



Māori Responsiveness Plan Literature Review

June 2015

Prepared for: Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU)

By: Dr Claire Gooder

Table of contents

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Exploratory Literature Search.....	3
2.0	Auckland Council's <i>Long Term Plan</i> and Māori Responsiveness Framework.....	4
3.0	Why Māori participation is important	7
4.0	Building relationships with diverse Māori communities.....	9
5.0	Mātauranga Māori	11
6.0	Addressing structural impediments: Recognising cultural bias and destabilising current norms	15
6.1	Resources	18
6.2	Capacity Building.....	19
6.3	Ethics	20
6.4	Reporting.....	20
6.5	Language	21
6.6	Outcomes and Evaluation	21
7.0	Indigenous Research Methodologies and Kaupapa Māori	23
8.0	Good Practice Guidelines for Collaboration	25
9.0	Case studies	30
10.0	Facilitating change at RIMU	33
10.1	Issues for RIMU to consider	35
11.0	Bibliography	38

1.0 Introduction

Auckland Council's Māori Responsiveness Framework, Whiria Te Muka Tangata, outlines four drivers – Value Te Ao Māori; Enable Te Tiriti o Waitangi; Enable Māori Outcomes; Fulfil Statutory Māori Obligations – and three goals – An Empowered Organisation; Effective Māori Participation in Democracy; Strong Māori Communities. These drivers and goals form the basis for Council units and departments to develop their own Māori Responsiveness Plans (MRPs). This directive means that the discussion no longer needs to be 'should this happen?' but 'how can we make this happen?' Developing an MRP should be viewed as an opportunity rather than simply an obligation. It is an opportunity for Council units to re-envision how they work, their structures, their priorities and their values. The following literature review is designed to help RIMU develop an MRP that is cognisant of both the fundamental elements and the potential complexities of such an endeavour as presented in the relevant literature.

This literature review focuses on the general areas to consider in the process of developing Māori responsiveness, Māori engagement and organisational change and the key issues involved in addressing the needs and aspirations of Māori within and by non-Māori organisations or structures. It raises issues of structural impediments and ways of building cultural competence to encourage Māori participation and collaborative research. It also covers the theory behind cross-cultural collaborative work, as well as case studies of such collaboration and the lessons learnt. These key areas were determined following a wider exploratory literature search.

1.1 Exploratory Literature Search

The exploratory literature search focused on: examples and theories behind the collaboration between indigenous groups and organisations (government and non-government); processes and case studies of organisational change to build cultural competency (responding to and encouraging indigenous involvement and reflecting indigenous values and aspirations); and a range of possible research methodologies that would support the framework goals and drivers of Whiria Te Muka Tangata. It also included an audit of Auckland Council literature including four examples of newly created MRPs. Although the search (and this review) includes some international illustrations, there is a rich literature related to Māori and New Zealand examples, the issues of which are unique and specific to this place.

Following a presentation on the findings of the exploratory literature search, the key focus areas for this literature were defined as frameworks, guidelines and case studies of Māori responsiveness, collaboration and organisational change.¹

¹ The bibliography at the end of this literature review includes additional material sourced during the exploratory literature search.

2.0 Auckland Council's *Long Term Plan* and Māori Responsiveness Framework

The Auckland Council's Māori Responsiveness Framework (the Framework) is presented in the *Long-Term Plan, 2012–2022*. This provides the general outline, areas to focus on and also what each unit's MRP is expected to achieve. The drivers underpin the Framework and work in conjunction with the goals. The Framework goals – An Empowered Organisation; Effective Māori Participation in Democracy; Strong Māori Communities – are to be integrated as part of Council's decision-making processes, policy thinking, capability building and provision of services, as well as enabling Council to be a good employer for Māori.² These align with the concepts found in the literature.

