

# Retention of Māori Staff Within the Ministry of Health

September 2002

Prepared by NAVIGATE



Phone: 0800 4 NAVIGATE (0800 462 844)

E-mail: [office@navigate.co.nz](mailto:office@navigate.co.nz), Website: [www.navigate.co.nz](http://www.navigate.co.nz)

NAVIGATE... success is now a matter of course

# Retention of Māori Staff in the Ministry of Health

## Format of Report

This Report contains:

- ▶ Executive Summary
- ▶ Recommendation Summary
- ▶ Background
- ▶ Survey findings
- ▶ Appendix 1: Interview Questions
- ▶ Appendix 2: Motivation Theory

## Executive Summary

The Ministry of Health wants to take steps to improve the retention of Māori staff, through identifying what encourages them to stay or to leave, and making appropriate changes to reduce 'avoidable' turnover/ the implications for HR practice within the Ministry. In January 2001 the Ministry and Health Funding Authority formally merged, followed by the devolution of contracting functions to District Health Boards in mid 2001. These changes contributed to a loss of Māori staff to the Ministry. Turnover continued for a period at a level sufficient to cause concern, given that the pool of available talent is limited, and the knowledge of experienced Māori staff is critical to the work of the Ministry in achieving its commitments.

Internationally, retention of knowledge workers is a major issue, and organisations are having to review work structure, organisation and job design, leadership and management practices, organisation culture and environment, to create organisations that attract and retain such people.

In Aotearoa New Zealand we are recognising that the organisational responses for generic knowledge workers may not be the complete answer for Māori staff, and that specific culturally appropriate measures are also required.

For the Ministry, these factors are exacerbated by the labour market scarcity of qualified Māori, and many competing opportunities for them.

The key findings of the survey are:

- ▶ The key drivers for many Māori Ministry staff are
  - the need for affiliation and collective success, and
  - the achievement of a higher purpose, often articulated as measurable improvement in Māori health status.
- ▶ There is a cultural gap between Māori and non-Māori staff in the Ministry. This gap is often invisible to non-Māori staff. Most Māori staff report feeling culturally compromised at work. They feel lip service is paid at times to Māori protocols.



- ▶ Māori staff report being 'head hunted' at regular intervals which means that the incentive to stay has to be higher than the pull to go. The Ministry must make itself more attractive to retain them.
- ▶ There is a need to support leadership and management in the Māori Health Directorate.
- ▶ The merger of the Health Funding Authority and the Ministry still has some 'unfinished business' which requires further work for successful merging of the two organisations.
- ▶ All staff interviewed value:
  - tangible improvement for Māori health, tangible improvement for the health of all;
  - positive opportunities for personal growth;
  - an environment where morale and high degrees of trust exist;
  - strong respect for leadership;
  - feeling valued;
  - climate of fun and humour;
  - adequate resources;
  - work flexibility;
  - high quality feedback.

## Summary of Main Recommendations

- 1 Review the Ministry's current initiatives (ie Framework for Building Māori Capacity and Capability, Te Rito, Māori competencies, and recruitment guide for managers) against the issues in this review, identify what the initiatives will address and where there may still be needs. Formulate a clear communication strategy on the above initiatives, so staff are aware of the Ministry's initiatives and the intentions behind them.
- 2 Workshop with staff the options for increasing culturally supportive activities and environmental changes which will "normalise" being Māori in the Ministry.
- 3 Examine HR systems and management practices from the point of view of affiliative working and collective success. This should determine if collective success is rewarded, and decide if collective targets, milestones and results can be achieved and accommodated.
- 4 Identify what support for leadership and management is required, e.g. assess resources, systems, practices, workflows, and processes in the Māori Health Directorate in relation to Directorate outputs and make recommendations for improvement.
- 5 Note that the Ministry needs to be aware that, following the merger of the Ministry and HFA, there are still issues around the degree of cultural cohesion in those Directorates where this is important.
- 6 Undertake a further review in 1 year to assess and recognise progress.



## Background

The Ministry of Health wanted to know what made Māori staff stay, and what encouraged them to leave the Ministry. The pool of people skilled in both 'hard skills' required for positions, and versed in tikanga Māori is acknowledged by the Ministry as small, and the Ministry is keen to manage recruitment and retention risks. The Ministry acknowledges Māori staff as key to its knowledge resource, to enable contribution to the improvement of Māori health and meeting the Government's Treaty of Waitangi objectives.

