

REVIEWS/RECENZJE

Stephen Hicks

Social work and gender: An argument for practical accounts. "Qualitative Social Work" 2015, 1, 14 (4): 471–487.

Reviewed by: Izabela Jajkiewicz

From among many works about the sundry aspects of social work, I have chosen this particular article by Stephen Hicks. It called my attention because I realized that the gender theme is rarely discussed in the Polish context especially. Polish social work is increasingly concentrating on effective action, trying to create new approaches in solving problems and dealing with disenchantment in bureaucratic status, but social workers have forgotten that they could, subconsciously, fall into the trap of stereotypes and stereotypization. Since social workers are people, consequently social work is not completely free from prejudices and discrimination, even if these are unintentional. The human brain has a tendency to simplify and categorize, so social workers should be conscious of their own behavior, thinking, and potential biases which could be harmful for other people.

In his article Stephen Hicks takes into account various theoretical positions of the feminist mainstream which create a discourse about gender. The author starts by thinking about the causes of a perception of the social work field as dominated by women. Next, he goes on to consider the perception of cultural gender in society. Hicks presents the concepts and illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of each theory. He signals a desire for this article to contribute to the opening up of a conversation about gender in social work and then applying this in social work theory, research, and practice. In social work, gender issues often are overlooked. In the author's words, gender is visible, but unnoticeable. He thinks it an irony, because social work is addressed to people who should care about their own good, independent of sociocultural features. Thus social work should be free of injurious discrimination, categorization, and the pushing of people to reproduce cultural male or female roles.

Social work usually describes two perspectives. On the one hand, it is featured as a feminine profession, but, on the other hand, it is regarded as (above all) addressed

towards women. On the one side, this could be the result of perceptions of social work as a care profession and caregiving is assigned to the woman's role. On the other side, social workers more often work with women than men. The author states that this could be a result of the roles assigned to each gender. He does not say it directly, but it seems women more often go for advice to social workers, because they have a socialized feeling that it is normal to go to somebody for help in order to solve a problem – especially when that somebody is a specialist in lending support and aid. Of men it is expected that they themselves will struggle along with some problem. For men it is adverse to admit to helplessness because, culturally, the male is perceived by society as strong and independent. Thus, for a man, it is somewhat humiliating when he, for example, must admit an inability to find a job after a prolonged period of unemployment.

Stephen Hicks mentions that it is often the case that social work is addressed towards a family system, yet has a tendency to blame problems on the women and overlook men's behavior – even if the latter is destructive for the family, causes conflicts within, and threatens family cohesion. Thus, in a child's unhappiness and suffering, the mother is found guilty and the father is ignored. Women are seen as guardians whose attention should be concentrated on the closest people. If any family member suffers, frequently the blame for it falls on a woman. For instance, if a child is a sexual harassment victim, the automatic responsibility for this is taken by the mother. This happens because often in society a mother is convinced that she should protect her child. Hence, if the mother has not protected her child from harm, then any guilt can only be assigned to the mother. Thus women carry the responsibility and the burden for their family; this is an expectation of them and constitutes one of their roles.

In combating an inequality of the sexes, the gender concept is helpful. This concept is not a process which eradicates sexual inequality. It is a kind of awareness about culturally imposed duties, restrictions, and everything else that fits the concepts of man and woman and is linked with their functions in society. The gender concept notices woman's and man's status as achieved through socialization. Sexual inequality has its source in society's institutions, especially or largely reproduced in the family. Here people gain their identity (including sexual identity) and every person obtains instructions on behavior and role-playing with respect to being physically male or female. A girl or boy grows up with an awareness of how she or he should be dressed, how she or he should behave, and what features she or he should have. In this way male and female features are artificially separated and reproduced by people. Often times men fear, when they take on "female" roles, that they are renegeing their masculinity.