The three goals of the Framework – Effective Māori Participation, an Empowered Organisation, Strong Māori Communities – are delineated in the *Long Term Plan*.³ For effective Māori participation, emphasis is on Council's democratic structures and the decision-making process. This can be achieved with a relationship, participation, and shared decision-making focus. For an empowered organisation the specific emphasis is on developing the staff and organisation's ability to respond more effectively to Māori. This requires a people, policy and process focus. For strong Māori communities the emphasis is on Council's role in contributing to Māori wellbeing, and this can be achieved through a focus on Māori engagement, Māori well-being, and building Māori capability and capacity.

The *Plan's* section 'Valuing Māori' provides a broader context for the Framework. Under the Local Government Act (2002), Parliament delegates responsibility to local councils to give effect or take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/ Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Te Tiriti).⁴ Council is charged with fulfilling Crown obligations under Te Tiriti to both mana whenua and mataawaka (which are diverse communities). This includes 'fostering more positive and productive relationships with Auckland Māori' and maintaining and improving opportunities for Māori to contribute to local government decision-making processes.⁵ Auckland Council recognises that these responsibilities fall within a local government/Tāmaki Makarau context. One of the desired outcomes, identified in the *Long Term Plan* is to achieve 'A Māori identity that is Auckland's point of difference in the world'.

The Auckland Council's *Long Term Plan* has identified Te Tiriti principles that are relevant to local councils: reciprocity; rangatiratanga; shared decision-making; partnership; active protection; ōritetanga (and mutual benefit); options for Māori to choose their own direction and process; the

² Auckland Council, 'Enabling Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ The Treaty of Waitangi Outcomes', *Long-Term Plan 2012-2022, Vol. One: An Overview of Our next 10 Years*, Auckland, 2012, p.26.

³ Auckland Council, *Long-Term Plan*, p.31.

⁴ *ibid.*, p.27.

⁵ *ibid.*

right to development property and taonga; and redress of past Treaty breaches.⁶ As well as the identified principles, the *Plan* recognises that future Te Tiriti principles might be developed, and that the principles must be considered holistically, not in isolation.

Alongside Council's *Long Term Plan*, is the Independent Māori Statutory Board's (IMSB) *Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau*.⁷ The IMSB was established in 2010 to promote and advise Auckland Council on cultural, social, economic and environmental issues of significance for Māori, as well as ensuring Council acts in accordance with its statutory obligations under Te Tiriti.⁸ The IMSB's *Te Tiriti o Waitangi Audit* (2012) highlighted areas of weakness within the Council's engagement and consultation with Māori as well as a need to ensure Treaty principles and Māori responsiveness are embedded as 'day-to-day' in Council's processes, roles, responsibilities, systems and data.⁹ Developing the *Māori Plan* involved extensive Māori engagement, including 23 hui with manawhenua and mataawaka and 10 hui with rangatahi (youth), as well as feedback through community events, Facebook and an online survey. This engagement provided the foundation for the *Māori Plan*, which consists of five elements: Māori values; key directions; domains and focus areas, Māori outcomes; and indicators. The creation of the *Māori Plan* provides a framework for the Council to monitor outcomes and measure change. This includes 111 'state of wellness' indicators that 'provide an accountability mechanism to ensure that the Auckland Council and other agencies are responsive to Māori issues.'¹⁰

In order to be responsive to the diverse needs and expectations of Māori, the public sector needs to operationalise its responsiveness and address issues such as ownership of information, dissemination methods and prioritisation and evaluation in Māori terms.¹¹ Policy must be backed up with a real desire and commitment to change, it will need to be incorporated into all aspects of the service provided, will require strong and motivated leadership as well as buy-in from staff at all levels. In their MRP, Libraries and Information recognised that 'We must make the aspirations of these documents a reality for Māori staff, people in specialist Māori roles and the workforce generally.'¹² Likewise, the Coastal, Land, Air and Water Unit (CLAW) felt that the MRPs are 'a conduit between the intent and successful delivery of the desired outcomes for Māori.'¹³ Council

⁶ For a fuller description see Auckland Council, *Long Term Plan*, p.27.

⁷ Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB), *The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau*, Auckland, 2012.

