

efficacy of the Incredible Years Basic Parent Programme in New Zealand. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 43, 76-79.

Growing Up in New Zealand News. (2015, July 24). *Growing Up study suggests low social service use among vulnerable children*. Retrieved from <http://www.growingup.co.nz/en/news-and-events/news/news-2015/vulnerability-report-2.html>

Hamilton, M. J. (2005). *The Incredible Years in Tauranga: Practitioner perspectives on purposes, processes and prospects*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Hedley, C., Thompson, S., Mathews, K., Pentecost, M., Wivell, J., Stockdale Frost, A., et al. (2012). The B4 School Check behaviour measures: Findings from the Hawke's Bay evaluation. *Nursing Praxis in New Zealand*, 28(3), 13-23.

Hornby, G. (2010). The demise of educational psychology in New Zealand: A personal view. *Psychology Aotearoa*, 2(1), 26-30.

Luthar, S. S. (2006). Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology, Volume three: Risk, disorder, and adaptation* (2nd ed., pp. 739-795). New York: Wiley.

Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. New York: Guilford.

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. J. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Synder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). New York: Oxford University Press.

Matheson, I. (2015, August 31). Re: *The State of Care Report* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.reimaginingocialwork.nz/2015/08/the-state-of-care-report/>

Ministry of Social Development. (2015a). *Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel: Interim Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.msdc.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/cyf-modernisation/interim-report-expert-panel.pdf>

Ministry of Social Development. (2015b). *Terms of reference for the Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel*. Retrieved from <https://www.msdc.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/newsroom/media-releases/2015/cyf-modernisation-tor.pdf>

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2015). *State of care 2015: What we learnt from monitoring Child, Youth and Family*. Retrieved from <http://www.occ.org.nz/state-of-care/>

Sargisson, R., Stanley, P., & de Candole, R. (2013). Quantitative screening strategies to identify new entrant primary-school children with potential difficulties. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 48(1), 66-81.

Sargisson, R., Powell, C., Stanley, P., & de Candole, R. (2014). Predicting motor skills from Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire scores, language ability, and other features of New Zealand children entering primary school. *The Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 31(1), 32-46.

Sargisson, R., Stanley, P., & Hayward, A. (2015, submitted). Multi-informant scores and gender differences on the Strengths and Difficulties

Questionnaire for New Zealand children. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*

Stanley, P. (2003). Risk and resilience: Part 1, Theory. Kairaranga. *The Journal of New Zealand Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour*, 4(1), 4-7.

Stanley, P. (2006a). A case against the categorisation of children and youth. Part 1: Theoretical perspectives. *Kairaranga*, 7(1), 36-41.

Stanley, P. (2006b). A case against the categorisation of children and youth. Part 2: Professional perspectives. *Kairaranga*, 7(2), 36-40.

Stanley, P. (2006c). The problem of seeing the same thing differently. *Social Work Review* 18(3), 92-93.

Stanley, P. (2008). The new multi-ministry response to conduct problems: A swot analysis. *Kairaranga*, 9(1), 13-19.

Stanley, P. (2010a). Youth'07: A swot analysis. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 22(3), 56-64.

Stanley, P. (2010b). The future of educational psychology. *Psychology Aotearoa*, 2(2), 82-83.

Stanley, P. (2011). Insights about resilience in emerging adulthood from a small longitudinal study in New Zealand. *The Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 28(1), 1-14

Stanley P., Rodeka, P., & Laurence, K. (2000). *Guidelines for teachers for the identification of year 7 students at risk for substance abuse and other problem behaviours*. Wellington: Specialist Education Services.

Stanley, P., & Sargisson, R. (2012). Systems of service delivery: A resilience perspective. *The Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 29(2), 129-140.

Stanley, P., & Stanley, L. (2005). Prevention through parent training: Making more of a difference. *Kairaranga*, 6(1), 47-54.

Sturrock, F., Gray, D., Fergusson, D., Horwood, J., Smits, C. (2014). *Incredible Years Follow-up Study*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Viathianathan, R., Maloney, T., De Haan, I., Dare, T., Jiang, N., Dale, C., et al. (2012). *Vulnerable children: Can administrative data be used to identify children at risk of adverse outcomes?* Auckland: University of Auckland.

Viathianathan, R. (2015, May 14). *Economics professor disappointed by limited plans for child abuse prediction tool*. *AUT News*. Retrieved from http://www.news.aut.ac.nz/news/schools/business/economics-professor-disappointed-by-limited-plans-for-child-abuse-prediction-tool?SQ_DESIGN_NAME=business

Webster-Stratton, C. (2009). Affirming diversity: Multi-cultural collaboration to deliver the Incredible Years parent programs. *International Journal of Child Health and Human Development*, 2, 17-32.