Stephen Hicks recalls the Risman research case which concentrated on single fathers raising children. It shows that fathers who fulfill a mother's tasks have a tendency to evaluate themselves as much more feminine than other men. In Hicks' opinion this could explain why the social work organizational structure is dominated by women. Firstly, a man could have a feeling of a falling out with his masculine role, because social work is connected with care and is not identified with a career path. It does not fit the socially constructed masculine role. Secondly, a man could be convinced that he is entering

a role recognized as feminine, which could lead to a concern about undermining their manhood. Everyone desires to be recognized as a “normal” person, whereas departure from social roles causes dissonance, anxiety, and a sense of being a deviant. Stephen Hicks recalls one of Harold Garfinkel’s works in which he states that social life is rigorously dichotomized. Thus, quite naturally, everything comes to a fission and – in that – to a fission of what is masculine and what is feminine. If an entity would like to be treated as normal, it must be seen as a man or woman.

From many concepts recalled by the author, it is worth noting Judith Butler’s conception of gender performativity. Performativity signifies a continuous cultural sexual reconstruction. Judith Butler emphasizes that the gender role is constantly reproduced by sentences and phrases voiced every day which influence reality. As a result of performativity acts, people assign to themselves and to others various predispositions connected with gender.

Stephen Hicks says that taking the time to think about cultural sex has practical applications in social work. The theories discussed in the article stress that cultural sex is not a congenital feature but only an acquired and socialized disposition. Institutions impose on people a sundry frame which foists certain behaviors socially ascribed to a man and a woman. Social work is not completely free of cultural gender reproduction, because social workers are, after all, men and women who have been – to a greater or lesser extent – socialized into their own roles, too. Social workers should be conscious of how their language potentially and really could reconstruct structural apportionment for what is male and female.

Even if social work is focused on homelessness, poverty, domestic violence, addictions, and other problems, all this is often divided distinctly into the male and female. Social workers create separate approaches in working with men and women, because that works. Social workers deal with various groups and have knowledge about group specificity. On the one hand, this seems a practical activity, because usually men and women do seem to have specific (for their nature) predispositions, behaviors, and ways of thinking. But, on the other hand, social workers should constantly consider whether their action is not a means for the reconstruction and reproduction of cultural sex.

Michal Krumer-Nevo, Adva Berkovitz-Romano, Michal Komem
The study of girls in social work: Major discourses and feminist ideas.
"Journal of Social Work" 2015, 15 (4): 425–446.

Reviewed by: Sandra Baldys

Technological, social, and cultural progress mean a lot of changes for each of us – also in how the social roles of women and men are seen. Historically, women had to stay at home and they had to take care of babies. They used to be subordinate to men. Often their lives depended on the decision of their husband and the family. If they ever worked outside the home, it was as volunteers. This means they were working with no pay, for society and poor people. This has changed with the coming of feminism.

A Polish encyclopedia defines feminism as the label for a very broad movement – one that is political, social, cultural, and intellectual. Its different orientations, schools, theories, and studies share a common belief that women have been and are the object of discrimination (PWN, Encyklopedia: Feminizm [online] <http://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/feminizm;3900322.html> [last accessed: 6.12.2015]). Today feminism is very prominent and popular. Feminism is advertised in the mass media: in the newspapers, periodicals, TV, internet, etc. Thanks to feminists (people believing in the idea of feminism and actively propagating it), today women can be free, study, and work in any job they want – for example, in social work. So this is good for all women and especially us who are young women and students of social work.

In searching for an article dealing with this aspect of social work, I did not know what to choose until I noticed an interesting title and read it. It was about feminism in social work and that caught my eye. However, the language used by the authors ultimately turned out to be somewhat difficult.

To start with, the Introduction was clear. The authors Krumer-Nevo, Berkovitz-Romano, and Komem provide very concise and concrete information about the article, text, and methods. The context of the article is set in Israel which is made evident in the following quotation: “hence, by systematically analysing the scholarly social work writing on girls in Israel, we wish to contribute to the understanding of the profession, and to that of girls, and to further developments in social work practice. Whilst local and contextual in nature, we see this analysis as holding the potential for international comparisons in the field of social work” (2015: 427). This hints what the article will be about. The paper has 15 elements – sections and subsections.

