjective wellbeing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Durie, M. 2003. *Launching Māori futures*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- _____. 1999. "Kaumātuaatanga reciprocity: Māori elderly and whānau", *New Zealand Journal of Psychology* 28(2):102-106.
- _____. 1994. *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M., E. Fitzgerald, T. King, S. McKinley, & B. Stevenson. 2003. "Monitoring Māori progress. Te Ngahuru: A Māori outcome framework". Paper presented at the Social Policy Research and Evaluation conference – Connecting policy and practice, Massey University, Palmerston North, April 29.
- Fergusson, D., B. Hong, J. Horwood, J. Jensen, & P. Travers. 2001. *Living standards of older New Zealanders: A Technical Account*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

- Flanagan, J. 1978. "A research approach to improving our quality of life", *American Psychology* 33:138-47.
- Gee, S., M. Stephens, T. Higgins, & J. Liu. 2003. "Toku reo, toku mana! Toku reo, toku tuakiri! Toku reo, toku mauri ora! Te reo, ethnic identity and wellbeing", *He Pukenga Korero* 7(2):16-24.
- Granovetter, M. 1983. "The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited", *Sociological Theory* 1:201-233.
- Hillcoat-Nallétamby, S. & A. Dharmalingham. 2002. "Constraints of multi-generational support for those in mid-life – An emerging policy issue?", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 19:128-140.
- Hirini, P., R. Flett, N. Long, M. Millar & C. MacDonald. 1999. "Health care needs for older Māori: A study of kaumātua and kuia", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 13: 136-53.
- Kahneman, D. & A. B. Krueger. 2006. "Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20(1):3-24.
- King, P. & C. Waldegrave. 2003. "Social capital, social networks, and access to employment", *New Zealand Population Review* 29(1):229-44.
- Kukutai, T. 2004. "The problem of defining an ethnic group for public policy: Who is Māori and why does it matter", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 23(Dec):86-108.
- Love, C. & A. Praat. 2004. "Understanding social wellbeing: Māori contributions". Paper presented at *The social policy, research & evaluation conference*, Wellington, 24-26 November.
- Lüscher, K. & K. Pillemer. 1998. "Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life", *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60(2):413-25.
- Ministry of Health. 2004. *Developing a monitoring framework and strategic agenda for He Korowai Oranga*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.
- _____. 1997. *The health and wellbeing of older people and kaumātua: The public health issues*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.
- Ministry of Social Development. 2005. *The social report*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Ministry of Social Policy. 2001. *The New Zealand positive ageing strategy*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Policy.
- Moody, H. 2002. *Ageing: Concepts and controversies*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA:

- Sage Publications.
- Ng, S. & T. McCreanor. 1999. "Patterns in discourse about elderly people in New Zealand", *Journal of Aging Studies* 13(4):473-489.
- Pere, R. 1988. "Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (ed.) *Women in education in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Allen Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.
- Pool, I. 2003. "Ageing, population waves, disordered cohorts and policy", *New Zealand Population Review* 29(1):19-39.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling alone: Collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reid, A. et al. 2003. *Quality of life in New Zealand's eight largest cities 2003*. Auckland: Manukau City Council.
- Richmond et al. 1995. *Care for older people in New Zealand: A report to the National Advisory Committee on Core Health and Disability Services*. Wellington: NACCHDS.
- Robinson, D. 2002. *Building social capital* Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- _____. 1999. *Social Capital in Action*. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- _____. 1997. *Social capital and policy development*. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Robinson, D. & T. Williams. 2001. "Social capital and voluntary activity: Giving and sharing in Māori and non-Māori society", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 17:52-71.
- Richmond, D., J. Baskett, R. Bonita, et al. 1995. *Care for older people in New Zealand: A report to the National Advisory Committee on Core Health and Disability Support Services*. Wellington: National Advisory Committee on Core Health and Disability Support Services.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. 1988. *The April report. Future directions*. Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Spellerberg, A. 2001. *Framework for the measurement of social capital in New Zealand*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Statistics New Zealand. 2004. *New Zealand life tables, 2000-2002*.
- _____. 2003. *National Māori population projections: 2001 (base) – 2021*. Wellington.

- _____. 1998. *Population Projections: Total and Māori 1997-2051*. Christchurch: Statistics New Zealand
- _____. 1997. *Draft framework for the measurement of social capital*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Te Pūmanawa Hauora. 1997. Oranga Kaumātua: The health and wellbeing of older Māori. A report prepared for the Ministry of Health and Te Puni Kōkiri. Unpublished. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2002a. *Survey of attitudes, values and beliefs about the Māori language*. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development/ Te Puni Kōkiri.
- _____. 2002b. *Survey of the Health of the Māori Language. Part I*. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development/ Te Puni Kōkiri.
- _____. 1999. Kaumātua: Fact sheet. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development/Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Waldon, J. 2004. "Oranga kaumātua: Perceptions of health in older Māori people", *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (23): 167-180.
- Xiao Z., & Y. Yany. 2002. *Intergenerational wealth transfer and its impact on Housing*. Boston: Harvard University, Joint Centre for Housing Studies.

Framework 1: Conceptual framework for the wellbeing of older Māori