Despite the increased number of Māori managers in the Ministry over the last 3 years (currently 12 positions), identifiable Māori staff have dropped from 10.8% in December 2000 to 8.3% at 30 June 2002 (although some of this can be attributed to the overall change in demographics in the organisation following the merger between the Health Funding Authority and the Ministry and some relates to EEO data not having been fully captured when the two HR information systems were transferred to one). It is worth noting the two organisations had very different cultures, roles and relationships.

The Māori Health Directorate has operated without full staffing since before the merger. The Directorate has a unique role in the Ministry, and routinely carries out reactive and often urgent work to assist other Directorates. This significantly complicates work-flow for the Directorate.

This enquiry needs to be seen within an international context where recruitment and retention of knowledge workers is a significant issue, which is causing many organisations to review their work design, organisation structure, culture, HR policies and practices, and leadership and management styles.

This is driven by (a) a limited pool of knowledge workers for whom organisations must compete, and (b) the characteristics of knowledge workers themselves, and the way they prefer to work. Even if scarcity did not give them additional power, knowledge workers would be changing the organisations they work in.

In the New Zealand context, Māori knowledge workers are a scarcer part of a scarce labour pool. Māori graduates are 5% of University graduates<sup>1</sup>.

There is competition for their services within the public sector and NGOs, and increasingly in corporate NZ. They are also in demand from the emerging Māori development sector, and from home.

Just as knowledge workers in general have preferences for the way that they work, organise, are led and managed, which are different to some of the traditional organisational models, a number of previous studies have indicated that Māori staff have preferences which are not always met in our organisations. Like other knowledge workers they are in a position, both through their abilities and awareness, and through their value, to expect changes or to take other choices.

---

<sup>1</sup> NZ Vice Chancellors Report 2001 – on 2000 statistics.



This study then looks specifically at the motivating factors and work conditions that matter to Māori knowledge workers who currently work within the Ministry, and who have left over the last two years. The emerging body of thinking on knowledge workers in general was used as a base to look at the specific experiences and preferences of Māori knowledge workers and draw some conclusions and recommendations.

## Survey Sample Size, Timeframe and Methodology

The methodology for the survey was face-to-face interviewing of 29 current staff members and 6 ex staff members. The interviews took place over a 3 ½ week period (June/July 2002), and over 30 hours of interviewing was involved. The DDG Māori Health was not interviewed. All Directorates within the Ministry are included in the sample. A geographic spread is also represented.

The questionnaire designed by NAVIGATE and the Ministry is attached as Appendix 1. Participants were also asked if they wished to add anything relevant that the questions did not include. In the majority of cases, the questionnaire was emailed ahead to participants before interview.

Comprehensive notes were taken, and read back at interview end to allow participants to check accuracy of recording and to expunge anything which might identify them.

In analysing the results, we looked for:

1. The 'push' and 'pull' factors. (What encourages Māori staff to leave and what continues to attract them to stay).
2. Themes emphasised by staff
3. What factors are similar to or differ from general local and international trends.
4. What the Ministry can do to encourage Māori staff to stay.

It was not within our brief to assess leadership performance against its contracted outcomes, or compare what Māori staff had to say with the views of other Ministry staff. For example, 40% of interviewees expressed significant satisfaction in their work, but there is nothing to allow comparison with the rest of the Ministry.

## Survey Findings

The analysis of findings is grouped here in the following order:

Themes, the 'pull' factors, the 'push' factors, themes emerging from staff interviews, local and international trends, and what the Ministry can do to encourage staff to stay.

### Themes

Most interviewees (85%) stated or implied they worked for other than monetary gain. This is in line with other studies. Not unexpectedly, Māori staff members want to make a difference to Māori health status, and see working at the Ministry as a way to make this contribution.



40% of the 'stayers' expressed significant satisfaction in their work.

Dual accountability for Māori in the Ministry is a significant issue (as it is in the Public Service in general). This refers to the tension of trying to simultaneously serve a Minister of the Crown and the Māori community.