Now I will try to write something about information, curiosities and aspects which interested me. The section on *The Israeli context* illustrates the situation of Israeli girls. In the beginning that made me curious. I learned that Israel used to be an immigration state and in the past this state used to be a harsh place for women. There was a social division along ethnic, class, and religious lines since 1948. Yet this has changed since the beginning of the 1980s, with the growing influence of feminisms and multiculturalism, on the one hand, and of neo-liberal ideology that effectively shrank the welfare state, on the other.

Although I had heard in Poland of girls under conditions of distress as a unique target group, I had never heard about a Unit for Girls in Distress in Israel (see page 427) and hence sought more information about this. This seemed particularly appealing, because of my interest in women, couples, law, and discrimination. In this article, clients of the Unit for Girls in Distress were young women with problems such as self-destructive behavior, traumatic experiences, violence, vagrancy, eating disorders, and depression. The authors also wrote that, according to the then most recently published data, 17,000 adolescent girls were treated by the Unit in 2003. Eighty percent of these were Jewish (about 30% immigrants); the other 20% were Arab. More than half lived in families struggling with poverty (2015: 428).

This piqued me to consider how the authors arrived at these detailed numbers? It turns out they did research which is carefully explained in the subsequent section. In this research the authors wanted to know the ways in which feminist ideas and theories are expressed; their means of exploration was a thorough analysis of scholarly texts published in Israel. The study examined four questions: (1) How are girls referred to and characterized in the body of knowledge; (2) Whether and in what ways the girls' context of life (such as family, community, society as a whole, etc.) is alluded to in the texts; (3) What kinds of distress or "problem zones" are highlighted in the texts; and (4) What are the attributed causes of their distress (2015: 428). Next the authors described their their method (analysis of documents, literature, and data). The analysis was based on qualitative content analysis and comprised five stages. This part was less comprehensible, as it was written in language at a higher level of fluency with complex words. Although struggling somewhat, I nevertheless learned that in Israel there are four discourses concerning girls.

The first is the discourse of pathology. The discussion is focused on pathology among young girls, and the text analysis is the result of an individualistic and contextual perspective. To quote the article, "the analysis (...) revealed an individualistic and an a contextual perspective, portraying girls' behavior as an autonomous phenomenon, detached from social processes, and pointing to their supposedly deviant psychology as the cause of their distress (...)" (p. 432). It interested me when I read that the girls were seen as objects of intervention. They were not treated subjectively but objectively. I asked myself: what does it mean to be treated subjectively or objectively? The authors do not explain; I can only assume that a girl is seen as an object (objectively) and not subjectively as a person. The authors do provide an example drawn from David Tennant (1987) who called attention to incest, but indicated an opinion that the daughter plays an active role in incestuous relationships and sometimes even acts as the initiator and seducer (p. 434). This was a shocking case: I asked myself why Tennant and others thought that the daughter could have such an impact on her relationship with her father? I know that pathologies (including sexual abuse) also have their source in the family, but viewing the girl or her culture as inferior and blame worthy is inappropriate.

With reference to the discourse of vulnerability, the authors note that the most influential text about this discourse and girls was Gilligan's "In a Different Voice" (1982:

434). In their analysis they note various factors which make the girls more or less vulnerable, especially at home and in the general environment (friends, schools, etc.). The authors point out that the girls are brought up in a particular way. The researchers noted that in the 1990s and 2000s gender inequality and social structure were more emphasized. Yet this section was vague for me as the authors neglected to explain exactly what these concepts meant to them. Next the authors moved on to another perspective: new programs for women were supposed to help, especially after the year 2000. The authors closing this part by asserting that, “although the Unit for Adolescent Girls and Young Women was established in order to respond to the specificities of girls’ needs and its main method was carrying out programs that were exclusively for girls, these programs rarely employed specific feminist or gender-sensitive models of practice. The scholars who called for a change in this practice expressed awareness of feminist ideas, and pointed out the need to develop further the services for girls in light of feminist ideas” (p. 437).