⁸ The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 legislated for an independent statutory body to assist Council, which led to the creation of the IMSB.

⁹ Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB), *Te Tiriti o Waitangi Audit: Executive Summary*, Auckland, 2012, p.8.

¹⁰ IMSB, *The Māori Plan*, p.14.

¹¹ Chris Cunningham, 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge in Research, Science and Technology', *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7, 1, 2000, p.64.

¹² Libraries and Information, *Te Pātaka Whakarūri Kōrero – Te Kauhanganui: Libraries and Information Māori Responsiveness Plan 2014–2017*, Draft, 2014, np, section 2.

¹³ Coastal, Air, Land and Water Unit (CLAW), *He Waka Eke Noa. Mō Te Taiao: Our CLAW Māori Responsiveness Plan*, Auckland, 2014, p.5

units need to be proactive and create opportunities for engagement in this process, not put the onus on Māori communities to begin the process of engagement.¹⁴ Action is key to the MRP.

¹⁴ Garth Harmsworth, 'Good practice guidelines for working with tangata whenua and Māori organisations: Consolidating our learning', Landcare Research Report (LC0405/091), Prepared for Integrated Catchment Management Programme, Motueka, 2005, p.42.

3.0 Why Māori participation is important

Although the directive has been given for all Council units to develop their own MRPs, there may still be some resistance within these units by people who might ask ‘why is Māori participation important?’. In his comprehensive ‘Good Practice Guidelines for Working with Tangata Whenua’, Garth Harmsworth provides a clear and compelling answer to this question.

Māori have a long record of co-habitation with the New Zealand environment over the past 1000 years, and have acquired comprehensive knowledge of New Zealand ecosystems, and how to sustain them. They also have extensive knowledge of Māori cultural heritage, which some believe is the backbone of a New Zealand identity... Māori therefore offer a unique indigenous perspective for planning, policy, decision-making and other activities such as projects. Resource management is becoming more and more complex, and requires participation at all levels to achieve agreed environmental, social, cultural and economic goals and outcomes. The key for achieving a clean, healthy environment balanced with expectations for economic growth and opportunity is our ability to work productively together, and participation lies at the heart of this. Quality decision-making requires effective participation between key stakeholders, and should be built on trust, respect and understanding. On occasion it also sometimes requires consideration of the diverse perspectives of an issue, and the integration of different types of knowledge.¹⁵

Harmsworth goes on to give six key reasons why Māori are a ‘distinct and important subset of community and stakeholder groups’, who bring ‘a different world-view, a different set of perspectives’ to local and central government practices and policies.

1. Contemporary Māori offer an indigenous perspective that should be taken into account.
2. The Māori population is spread throughout the whole country, not in one corner, and communities have strong attachments to the environment in specific geographic areas. Their participation is represented through marae, whānau, hapū and iwi or other organisations in those areas.
3. Unlike many other cultures in New Zealand, this is the Māori cultural homeland, the genesis of Māori culture, and there is nowhere else in the world for Māori to express, live and sustain their culture. Assimilation, integration and subsumption of minority cultures, such as Māori, into larger Western Eurocentric cultures are not reasons to discriminate, marginalise and alienate a distinct minority culture, and to dispute its identity.
4. Māori have a distinct set of customs and values often referred to as tikanga.
5. Along with cultural identity, Māori often have a different set of issues often based on indigenous cultural perspectives, beliefs and assumptions, and distinct from the wider community and stakeholder groups.
6. Many contemporary Māori have a responsibility to express views based on ancestral

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p.7.

links, such as traditional values and knowledge, in a modern environment or forum. Many contemporary Māori, descendants of early Māori, take these responsibilities through different generations, very seriously.¹⁶

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p.8.