Māori staff acknowledge that the Ministry cannot deliver on all community expectations. However, staff also said, "Māori health issues" were not perceived as being well integrated with the Ministry's wider health goals and were seen to be an 'add on'.

Both the current and ex-staff groups were consistent in their feeling that the Ministry needed to improve the corporate climate to make Māori ways of being in the workplace "normal". There is a 'cultural gap' experienced by most interviewed for this survey. A 'cultural gap' refers to differences in preferred ways of working; individual identity and norms - eg Māori particularly emphasise creating, maintaining and honouring relationships (inside and outside work). The gap is thought to be generally invisible to non-Māori staff.

Around half of the surveyed staff emphasised the affiliation factor as a key life driver. Affiliation refers to the preference for working in a group, with others similar to oneself.<sup>2</sup> In practical terms, it translates to a need for collective success. This may be part of the cultural gap; knowledge workers in general are more likely to have a preference for individual achievement.

All those interviewed who no longer work at the Ministry said they left because it was time to move on. The emphasis was on personal journey, and having more to learn or contribute elsewhere. Four (out of six) said a lack of leadership influenced their decision to leave.

Those working in the Māori Health Directorate identified issues of 'overwhelm' (mainly related to work load) and perceived lack of leadership in managing the complex environment. It is interesting to note criticism of the Māori Health Directorate leadership style sometimes comes from those who have not actually worked inside the Directorate itself, and do not have actual knowledge of the complexity and workload experienced there. Certainly, the Directorate operates, understaffed, in a complex environment where it is bound to respond to multiple requests simultaneously.

Individuals who appear to have a high degree of personal maturity combined with strong opportunities to progress in a rewarding career, seem best able to balance the many competing factors of the complex environment.

All staff interviewed would value:

- ▶ tangible improvement for Māori health, tangible improvement for the health of all;
- ▶ positive opportunities for personal growth;
- ▶ an environment where morale and high degrees of trust exist;
- ▶ strong respect for leadership;
- ▶ feeling valued;

---

<sup>2</sup> For a reference on affiliation, see Appendix 2. See also "Recruiting Māori and Pacific Graduates: Challenges for The Public Service" – Emily McDonough, Draft MPP Research paper, June 2002 at P.40



- ▶ climate of fun and humour;
- ▶ adequate resources;
- ▶ work flexibility;
- ▶ high quality feedback,

### **'Pull' Factors**

'Pull' factors attract and contribute to keeping Māori staff working at the Ministry:

(\* indicates typical knowledge worker motivators)

- ▶ Feeling valued and supported
- ▶ Trusted to perform well\*
- ▶ Enjoying high quality feedback\*
- ▶ Feeling part of a high performing, skilful team\*
- ▶ Feeling individual and team contribution and skills are recognised, encouraged and rewarded\*
- ▶ Loyalty to the team
- ▶ Collegiality with colleagues (affiliation)
- ▶ Adequate resources to do the job\*
- ▶ Positive opportunities for personal growth\*
- ▶ A stable work environment
- ▶ A climate of fun and humour
- ▶ Strong leadership based on honouring a team model of working
- ▶ Feeling Māori issues were taken seriously, and Māori culture is normal
- ▶ Feeling there is freedom to move in the ways that work is done (e.g. choosing methodology or working from home). This is experienced as being trusted to work for the benefit of the Ministry wherever you are.\*

### **'Push' Factors**

'Push' factors may encourage staff to leave the Ministry:

(These are clustered into general operational concerns and specific concerns related to commitment to Māori, cultural environment etc)

#### ***Operational***

- ▶ More attractive options elsewhere (100% of those who have left).
- ▶ Lack of leadership in immediate environment and throughout the Ministry (100% of those who have left, and at least 65% of those who remain).
- ▶ Experiencing strong political pressure (said by those who had worked in the Health Funding Authority, which might suggest that those staff have not yet become acclimatised to the different environment).
- ▶ Feeling undervalued (an absence of positive feedback soon after work is done).
- ▶ Feeling overwhelmed by accumulated pressures (deadlines, changing priorities, ad hoc work).
- ▶ Confused or absent communication when tasks and projects are assigned; particularly where a change was made to the brief.
- ▶ Lack of clear guidance in defining tasks and work-flow; times changing.