Werry, J., Fergusson, D., Church, J., Lambie, I., Langley, J., Liberty, K. (2010). Submission on the Inquiry into the Identification, Rehabilitation, and Care and Protection of Child Offenders. Social Services Select Committee. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.nz/resource/0000104310>

Pesky pronouns in

Dr Raymond Nairn



Ray is a social psychologist with many years' experience in community education and action around Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi). With Waikaremoana Waitoki, Roseanne Black, and Phillipa Pehi, he edited *Ka Tu, Ka Oho: Visions of a Bicultural Partnership in Psychology* published by the NZPsS in 2012. Ray is a Pākehā New Zealander of Scots and English descent who was the NSCBI representative on the Code of Ethics working party (1995-2002) sparking his concern over the relationships between ethics, professional practice, Te Tiriti, and the culture of psychology. Since the late 1980s Ray's research has explored mass media portrayals of persons living with a mental disorder and representations of Māori and Māori issues in mass media.

Article 1 of te Tiriti o Waitangi

In November 2014 the Waitangi Tribunal released Part 1 of Te Paparahi o te Raki report (Wai 1040) in which they concluded that Ngapuhi signatories to Te Tiriti o Waitangi had not ceded their sovereignty. The decision confirms that, as in the Code of Ethics (Comment 1.3.1, 2002, p.6), Te Tiriti o Waitangi is the Treaty. It also confirms, as Ngapuhi speakers insisted, that *He Wakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni* (the Declaration) provides the context for and guide to understanding Te Tiriti. However it does not resolve the problem created by grammatically correct translations of Article 1 of Te Tiriti as instanced in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Article 1 of Te Tiriti

Ko nga Rangatira o te Wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki kihai i uru ki

The Rangatira of the Confederation and all those Rangatira who have not joined

taua Wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu –

the Confederation grant to the Queen of England forever

te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.

all the Governorship (Kawanatanga) of their lands.

An English speaker reading the inter-lined translation is being told that ‘The Rangatira’ granted ‘Governorship of their lands’ to the Queen. It works like that because the translation reads like a form of reported speech - the translator telling us what the Rangatira did – making them the only actor and therefore the obvious possessor of the lands over which Kawanatanga is to be exercised. That interpretation runs counter to the Tribunal finding and that is important because Article 1 is where the Pakeha (Crown, Government) belief that Māori ceded sovereignty has been grounded ever since 1840. In this brief note I am going to present a translation offered by Ngapuhi scholars that removes any ambiguity about whose lands Hobson was allocated to govern (See Healy, Huygens & Murphy, 2012, pp. 197–214 for translations by three Ngapuhi scholars).

However, before presenting that translation I am going to explain why, or how, the translation in Figure 1, although grammatically accurate, misrepresents the situation. Primarily the misrepresentation occurs because the translator followed the style of the English texts in which the actions of parties to the agreement are described. For

example: (Article 1): “The chiefs of the Confederation... cede to her Majesty...”; (Articles 2 and 3): “Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives...”. Unlike those English texts, each article of Te Tiriti has a nominated speaker, as when Article 2 begins: “Ko te Kuini o Ingarani” (the Queen of England..., Nairn, 2007, Figure 3, p. 24). It follows that any pronouns in the article must be read in relation to that speaker. So, when reading Article 1 where the rangatira: “Ko ngā Rangatira ...” (Figure 1), are the nominated speaker(s) we must understand the article, including the crucial pronominal phrase: “...o o ratou wenua”, as being spoken by them.

Further, the phrase, ‘ka tuku rawa atu’ (second line Figure 1) is translated ‘grant...forever’ though ‘tuku’ often means permit or give permission. ‘Tuku’ was used when, in *He Wakaputanga*, the rangatira refused to permit - ‘e kore e tukua matou’ – any [other] group to frame laws or exercise governorship in the lands of Te Wakaminenga without their express permission. As is clear in the Ngapuhi translation (Figure 2, Healy et al, 2012, pp.209-11); Article 1 has the rangatira giving permission for someone other than themselves to frame laws and exercise governorship in “o o ratou wenua” (their lands). If the rangatira had been referring to lands for which they were responsible they would have said, as they did in *He Wakaputanga*, ‘o to matou wenua’ (over our land). Consequently, and the Ngapuhi translation makes this very clear, ‘o o ratou wenua’ refers to “nga wahi katoa o Nu Tireni i tukua ... ki te Kuini” (all the parts of New Zealand given to the Queen) (Nairn 2007, Figure 1, p. 23) - not the entire country (Healy et al, 2012, p. 210-211). Ngā Rangatira were

Figure 2: KO TE TUATAHI The First Article

Ko nga Rangatira o te Wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki kihai i uru ki

The members of the Confederation, and all these leaders who have not joined in

taua Wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu –

that confederation give completely (tuku rawa atu) to the Queen of England for ever

te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.

all the Governorship of their (the Crown's) lands.

permitting Hobson, as the Queen’s envoy, to exercise her authority over her people in those “lands that had been or would be assigned for the use of the Queen and her people” (op. cit. p. 210).