Regarding the discourse of agency (can-do girl/girl power), the part which interested me was a sentence from Katzav’s (2009) study which added something to the image of the runaway phenomenon by examining girls’ experiences on the streets. The authors called running away “a pattern of hidden homelessness,” since – as opposed to boys who tend to live on the street – girls tended to live with men, and, consequently, disappeared from the social services radar (p. 438). The authors noted that this was like *punishing the victim* and I must agree. This is a very fascinating, yet sad topic. Unfortunately it is not described further.

Regarding the discourse of intersectionality, Krumer-Nevo, Berkovitz-Romano, and Komem maintain that intersectional theory constitutes an analysis of the ways various identity categories (such as gender, race or class) are mutually constructed, leading to domination, oppression, surveillance, and discrimination in their various forms (Crenshaw 1989: 438). In my view, this suffices to explain this discourse.

In summary, although I initially thought this text would be more interesting for me and would further my knowledge, I was to some extent disappointed. My expectation was that the text would be about feminism in social work when working with girls but the focus was on analysis of past texts. This did include noteworthy information, like the hidden homelessness, but, aside from this, the overall impression was generally less than special.

Robert de Vries, Samuel Gosling, Jeff Potter
Income inequality and personality: Are less equal U.S. states less agreeable?
"Social Science & Medicine" 2011, 72 (12): 1978–1985

Reviewed by: Tomasz Kuźmiński

Researchers have been working on this issue for decades. There is a theory in sociology which tells us that income inequality affects the populations of some countries in a very pathologizing way. Social scientists, politicians, and commoner citizens may argue about whether this hypothesis is true, but the facts show us an undeniable connection. Average life expectancy, crime level, substance abuse, literacy, and many other indicators are far from desirable in countries with a high level of income inequality. The big debate about the advantages and disadvantages of income inequality is one of the favorite topics in the dispute between economic liberals and left-wing voters. The authors here tried to find out about one specific indicator they felt is connected to income inequality, that is, agreeableness.

As the article presents, the income gap in United States has enlarged considerably. From the end of the Second World War until the 1980s, the most rich 10% of US citizens gained around 30% of the total income. Since the mid-1980s this disproportion grew constantly to the level of 45% in 2007. After 2010 it became a well-known fact that 10% of the US population gets over half the cake. Some say that the possibility for certain individuals to earn more than they could spend in thousands of years by, for example, monopolizing one specific branch of the national economy is a sacred law of a truly capitalistic country. The economic power of the US is a fact. But, according to many studies, the level of income inequality may become a serious threat for national unity in the USA.

The authors examined different levels of agreeableness in each of the states in the US. Then they compared the results to the Gini coefficient of each one (the Gini coefficient tells us about the income inequality in a population). It turned out that the areas in which the level of agreeableness is high have a low level of income inequality. The leader among the states with high stratification proved to be Washington DC; it also has the lowest level of agreeableness among all the states. In most, income inequality grew inversely proportional to agreeableness. It was also noted that the more urbanized the state is, the higher level of income inequality it has. The wealthier ones such as Washington DC and New York also have high levels of that factor.

Nevertheless the relationship between agreeableness and income inequality was proven to be not very significant. Also, if one were to remove two of the most extreme examples – Washington DC and Mississippi – the dependency decreases even further. However, we should not consider this test as superfluous or showing nothing new. Please note that the authors studied larger areas of people, not individual human beings, so the results are very generalized. To demonstrate a higher correlation, a large group of United States citizens should be tested individually.

In this article I liked the very clear presentation of the research results. The authors have devoted much space to introduce the reader to the subject. However, I missed infographics that would help me to grasp the problem as a whole.

The problem of inequality is increasing all over the world, not just in the United States. Research like this can help us work out a solution that perhaps could save us from the longterm consequences of this state of affairs. History has shown many times that a deep social divide can cause much more harm than the negative effects that we see today. It is worth remembering that tsarist Russia, in the face of overwhelming social stratification, split into two camps – the white and red (and the winner is known to all). The effects of social injustice in one country resulted in the risk of spreading communist regimes in the whole world in the following decades. The longterm effects of deep social injustice can be unpredictable. On the other hand, countries in which social equality is the highest – namely, the Scandinavian countries – can be proud of having the highest ratios of satisfaction with life.