### ***Māori-focussed***

- ▶ Lack of faith in the individual's ability to make a difference for Māori health. (Inability to connect work performed to measurable improvement for Māori health status).
- ▶ Feeling the environment is alien and the working environment is culturally compromising. (Leave your values at the door).<sup>3</sup>
- ▶ Māori concepts and ways of being need to be constantly explained; Māori issues are invisible to others. (About 80% of all those interviewed)
- ▶ Lack of support and understanding for Māori ways of working and for uniquely Māori issues. (Examples of these issues are unclear boundary between Māori and the State in considering Māori cultural and intellectual property; determining the effect of core business on Māori communities; the entrenchment of negative views of Māori in the fundamental conceptualisation underlying policies and procedures; advocacy boundaries).<sup>4</sup>

### **Comparison with the Public Sector Māori Recruitment and Retention Project**

We were interested to assess how much of what was found in this survey response was unique to the Ministry, and what was reported across the public service. In particular we noted the Māori Recruitment and Retention Project – A Report to the Chief Executives Forum, by Gardiner and Parata,<sup>5</sup> and compared findings.

The key points that this Survey and the Gardiner and Parata Report had in common were:

- ▶ The Ministry was generally found to be culturally compromising (e.g. having to leave your values at the door) and a minority used the word 'unsafe'.
- ▶ There was a constant need to explain what it means to be an individual Māori working on Māori health issues within the Ministry.
- ▶ A Māori way of working e.g. openly acknowledging their links and relationships with others was not generally understood in the Ministry.

Notwithstanding these factors, Māori staff remain committed to the higher purpose of Māori health. The commitment to the cause is greater than to the Ministry itself – again this is not unexpected.

### **Other Survey Findings**

*Mentoring* - Most people did not have strong views on whether or not they wanted a mentor, but did say a number of them have informally arranged their own mentors anyway. Where there was an opinion on mentoring, it was repeated that a mentor had to be appropriate, chosen by the person being mentored, and paid at consultancy rates.

*On becoming a mentor* people said that it would add to their personal satisfaction, rather than job satisfaction.

---

<sup>3</sup> The points made here about cultural compromise reinforce those made by Gardiner and Parata in 'Māori Recruitment and Retention Project – A Report to the Chief Executives Forum', May 1998

<sup>4</sup> Ethical issues from "Māori And The State: Professional And Ethical Implications For The Public Service" by Dr M H Durie, Department of Māori Studies, Massey University. 1993

<sup>5</sup> Report by Gardiner and Parata Ltd. May 1998.



There was appreciation of the *complexity of what the Ministry does*. The answers included improving health for all, reducing inequality, balancing a number of competing objectives, working through constant change, providing a quality service to the Minister, and to provide sector leadership.

*Feeling clear about role and responsibilities* within the Ministry, and confidence in ability to carry them out. The answers reflected the time people had been in their jobs, as would be expected with the general population. There were no specific issues raised here which need attention in addition to the amount of ad hoc work raised earlier in relation to the feelings of overwhelm experienced. The answers served to give an overall impression on push and pull factors.

*Confidence in team skills and abilities* - the comments to note from these responses related to the requests for up-skilling in management skills, particularly the giving of clear instructions, clear communication, consistency of treatment by managers, display of trust by managers, depth of knowledge of tikanga Māori by managers, willingness of managers to 'fight' for important issues.

Whether or not there was *high quality feedback* is seen as closely linked to the skill of managers to manage well. Where a manager was seen as competent, high quality feedback went with the territory. (High quality feedback is not merely on a job well done, but includes constructive suggestions at appropriate times). Once again, research indicates knowledge workers want to produce outcomes which are rewarded.

The Ministry was seen as *very well resourced* physically.

Few staff say they are *actively looking* for jobs outside the Ministry, but all say they are sometimes approached from outside the Ministry with job possibilities.

Staff members had varying reactions to whether or not they were *proud to work for the Ministry*. It was said several times that there was no pride when fronting up to the community and delivery could not meet community expectations. There was pride where it was felt the Ministry had got it right, and the community was being well served.

## Comment

In the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, a significant change in employment expectations occurred. There is now a climate of contracting for as long as it suits both parties. Long term commitment is generally no longer expected, on either side.

Workers are now effectively their own bundle of transferable skills and must continually develop and market them.