4.0 Building relationships with diverse Māori communities

From the outset it is important to note that Māori are not a monolithic group. Although this review will at times talk about ‘Māori’ as if they are one definable group, the reader is asked to remember the diversity within the Māori community. Māori exist in numerous worlds – Te Ao Māori, Te Ao Pākehā, hapū, iwi – with all the pulls on obligation, aspirations, needs and politics that these different worlds involve.¹⁷ This diversity means that not all Māori needs and aspirations are the same, and so determining, recognising and addressing those needs and aspirations will be a complicated and ongoing process. It also is important to recognise that this diversity extends to accessing mātauranga and development of mātauranga, knowledge of te reo and knowledge of tikanga.¹⁸ There are 19 mana whenua tribal authorities within Tāmaki Makarau that Auckland Council engages with. These tribal authorities are at different stages in the settlement process (some are post-settlement, some are still in negotiation) and nuances such as this have to be taken into account.

Building relationships with Māori communities is a fundamental part of improving cultural competency, and the practice of whakawhanaungatanga underlies the motivation, the development, the direction and the outcomes. Without relationships, cultural competency cannot and will not be achieved. The motivation for those relationships need to be clear, honest and transparent.¹⁹ And because Māori are diverse, such relationship building must occur with different groups, be maintained over time, and be allowed to change. The international literature also cites genuine relationship-building as key to successful engagement with indigenous communities.²⁰

Developing and sustaining relationships with diverse Māori communities was a key theme

¹⁷ Lisa Chant, ‘Hauora Kotahitanga: Maori health experiences as models for co-operative co-existence between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples’, PhD, University of Auckland, 2013.

¹⁸ David Williams, ‘Mātauranga Māori and Taonga: The Nature and Extent of Treaty Rights Held by Iwi and Hapū in Indigenous Flora and Fauna, Cultural Heritage Objects, Valued Traditional Knowledge’, Waitangi Tribunal Publication, 2001, p.21; Melinda Webber, ‘The multiple selves and realities of a Māori researcher’, *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.

¹⁹ Harmsworth, ‘Good practice guidelines’.

²⁰ Aboriginal Peak Organisations, Northern Territory, ‘Principles for a Partnership-Centered Approach for NGOs Working with Aboriginal Organisations and Communities in the Northern Territory’, 2013; Elisa Peter, ‘Four things NGOs should know for successful engagement with indigenous peoples’, The Hauser Center for Non-Profit Organizations at Harvard University, 2011, <http://hausercenter.org/iha/2011/12/03/four-things-ngos-should-know-for-successful-engagement-with-indigenous-peoples/>; Shawn Wilson, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*, Black Point, Nova Scotia, 2008; T. Tran, L.M. Strelein, J.K. Weir, C. Stacey, and A. Dwyer, *Native title and climate change. Changes to country and culture, changes to climate: Strengthening institutions for Indigenous resilience and adaptation*, National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility, Gold Coast, 2013.

identified by Te Wāhanga, the Māori unit at the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER).²¹ Their research, which worked with kaupapa Māori principles and ways of understanding the world, was part of a broader project, aiming to create a dialogue between scientists and the community about food technologies. The report raised a number of relevant issues to relationship building. Māori interviewees felt that there was a lack of respect for Māori views, with Western-based process privileged over kaupapa Māori approaches. Māori participants also identified that dialogue worked most effectively face to face, and that organisations or non-Māori groups needed to build their skills at working in Māori settings. Another recommendation was that 'successful dialogue with Māori communities will be built on Māori informed processes that validate the connections between kaupapa, tikanga and mātauranga Māori.'²²

²¹ Jessica Hutchings, Katrina Taupo and Alex Barnes, *Future Food Technologies and Māori Well-Being. He Peka Kai, He Peka Taonga*, Ministry of Science and Innovation CO 2X 0801, 2012.

²² Ibid.