Clearly, Article 1 of Te Tiriti is both permitting the newcomers to govern themselves, according to their own

laws, ethical principles, and institutions as Māori governed themselves according to their tikanga and cultural practices. Ngāpuhi practices included Te Wakaminenga a deliberative body for addressing issues affecting everybody and the rangatira expected Hobson, as rangatira of the hapu hou, to participate enabling the newcomers to be part of the wenua rangatira ('land under authority of tribal leadership' *He Wakaputanga*, Section 3a, op cit p.84). Acceptance of Te Tiriti was driven by the priority Māori accorded relationships and their recognition that the newcomers needed their own territory where they would be responsible for applying their own tikanga in their own way. This understanding of Te Tiriti offers us a template for interactions between peoples in which the dignity of all parties is respected (Nikora, 2012; Nairn, 2007).

References

- Healy, S., Huygens, I., & Murphy, T. (2012). *Ngāpuhi Speaks: He Wakaputanga and Te Tiriti O Waitangi - Independent Report on Ngāpuhi Nui Tonu Claim*. Whangarei: Te Kawariki & Network Waitangi Whangarei.
- Nairn, R. (2007a). Ethical principles and cultural justice in psychological practice. In I. M. Evans, J. J. Rucklidge, & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp.19-33). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Psychological Society.
- New Zealand Psychological Society (2002) *Code of ethics for psychologists working in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Wellington: NZ Psychological Society.
- Nikora, L. W. (2012). *Rangātiratanga and kāwanatanga – resetting our future*. In R. Nairn, P. Pehi, R. Black & W. Waitoki, (Eds.), (pp. 247-260). Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Psychological Society.

Strengthening the Future of Psychology in

Du Villier, T., Earl, T., Feather, J., Howard, F., Lambrecht, I., Soldatovic,

This group is a subset of the Future of Psychology Initiative Coordinating Group who represent various sectors of psychology, workforce development, university training programmes, DHBs, PHOs and private psychology practice as well as health and clinical psychology.

Future of Psychology Initiative Coordinating Group

Anita Bellamy, Epenesa Olo-Whaanga, Fiona Howard, Helen Lenihan, Ingo Lambrecht, Iris Fontanilla, Jackie Feather, Julian Reeves, Kerry Gibson, Malcolm Stewart, Marleen Verhoeven, Mike Butcher, MIMOZA Soldatovic, Nigel George, Tina Earl, Trish Du Villier, Willem Louw

Introduction:

The Future of Psychology Initiative was started to ensure that psychology remains a **robust, resilient, and relevant** profession in New Zealand. It has a particular focus on the health services, but may also be relevant to other social service areas. This initiative involves psychologists from a range of practice areas, ethnicities and service types. It includes practitioners and academics, and members of the New Zealand Psychological Society and the New Zealand College of Clinical Psychologists. It began in Auckland with colleagues who have shared similar concerns about psychology in the health sector for some years. The Future of Psychology Initiative has consulted at national forums and with psychologists from other social service sectors, and is keen to involve the professional organisations and psychologists from all areas in Aotearoa in the work to fulfil the overarching goal above.

The Future of Psychology Initiative's previous article *Psychology in Aotearoa – where are we going?* (Bellamy, Feather, Gibson, Howard & Lambrecht, 2014) invited your engagement with a series of questions about our profession's future. In this paper we bring you a summary of this dialogue to date and recent actions arising from it. We also propose the next steps and seek your involvement in actions to ensure and enhance the robust future of psychology.

What Have We Done? Defining the Issues and Strategies

In the past two years, members of the Future of Psychology Initiative have met, discussed, consulted, and planned. We have held local and national workshops, including at the 2014 NZPsS conference in Nelson, the 2015 NZCCP conference, and workshops in Auckland in 2014 and 2015. The earlier workshops explored the issues related to psychology maintaining and increasing its robustness, resilience, and relevance, and began generating strategies

to address these issues. Small and large group discussions at the initial workshop (involving approximately 70 psychologists) identified the challenges facing psychology in the health and social service sectors, as well as potential mitigating strategies and actions. These were further discussed, expanded, and refined at the two subsequent professional association conference workshops (NZPsS and NZCCP) which were attended by approximately 50 and 70 people respectively. Eight major themes emerged from the issues discussed and,