Knowledge workers as a defined group have developed within that environment. Therefore, knowledge workers must have constant opportunities to continue to grow their knowledge and marketability. Knowledge workers are thought generally to have strong achievement orientation, and some power needs. (Often power *to* rather than power over).

Studies on motivation and connections between motivation and job satisfaction and job satisfaction and retention have been extensive since the 60s. More recently, individual differences have been acknowledged, with motivating factors influenced by gender, ethnicity,



socialisation, environment, and generational factors. Some of the relevant models are outlined in Appendix 2.

In general, knowledge workers are seen to be motivated by opportunities for growth (both for the personal pleasure of exploring one's potential, and to aid future marketability); autonomy, to be able to apply their knowledge and skills; and appropriate direction, to have a field within which to do that.

The interviews generally confirmed these international trends, except that the affiliation need is stronger.

The comments around leadership and management are to be expected. Generally much is expected of managers by knowledge workers. In the policy sector in New Zealand, roles where the manager is also the "thought leader", "super-analyst" and manages external political relationships add to the demand and complexity of the role. Typically in organisations we have reviewed, Māori staff groups also have a cross-organisation role for trouble shooting and advice, which puts them in a position of responding to internal calls for help, to the detriment of their work plan. In Ministries, there are similar calls for immediate response from the political arena.

To confound the work pressures further, given the scarcity of Māori analysts there is in many organisations the need to promote Māori staff into management positions relatively early in their career. In the Ministry, these factors are exacerbated by the need to manage the ongoing impacts of the merger, and the stresses of being under-staffed.

There is a further factor which appears to be present through the interviews. We have observed that as more people are seeking for and valuing the ability to make a meaningful contribution in their work, new dynamics are emerging<sup>6</sup>. People will be attracted to an organisation where they believe their commitment to a purpose can be usefully expressed. That commitment to purpose is a strength while the organisation and the individual are in alignment. If there is a difference over how the purpose should be achieved, it can lead to a breakdown in the relationship. The comments about political pressures are important here.

There is an important cluster of comments around specific issues that relate to current larger debates on tino rangatiratanga, intellectual property etc. (Eg unclear boundary between Māori and the State in considering Māori cultural and intellectual property; determining the effect of core business on Māori communities; the entrenchment of negative views of Māori in the fundamental conceptualisation underlying policies and procedures; advocacy boundaries.)

There are competing desires. One is for pakeha and organisations to better understand and appreciate Māori ways of doing things – and for this to reduce the call on Māori staff to intervene, translate, coach etc. Simultaneously, there is a concern to avoid cultural appropriation and colonisation, and to maintain and protect Maori intellectual property. This can be confusing for well-meaning pakeha and organisations – and needs to be handled with a lot of dialogue to create understanding.

---

<sup>6</sup> Lane 2002



Dual accountability has been well-discussed – but is still difficult in the real-politik of public sector/community relationships and partnerships.

Internationally there is a lot of work and thinking about partnership models – but several levels lower than a Treaty-based partnership. NAVIGATE believes that Aotearoa NZ is going to need to develop its own thinking about how the public sector responds.

How much does this impact on retention within the Ministry? We speculate that it is a background issue: it does not differentiate the Ministry as an employer from any other public sector organisation. It may cause people to go to less complicated environments – eg working directly in communities with a single accountability to that community, or into a commercial environment and saving their “higher purpose” drive for their personal life. There have been suggestions that there is less conflict for people working in the regions (eg closer to the community) but this study did not focus on that. This whole area needs further, wider research.

**In the New Zealand context, the following have been found to define a popular workplace:<sup>7</sup>**

- ▶ A strong sense of alignment to a unifying vision (a feeling of community)
- ▶ Values that strongly emphasise looking after people (treating them fairly and with respect)
- ▶ Energy, enthusiasm and a sense of fun
- ▶ A variety of rewards and recognition where contributions are acknowledged and success celebrated
- ▶ Open and honest communication
- ▶ Investment in staff training and development
- ▶ Willingness to involve people in decision making and encouraging individual responsibility

Where there was job satisfaction within the Ministry, these factors were largely present. They provide some indicators to measure how attractive a Directorate is to staff.