5.0 Mātauranga Māori

Mātauranga Māori is about Māori knowledge, ways of interpreting and being. It covers both the tangible and the intangible. Mātauranga is considered a taonga, thus its maintenance, protection and Māori ownership is covered by Te Tiriti. Mātauranga Māori incorporates both past and future knowledge; it covers both a conservative Māori worldview (wholism [sic], Māori social systems and oral traditions) and a contemporary Māori worldview (social and cultural diversity, redress, Treaty-based protection and partnership, and responsiveness related to public sector interactions).²³ Cunningham also points out that ‘past’ knowledge is both the *recent* past (post-Treaty, colonisation, urbanisation) and the *distant* past (pre-Treaty). The future knowledge, however, is always informed by the past. Ani Mikaere says we can think of a mātauranga continuum: drawing on the knowledge of the ancestors, contributing to that knowledge in the present, passing on that knowledge to be further developed by mokopuna in the future. This intergenerational continuity is part of Te Ao Māori.²⁴ Māori do not have equal access to mātauranga Māori, and such knowledge is diverse within and across hapū and iwi.²⁵ Durie cautions that mātauranga Māori must remain under Māori control, and its use (in government policies, institutions, education curricula or science and research) needs to be with Māori control as paramount.²⁶

There is a healthy literature on Māori, mātauranga and science.²⁷ The debate about mātauranga

²³ Cunningham, ‘A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge’, p.63.

²⁴ Ani Mikaere, ‘From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori: Making Our Contribution to Māori Survival’, in J. Hutchings, H. Potter and K. Taupo, eds, *Kei Tua o te Pae Hui Proceedings – The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century*, NZCER, Wellington, 2011, p.33.

²⁵ Williams, ‘Mātauranga Māori and Taonga’, p.21

²⁶ M. H. Durie, ‘Characteristics of Māori Health Research’, a paper presented at the Hui Whakapiripiri: Hongoeka, 1 February 1996, Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1996.

²⁷ See for example Daniel Hikuroa, Angela Slade and Darren Gravley, ‘Implementing Māori indigenous knowledge (mātauranga) in a scientific paradigm: Restoring the mauri to Te Kete Poutama’, *MAI Review*, 3, 2011; G. R. Harmsworth, R. G. Young, D. Walker, J. E. Clapcott & T. James, ‘Linkages between cultural and scientific indicators of river and stream health’, *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 45, 3, 2011, pp.423–436; Laura Jardine-Coom, *When Men and Mountains Meet: Rūiamoko, western science and political ecology in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2010; Jessica Hutchings and Paul Reynolds, ‘Maori and the “McScience” of new technologies: Biotechnology and nanotechnology development’, *Matariki: a Monograph Series*, 2007, pp.81–111; J. S. Te Rito and S. M. Healy, eds, *Te Ara Pūtaiao: Māori Insights in Science*, Auckland, 2008 (a monograph compilation of four papers by Māori scientists as part of Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga Policy Seminar Series, 3–4 November, 2005, Wellington, convened by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga/New Zealand’s Māori Centre of Research Excellence); Fiona Cram, ‘Māori and Science: Three Case Studies: Final Report’ prepared for the Royal Society of New Zealand, 2002; Garth Harmsworth, Kim Barclay-Kerr, and Tamati Reedy, ‘Māori Sustainable Development in the 21st century: The Importance of Māori Values, Strategic Planning and Information Systems’, *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 3, 2, 2002, pp.40–68; Cunningham, ‘A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge’; Garth Harmsworth, ‘Indigenous Values and GIS: a Method and a Framework’, *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor*, 6, 3, 1998, pp.1–7.

and whether it is science has occupied much literature as ‘a vexed question’, but now the consensus seems to be that science and mātauranga Māori are different knowledge paradigms, and that comparing them is unhelpful.²⁸ However, the literature is still very concerned with how such paradigms can contribute to each other, or work together, such as in collaborative environments.²⁹ The Waitangi Tribunal publication, ‘Matauranga Māori and Taonga’ considers the relationship between mātauranga Māori and scientific knowledge, and concludes that mātauranga Māori needs to be validated in its own right as a taonga.³⁰