Proponents of aggressive capitalism claim that inequality is a natural state of affairs and we should not disturb it. They say that it promotes technological development, competitiveness, and self-improvement. They argue that capitalism allows living a life which each individual has deserved. However, one should look at how technological development affects the environment. Or how competitiveness deals with the monopolies of large corporations. Or how is the self-improvement of the poor possible while they choose even the worst-paid jobs just to survive. The claim that everyone under capitalism has a life which they deserved is highly simplified. It is a widely known fact that a significant part of the current millionaires and billionaires in the United States did not earn their fortunes but inherited them. Hereditary financial empires like the Rockefellers or the Morgans serve as examples.

Capitalism has many faces and does not necessarily include massive inequalities and all the social pathologies associated with them. Studies like this should be made public to increase social awareness about various aspects of this issue.

Libby-Lee Hammond, Sandra Hesterman, Marianne Knaus
*What's in Your Refrigerator? Children's Views on Equality, Work, Money
 and Access to Food.* "International Journal of Early Childhood" 2015, 47 (3):
 367–384

Reviewed by: Katarzyna Bułka

Chosen here is an article written by a group of academics from Murdoch University in Perth (Australia). The researchers wanted to describe the world in which they live, more specifically, the problem of poverty and lack of food in some families. But they ask neither the experts nor the adults: they gave voice to children. The scholars devoted a lot of time for preparation of this research because children are a very unique group of respondents. On the one hand, they have an unbridled imagination and we have to remember that this could present a danger for us. On the other hand, the child's knowledge and openness to the world is based on his or her imagination. The world of the child is full of emotions. Further, they know and see much more than we, as adults, expect. We should try to get know them, but, unfortunately, this is not an easy thing to accomplish.

So why did a group of academics from Perth decide to create this project? The answer is easy. The problems of poverty and famine are the most common in the world. This has been named the "wicked" problem because we very often do not see it and it is virtually impossible to solve. Wicked problems are dangerous for sustainable development, and that is why the United Nations looks for support – in association with governments, non-profit organizations, and the usual people who want to help people who are sick or dying of starvation. All of them are searching for a solution to this situation because only together can we overcome this problem. Access to food, shelter and water are the most fundamental human rights.

The problem of poverty is also dangerous in education. On the one hand, people who have no guaranteed shelter and no access to food or potable water will not take up an education. On the other hand, people who are uneducated very often unconsciously reconstruct the behavior patterns of their parents and also become incapable of change. Poverty is handed down from generation to generation. It is a vicious circle.

This research was based on a single case study. Most interesting was the form of this investigation because: "This study investigates young children's theorizing about families and their differential access to food from a perspective of wealth and poverty" (2015: 367). The group of academics were aware of the background of this project; they wanted to know both the experience and expressions, but this time the children come to the fore. They were talking, painting, and describing while the researchers were observing, listening, and documenting their perspective. The researchers wanted to discover how children understand the problem of poverty and famine – how they see that problem in their own families and how they explain it.

The children (52 of them) who took part in the research were aged 6–7 years old. They were from three different classes in a primary school located in the suburbs of

a large city in Australia. A lot of them had different ethical and cultural backgrounds. This was connected with the fact that their parents were often refugees.

Only children who had permission from their parents could take part in the research. The pupils who could not participate in the project performed alternative activities which had been prepared by the researchers. The research was divided into three stages. At the beginning, the academics introduced the project, talked about the problem, and asked children what was in the fridge at their home. In the second stage, the children were divided into six groups. They got a pen and an A3 sheet of white paper and they had to print a fridge which could be opened. That drawing should represent their own fridge. The last stage was time for a story. The researcher told a story about two different families and showed children two big pictures of families and their fridge; one was full of food and one was almost empty. The children had to ask why is that? They created different hypotheses and the researcher asked them open-ended questions.

The conclusions of the researchers were divided into four themes. This was connected with the process of analyzing.