**What Can The Ministry Do To Retain Māori Staff?**

The previous paragraph lists factors found to attract New Zealand workers generally. No evidence was found that Māori staff do *not* want to experience these sorts of things in the work place. Our research suggests they expect these conditions, and have the general preferences of other knowledge workers. As this is “mainstream” HR for the Ministry, our recommendations focus on the factors specifically relating to being a Māori staff member of the Ministry.

These address the additional ‘pull’ factors discussed earlier such as opportunities to affiliate with other Māori, to have Māori ways of being in the work accepted as normal, and to be able to make a difference to Māori, and general, health.

---

<sup>7</sup> Unlimited Magazine February 2002 at P.36



## 1. Building on what's underway

There was an almost universal feeling that the Ministry could do better at:

- ▶ Normalising Māori ways of being in the workplace and accommodating some rituals important to Māori
- ▶ Integrating Māori health issues into the body of the Ministry's work instead of being an 'add on'
- ▶ Reflecting the Māori client base with Māori staff, and ways of working
- ▶ Assisting Māori staff to clarify their boundaries (around dual accountabilities) with clients, staff members and other stakeholders –eg they need a safe place to be when they return from demanding community members.
- ▶ Creating a process (or resource) across the Ministry for clarifying and explaining Māori protocols and language to relieve staff from the continuous interruptions and enquiries from other Directorates.
- ▶ Understanding Māori values such as whakapapa (lineage) and what this means when dealing with clients and stakeholders.
- ▶ Providing access to Māori experts for both work content and working within the Ministry environment.
- ▶ Giving increased weight during general recruitment to support the promotion of improved Māori health
- ▶ Taking challenges on Māori tikanga seriously eg Māori staff members find their assertions on Māori views are often dismissed without fair consideration by non Māori.

The Ministry has several initiatives in progress which will address some of these things. The recently finalised Building Māori Capability and Capacity Plan includes the development of specific Māori competencies in position profiles and performance agreements; the availability and further development of Te Rito, the on-line training resource on the Treaty of Waitangi and cultural issues; continued provision of scholarships for Māori graduates, and much more. Significant progress has been made on implementing a number of initiatives in the plan, to the point where NAVIGATE is unaware of any other state agency which has implemented such a range of activities to build and enhance it's Māori capacity and capability.

*We recommend* that the Ministry:

- ▶ maps its initiatives against the above requirements. That will enable the Ministry to then:
- ▶ explicitly articulate how the initiatives will move the organisation in the desired direction
- ▶ identify the requirements that are *not* addressed by the initiatives-in-progress and require separate attention.

## 2. 'Normalising' Māori ways of being

NAVIGATE has observed workplaces where there are initiatives which seek to 'normalise' Māori ways of being. These include a Māori caucus which includes daily karakia at the beginning of the working day (15 minutes of prayer), kapa haka (about an hour a fortnight for ceremonial practice), the sharing of meals, and, at times, heated debate. At least one worksite has a dedicated space for the caucus which is pleasant, and physically integrated with the workplace. In interviews, aspects of such initiatives were mentioned. While accommodation is an issue for the Ministry, some other initiatives may be possible.



*We recommend* the Ministry workshop with staff the options for increasing culturally supportive activities and environmental changes which will “normalise” being Māori in the Ministry.

### **3. Affiliation Drive**

A key finding was the strength of the drive for affiliation and collective success – which is likely to be different from the Ministry as a whole. This has implications for both working style, and for HR systems such as performance recognition.

*We recommend* an examination of HR systems and management practices from the point of view of affiliative working and collective success. This should determine if collective success is rewarded, and decide if collective targets, milestones and results can be achieved and accommodated.

### **4. Leadership and Management**

The ideal is leadership and management which supports the needs of knowledge workers in general and Māori staff in particular, while meeting the needs of the Ministry. This needs to be accomplished in an external demand-driven environment – and where issues of dual accountability and commitment to purpose are a vital part of the picture.

There are clear calls from staff for greater guidance and direction, management of ad hoc tasks which adversely affect workload, and the creation of a climate of fun and respect. Research indicates that improving management of workflow (eg ad hoc tasks) will remove a demotivating factor, and take satisfaction to a neutral place from which to build. The same research indicates that climate creation, guidance and direction will increase staff satisfaction.<sup>8</sup> A positively viewed style of supervision is therefore critical to staff retention.