Māori participation in part relies on council and other stakeholders recognising the legitimacy of ‘the information and accumulated knowledge bases of iwi, hapū and whānau. Gaining acceptance of the legitimacy of such community-based knowledge, as opposed to formal institutional research, is not only an issue for tangata whenua — for example, farming communities also have considerable experiential knowledge.’³¹ For Māori, however, providing such knowledge is an issue of respect and trust. ‘It is important to remember that in Māori society knowledge and learning are associated with being tapu (sacred)’, and as such, obtaining knowledge and then not using it for what it was intended, is a breaking of tapu. For this reason, when Māori share their knowledge, it needs to be treated with respect and the sacredness of learning. ‘Thus gathering information as a Māori researcher involves mutual respect, and trust and often occurs “a te wa”, when the time is right.’³²

The issue of trust is fundamental to encouraging Māori participation and working in collaborative environments. The literature notes a strong distrust by Māori of research, because research has been done *on* them, without their involvement, direction, and with no sense of rangatiratanga and respect.³³ Māori have also expressed distrust of the scientific community.³⁴ This sense of distrust is

²⁸ Mason Durie, ‘Exploring the Interface Between Science and Indigenous Knowledge’, presentation at the 5th APEC Research and Development Leaders Forum, Capturing Value from Science, Christchurch, 2004; Graham Foster, ‘Facilitating improved achievement of Maori students in science’, New Zealand Science Teacher, 2013: www.nzscienceteacher.co.nz/putaiao/facilitating-improved-achievement-of-maori-students-in-science/#.VHe7yGe0S8C.

²⁹ See the special issue of the *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009: all the papers in this issue all highlight the importance of working with indigenous peoples on issues of environmental management. The use of indigenous knowledge in environmental research raises some particular issues for transdisciplinary approaches. Questions raised about indigenous vs science debate and whether collaboration, partnership and dialogue can work, and how they work.

³⁰ Williams, ‘Mātauranga Māori and Taonga’, esp. pp.13–26.

³¹ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, ‘Kaitiakitanga and local government: Tangata whenua participation in environmental management’, Wellington, 1998, p.iii.

³² Kataraina Pipi, Fiona Cram, Rene Hawke, Sharon Hawke, Te Miringa Huriwai, Tania Matakai, Moe Milne, Karen Morgan, Huhana Tuhaka, and Colleen Tuuta, ‘A Research Ethic For Studying Māori and Iwi Provider Success’, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23, 2004, p.151.

³³ Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, *He Tikanga Whakaro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community: A Discussion Paper*, Wellington, 1991; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 1st edn, New York, 1999, 2nd edn, London, 2012.

³⁴ Hutchings, Taupo and Barnes, *Future Food Technologies*.

not isolated to Māori groups. Maynard and Wood identify communities often have a 'history of distrust' toward government agencies based on: conservative government views of how much communities should be involved in policy development; that consultation often occurs on an already established position; community input is not reflected in the final product; expectations are raised but not delivered on; and communities do always receive feedback on the outcomes of their participation.³⁵ Addressing such issues could be achieved by ensuring honest and transparent communication, operating in a respectful way and recognising that expertise can lie in the community.³⁶

For Māori, sometimes participation includes an experience of 'knowledge stealing' or the intellectual property of mātauranga being disrespected.³⁷ Garth Harmsworth talks about the importance of recognising intellectual property with the technological age – in this case, developing culturally appropriate GIS tools that use mātauranga Māori to enhance understandings of the environment, but are not exploitative of that knowledge.³⁸ Aroha Mead says that her experience in the public sector has shown three general responses to a dialogue about Māori intellectual property rights: 'Status quo – outright dismissal of the legitimacy of this view – carry on as before; Paralysis – I don't understand and therefore I won't make a decision; Best intention – Scoping Reports, Hui.'³⁹ Like recognising mātauranga Māori as a knowledge system, there is much literature on Indigenous knowledge (IK) and the way it informs indigenous and collaborative research.⁴⁰ Issues such as trust, relationship-building, and intellectual property dominate the discussion.⁴¹

³⁵ Kristen Maynard and Beth Wood, 'Tatou Tatou – Working Together: A Model for Government/Non-Government Collaboration', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 18, 2002, p.86.