Theme 1: Sharing funds of knowledge about food. The children liked the idea of drawing. Some of them drew a full fridge, but others did not. But we can remember that an almost empty fridge does not mean that families do not have money for food. The respondents drew not only food which was in their fridge, but also those products which they like to eat. The researchers noticed that very important in this part was the diversity of their cultural dietary habits. For example, one of the respondents, who with his family had recently migrated to Australia, drew a paratha which is a traditional meal from India.

Theme 2: Inequality and Disadvantage. The researchers asked the children about associations with a full and almost empty fridge. Some children who saw the empty fridge said that that was their fridge. Some of them said that they had a lot of food in the fridge. The reason why they had a full fridge was their hard-working parents in the mines (concrete places where almost all of the parents in this local society work), earning money for food. The respondents also commented that only people who are good workers could have a full fridge. The relationship between money and work competence was clearly articulated by the children. All of those elements could fill the fridge. The children indicated also the bank and the automatic teller machine as a source where their parent could derive money but they did not know from where this money came.

Theme 3: Reason and Rationalization. In this part children gave an answer why some families experienced a lack of food. They said that it was connected with the helplessness of families, their laziness, and a lack of money. The respondents presented a perspective on poverty which asserted that this was not a global problem, but depended on the individual decisions of family members. They associated poverty with being inferior.

Theme 4: Ingenuity and Empowerment. The children were unanimously against unequal access to food. They said that it was unfair. Everyone should have enough money to buy food and other different things which are necessary for a decent life. The most interesting thing in this part was that the children did not connect a formal education

with a better life. They passed over the education theme and instead focused on a modus operandi their families applied in a critical situation when they had limited access to food. The researchers knew a lot of different ways to get food: for example, to grow one's own vegetables, to borrow money from neighbours or a relative, or to get more money out of the bank. The respondents also emphasized that food sharing is a very good idea; if people have too much they should share with poor people.

I chose this article because I am interested in working with children in my social work future. In my opinion, the authors of this above-described research created a well thought out strategy. They were really well prepared to talk with children; they knew a lot about the children's local environment, social background, and origin. The research based on a single case study methodology was, for me, the best way to know more about this "wicked problem" of poverty. Also the researchers gained a lot of information thanks to using a projection technique. Such methods enable us to access the perceptions of children. The group of academics did not forget to talk with those young people and asked them about their opinions. This is the truly great value of this study, because we very often can imagine completely different things than children are trying to say.

This article showed that if we want to know the world around us, we, as researchers, should try to get to new respondent groups. Dealing with child respondents is not an easy thing. If we want to talk with them, we have to be specifically prepared for different circumstances, because with children halfway measures will not work. They are honest, so they expect honesty from us. The children are a minefield of knowledge. They are constant in their opinions because their outlook on life results from observation and listening to what adults say.

Louise Humpage

An 'inclusive' society: A 'leap forward' for Maori in New Zealand. "Critical Social Policy" 2006, 26 (1): 220–242

Reviewed by: Beata Matejczyk

In 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi was signed by Maori representants and colonizers in an event which is recognized as the first step towards reconciliation between these two different worlds. Gradually Maori were integrating with White society, yet their culture is equally important as that of the European settlers. The New Zealand anthem consists of both Maori and English verses, geographical names are also in both languages, and both these languages have become official in that country. In New Zealand there are areas where the population of Maori is higher than in the others but anywhere they live they live with other people; there is nothing like special Maori ghettos or quarters. Moreover, they have their representatives in government, and are free to practice their traditions and habits. Nevertheless the question arises: do all these things make New Zealand's society an inclusive society?

The author of the article at hand argues that an 'inclusive' society is a phenomenon which exists only in theory, not in the real world. I had always imagined New Zealand as being a socially inclusive country but, according to Humpage (2006: 223), this is impossible. Kiwi want to live in a country where all people live together in peace; they accept each other, they have the same rights; and they all have a feeling of belonging. However, is it possible to make a society become inclusive in such a multicultural country?