As there are signs of overwhelm in the Māori Health Directorate, systems, practices, workflows and processes should be assessed to determine how the leadership and management can be supported, if in fact extra support is required now that the directorate is almost fully staffed.

Individual staff qualities are also important – where there are great variations in the skills, maturity and experience of staff, managing is more complex. Those interviewees who feel they manage the complex pressures well, demonstrate that individuals with a high degree of maturity (age is irrelevant to this) and self assurance find it easier to adapt to the complex work environment. Given the small labour market, compromises will be inevitable, but recruitment emphasis on individual adaptability and maturity is likely to be helpful.

*We recommend* the DDG Māori Health identifies what support for leadership and management is required.

---

<sup>8</sup> Herzberg – see appendix



## 5. Transitional Issues

Even for those of us who “know” how long such things take, the time and effort it takes to merge two organisation cultures is often underestimated. There are indications that staff who came from the HFA still experience the environment as occasionally difficult – especially in the area of managing the political environment.

More understanding of the environment is likely to assist. This may include an internal communication strategy, perhaps with lunch-time lectures from visiting experts, and experiential opportunities to appreciate the role of the Ministry. It may also indicate a need for team-building to assist in bridging the cultures.

The focus of this survey was Māori retention, and the implementation of current Ministry initiatives may well go some way to creating a culture more acceptable to Māori staff. We are unable to tell to what extent the transition is incomplete across the Ministry as a whole.

However, the Ministry needs to be aware that, following the merger of the Ministry and HFA, there are still issues around the degree of cultural cohesion in those Directorates where this is important.

## 6. Further review

Over the years, the public sector has undertaken a number of studies on how to make organisations more attractive and appropriate for Māori staff. These appear to be episodic – or at least there is no evidence of tracking of the implementation of the recommendations, or their impact. For changes to have their full effect, it is important that the people who are concerned have the opportunity to reflect on what has changed, and consider the next steps.

*We recommend* that a further review be undertaken with the Māori Health Directorate in 1 year to assess and recognise progress. This is particularly so as many initiatives are recently begun, and staff levels have only just increased.

## Conclusion

It would be wise to conduct further enquiry in one year’s time to determine what progress has been made in implementing Ministry initiatives.

International and local research shows Ministry staff have views consistent with knowledge workers generally; it is critical to provide opportunities for personal growth and maintain a satisfying environment to retain them.



## Appendix 1: Interview Questions

- 1 How long have you worked in your current role at the Ministry of Health (MOH)/in MOH &/or the Health Funding Authority?
- 2 How do you describe your role at the MOH? (policy, etc)
- 3 What do you think MOH is trying to accomplish?
- 4 Do you feel clear about your role and responsibilities within MOH?
- 5 Do you feel confident about your skills and abilities to carry out your role and responsibilities?
- 6 Are you confident about the skills and abilities of those in your team to carry out their role and responsibilities?
- 7 Do you have all the resources you need to do your job effectively?
- 8 Does your job give you: a) the opportunity to use all your skills? b) Clear focus about what you are accomplishing? c) Opportunities to grow and extend yourself?
- 9 Relative to others, do you feel you are adequately rewarded? (pay, positive feedback)
- 10 Would a mentor assist you to do your job better? Can you think of other things that might assist you to do your job better?
- 11 Does it add to your job satisfaction to BE a mentor?
- 12 How do you experience MOH as a place to work?
- 13 Does the person you report to treat you with respect?
- 14 Is there clear leadership and direction?
- 15 Do you get high quality feedback? Where from?
- 16 Can you make enough decisions about how you work?
- 17 Do you enjoy your colleagues?
- 18 What keeps you working for MOH? Have you applied for jobs elsewhere?
- 19 Are you proud to work for MOH?
- 20 Would you encourage others to work for MOH?
- 21 How do you compare MOH to other places you have worked?
- 22 Do you feel Māori staff have different issues to other MOH staff? How are these handled? Is it getting easier or harder?
- 23 Thinking about the year ahead, what would make a difference for you in your work?

### For those who have gone, the above in past tense, plus:

- ▶ Was there one reason you left working at MOH, or were there a cluster of reasons? (Was it cumulative?)
- ▶ Was there something MOH might have done to keep you working there?
- ▶ Did you learn things at MOH that are proving valuable now that you have left?