³⁶ Te Awakotuku, *He Tikanga Whakaro*, pp.18–19.

³⁷ Jardine-Coom, *When Men and Mountains Meet*, p.20.

³⁸ Harmsworth, 'Indigenous Values and GIS'.

³⁹ Aroha Te Pareake Mead, 'Understanding Māori Intellectual Property Rights', The Inaugural Māori Legal Forum, 2002, np.

⁴⁰ Deborah McGregor, 'Lessons for Collaboration Involving Traditional Knowledge and Environmental Governance in Ontario, Canada', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10, 4, 2014, pp.340–353; Donna L. M. Kurtz, 'Indigenous Methodologies: Traversing Indigenous and Western Worldviews in Research', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 2013, pp.217–229; Jessica Mercer, Ilan Kelman, Lorin Taranis and Sandie Suchet-Pearson, 'Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction', *Disasters*, 34, 1, 2010, pp.214–39; Arun Agrawal, 'Why "indigenous" knowledge?', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.157–8; Phil Lyver, Christopher Jones & Henrik Moller, 'Looking past the wallpaper: Considerate evaluation of traditional environmental knowledge by science', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.219–223; Priscilla M. Wehi, Hēmi Whaanga and Tom Roa, 'Missing in translation: Maori language and oral tradition in scientific analyses of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK)', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.201–204; Les R. Tumoana Williams and Manuka Henare, 'The double spiral and ways of knowing', *MAI Review*, 3, 2009.

⁴¹ For work on intellectual property and Māori see Mead, 'Understanding Māori Intellectual Property Rights'; Williams, 'Mātauranga Māori and Taonga', esp. pp. 27–54; International Research Institute for Māori and

Indigenous Education (IRI), 'Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights: Economics, Politics & Colonisation', vol. 2, Series: Critical Issues in Contemporary Māori Society, 1997; Cram, 'Māori and Science', pp.11–12.

6.0 Addressing structural impediments: Recognising cultural bias and destabilising current norms

Building cultural competency is about incorporating awareness, knowledge and skills.⁴² A starting point for the process of building cultural competency is recognising cultural bias inherent in organisations, research methods, investigations, analysis and interpretation – our ways of being in the world. Building cultural competency involves acknowledging one’s own culture and the way it influences a worldview.⁴³ In her work on how structural impediments can limit innovation in science, Helen Moewaka Barnes states ‘Our organisations and structures are not culturally neutral, and Māori strategies have a tendency to become add-ons catering to “difference”. As a result, we take a narrow approach to developments in this sector.’⁴⁴ Rather than a narrow approach, it needs to be broad. The MRPs that have been completed so far have included an audit of current organisational practices and structure to create a plan for a ‘desired, responsive future’. There is room to acknowledge and celebrate the current elements of each unit that are responsive to Māori, while also recognising that change is required. This change, CLAW’s MRP notes ‘is needed in our culture, thinking and practices.’⁴⁵

In their work on the education sector, Bishop and Glynn argue that culture is central to learning, and we need to be aware of the range of socially constituted traditions for creating meaning and engaging in practice. By making culture visible, by acknowledging our own cultural heritage (such as ethnic, disciplinary, or life experience) this brings a visibility to our processes, allowing them to be seen, challenged, critiqued, and adjusted.⁴⁶ Not acknowledging the cultural influences over research or organisation or institutional practices, tends to reinforce the dominant worldview.

In his influential text on collaboration, *Whakawhanaungatanga*, Russell Bishop highlights the importance of recognising power relations inherent in cultural forms in order for collaborations to work. One person may be many things in the collaboration process, shifting from a position of ‘expert’ to one of collaborator, learner, teacher, listener.⁴⁷ This concept is reflected in international

⁴² Lisa Cherrington, ‘Te hohounga: Mai i te tirohanga Māori. The process of reconciliation: Towards a Māori view. The delivery of conduct problem services to Māori’, Report prepared for Ministry of Social Development, 2009, p. 56.