Currently more and more people emigrate to other countries where they have to face the difficulties of getting a job, finding a place to live, and becoming a part of society. It is not an easy process as each country has a different culture, habits, and history which also influence this. Social inclusion and exclusion have become a worldwide problem, not only in countries which were colonized, but also in highly industrialized countries and others. In my opinion, getting a job and settling down in another country is not as difficult as socializing in the place where we choose to live. The thing is that, even if we moved to another city in our own country, we may find it difficult to feel like a part of the local community, to make friends, or even get to know our new neighbours.

The Maori were the first settlers on the islands of New Zealand. However, although one of the main goals of the New Zealand government is to building an 'inclusive' society, still most of the Maori are among the poorest citizens of New Zealand. They are worse educated and quite a high percentage of Maori struggle with alcohol and other problems.

The current policy leads to closing these gaps but, even though the idea of this policy is to provide all citizens with equal chances and the same rights and responsibilities, Maori have their own claims. Maori feel like New Zealand citizens and have a sense of belonging, but sometimes they also plead the case of their history and want to be treated differently. However, if they were treated in another way than other citizens, they would have special privileges and hence the idea of the inclusive and equal society

would be ruined. Maybe they should not have any special privileges, but the politicians should remember about Maori needs as an indigenous people and an excluded group.

Maori emphasize how their culture is important to them and they consider themselves as representing 'distinct' nations. This is true, but if New Zealand wants to become socially inclusive, should everybody not be treated equally? I think that all the people should be treated in the same way. Further, if there are cases in which somebody has harmed Maori in the past, then they should get compensation. Yet, at the present time, perhaps there should not be so much talking about Maori issues and their distinctiveness. Different people live side by side but emphasizing that they are different does not facilitate social integration. Additionally, giving someone some privileges would make others jealous and would change attitudes towards a 'privileged' group for a stance less friendly.

If the politicians really want to make New Zealand a socially inclusive country, they should first try to change the way of thinking of both Maori and non-Maori. Quite a high percentage of Maori is unemployed and this causes social problems and creates stereotypes of Maori who just drink, do not work, and have large families which receive benefits from the state. Yet the truth is that not only Maori act like that and not all of them but some non-Maori display this type of behaviour, too.

Some Maori work and can afford to live on their own without receiving benefits from the state but that way of thinking might also influence the Maori themselves. There is hardly a Maori studying at the universities and the question is if it is because of the cost or because they do not believe in the possibility to achieve something more than other New Zealanders.

For this reason I think that, first of all, Maori and non-Maori should realize that they all have the same rights and responsibilities which stem from being New Zealand citizens. They all have influence on the development, safety, and living conditions in their country. To achieve the best results they all have to work together and accept their differences. If all New Zealand citizens were thinking that way maybe it would be possible to create an inclusive society over there.

The other point is that older generations could grow up with the attitude that "we tolerate that they are here but do not really accept them." Luckily younger generations meet kids at school with different ethnic backgrounds which helps change this type of attitude. At school they learn that it does not matter if you are Maori or non-Maori because they are all pupils and they are all in the same situation. They get marks according to the effort they put in to achieve the results. When something happens in the class they are all responsible so each of them is responsible for a good and safe atmosphere in class. If someone breaks it, then the influence of the group will affect that person and he or she will try to fix things.

What is more, I think that their national sport also helps in the process of New Zealand becoming an inclusive society. Rugby is a national and favorite sport in Aotearoa. The All Blacks (the national rugby team) dance a Maori war dance before each game. Additionally, for the All Black's fans, whether the team loses or wins, it is not important where the players come from but the feeling of being from the same country and feeling

of being proud of them. In sport it does not matter if they are Maori or non-Maori. They represent New Zealand and with each victory they make people happy and with each loss they make the audience upset. That feeling of belonging to the same country or society we could call patriotism, something that I also consider a feature of an inclusive society in that particular country. It is worth mentioning that there is no place for racism or fights at New Zealand stadiums. If that happens, action is taken.

In conclusion, probably it is impossible to create a totally inclusive society, but even if that ideology bears influence on just a few people, it is worth a try. There will always be differences between people and not all the people will accept each other. Still they can all create a country of which they may be proud, where they feel safe, and where they will be happy to live in.