## Appendix 2: Motivation Theories

We used some key theories to consider factors raised by the interviewees. The theories included:

Herzberg's Hygiene Factors and Motivating Factors. <sup>9</sup>The Hygiene Factors will remove job dissatisfaction, and *do not* contribute to performance or motivation. They are likely to be quoted as ('push factors') in reasons for leaving. The Motivating Factors cause satisfaction, and are likely to be cited as reasons for staying – or reasons for moving to another job that appears to offer more ('pull factors').

Hygiene Factors:  
Pay, style of supervision, status, security, working conditions, Co. policy

Motivating factors:  
Achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, the work itself, growth

Hackman and Oldham's Task Characteristics Model. <sup>10</sup>This says that, assuming an employee has a reasonably high internal motivation towards growth (a safe assumption in knowledge workers) then a job that has certain characteristics is likely to be satisfying.

Motivating potential score =  
 $(\text{Skill variety} + \text{task significance} + \text{task identity}) \times \text{Feedback} \times \text{Autonomy}$ <sup>11</sup>

Vroom's Expectancy Theory <sup>12</sup> which looks at the relationship between motivation and the expectation that performance can produce a valued outcome producing a reward. Knowledge workers are generally achievement oriented, and if their efforts do not produce a rewarded outcome, they become disenchanted.

Equity theory <sup>13</sup> which looks at the way people compare their effort and reward with those they consider similar. Again – dissatisfaction here is likely to be a 'push' factor.

Overlaid on those theories, there are elements of individual difference. Personal patterns of reference differentiate between people who have an 'away from' motivation pattern, and those who have a 'towards' pattern. <sup>14</sup> People with a primary 'away' motivation are likely to choose to move from a job when, despite their efforts to solve the problems around them, they find the situation untenable. 'Towards' people are more likely to be attracted towards the next great opportunity, even when their present circumstances are fine.

Another relevant differentiation is the task/relationship focus. People who have a high need to get the job done and complete a task will leave if getting the job done appears to have insurmountable obstacles. People with a high relationship/process focus will leave if their needs for creating and maintaining good work relationships are not met.

<sup>9</sup> Huczynski & Buchanan Organisational Behaviour 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Prentice Hall 2001 P.255

<sup>10</sup> Huczynski & Buchanan Organisational Behaviour 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Prentice Hall 2001 P.258

<sup>12</sup> Same reference P.248

<sup>13</sup> Same reference P.246

<sup>14</sup> Sue Knight NLP At Work Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London 1995 at P. 28 , P.119



Hence, two people with different individual motivation profiles may respond quite differently to identical situations.

There are also generational profiles; the X generation (20 –30), and to an even greater extent, the Y generation (13 – 19), <sup>15</sup>invest in themselves, see themselves as their only form of security, and want employers to recognise their individuality.

McClelland identified three different 'need' profiles – achievement, affiliation, and power. <sup>16</sup> (People with strong affiliation needs have a need to communicate with others like themselves). In any single individual, the strength of these three needs will vary. The need for power is the desire to make an impact on others, change people or events, and make a difference in life. The need for affiliation is to work with similar people, to feel a sense of belonging to the group. People with a strong affiliation driver are generally motivated by a desire to please.

Again, what is important to a person will affect their reaction to situations.

Butler and Waldrop looked at job sculpting, and argue the following need to be done in order to motivate people to perform well and to stay with an organisation:<sup>17</sup>

- ▶ Listen carefully to discover what really challenges, excites, and motivates people
- ▶ Understand the individual's embedded life interests
- ▶ Design both the job and the individual's career path to match those interests
- ▶ Use assignments as opportunities to sculpt the job for the person
- ▶ Review performance regularly to ensure work and career interests are consistent.

---

<sup>15</sup> Matathia and Salzman Next – Trends For The Future Pan MacMillan Australia 1998 at P.386

<sup>16</sup> Huczynski & Buchanan Organisational Behaviour 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Prentice Hall 2001 at P.824. Also, French and Bell Jr. Organisation Development 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Prentice Hall 1999 at P.283

<sup>17</sup> Harvard Business Review Sept –Oct 1999