⁴³ *ibid*, p.40. See also pp.35–56.

⁴⁴ Helen Moewaka Barnes, ‘Transforming Science: How our Structures Limit Innovation’, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 29, 2006, pp.1-16.

⁴⁵ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*, p.11.

⁴⁶ Russell Bishop and Ted Glynn, *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*, Palmerston North, 1999, p.78.

⁴⁷ Russell Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative Research Stories*, Palmerston North, 1996.

literature on successful engagement with indigenous peoples.⁴⁸ Elisa Peter lists the four principles for engagement as: An honest examination of power relationships; A readiness to question assumptions; A shift from viewing indigenous peoples as stakeholders to rights holders; A long-term commitment to trust and relationship building.⁴⁹

In a similar vein, Chris Cunningham looks at 'control' and how kaupapa Māori or Māori-centred research is fundamentally about Māori having control of the research process. One of the elements he sees as restricting Māori involvement in and engagement with research, or that stymies the responsiveness of research is that control is held elsewhere. Cunningham's focus is on the Research, Science and Technology environment, where financial accountability and methodological or technical competence is determined by a hierarchical system – where agencies like universities, SOE's and independent research organisations receive funding based on outputs, certain methodological ideals and ethical processes, and topics that satisfy policy and research priorities. While Māori issues and people may be involved, Cunningham emphasises that the whole system is based on what he calls 'mainstream controls' based on conventional western research, science and technology structures.⁵⁰

Different cultural institutional practices can mean a difference in motivation, expectation and priorities. The findings of a project investigating the range, scope and effectiveness of local partnerships between university researchers, local government officials and local facilitators showed that all three groups worked within slightly different institutional cultures and this sometimes meant a dislocation between groups in language, resources, motivations for engagement, and intentions or aspirations for outcomes.⁵¹ Similarly, Cunningham has emphasised that 'Māori research priorities will not always coincide with mainstream research priorities, and there is the expectation that Māori research priorities should be homogenous. Clearly there will be a range of Māori views.'⁵²

Destabilising the normalisation of current practices, principles and theories will potentially help with identifying and accepting new practices, and in some cases recognising Te Ao Māori. These current systems (institutional and scientific) are identified in the literature as kaupapa Pākehā (Pākehā way of doing things).⁵³ To unquestioningly perpetuate these systems maintains an

⁴⁸ See for example Aboriginal Peak Organisations, Northern Territory, 'Principles for a Partnership-Centered Approach'.

⁴⁹ Peter, 'Four things NGOs should know for successful engagement with indigenous peoples'.

⁵⁰ Cunningham, 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge', p.66.

⁵¹ Wendy Lerner and Tony Mayow, 'Strengthening Communities through Local Partnerships: Building a Collaborative Research Project', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 20, 2003, pp.119–33.

⁵² Cunningham, 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge', p.63.

⁵³ Leonie Pihama, 'Tungia te Ururua, kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke: A critical awareness of parents as first teachers', MA Thesis, University of Auckland, 1993; Linda T. Smith and Papaarangi Reid, 'Māori Research Development: Kaupapa Māori Principles and Practices: A Literature Review' for Te Puni Kōkiri, 2000; Cram, 'Māori and Science'.

unequal balance tipped against access, leadership and participation by marginalised groups. Change must be genuine and based on addressing structural impediments or bias. Ritchie and Rau give the example in their work on early childhood education (ECE), that using superficial cultural icons such as Māori songs within ECE, rather than a broader inclusion of culturally specific patterns of interaction, emotion, and philosophy results in a marginalizing of Māori content and a devaluing of Te Ao Māori.⁵⁴ Kaupapa Māori is about intervention and transformation at the level of institution and mode – challenging, questioning and critiquing Pākehā hegemony but not excluding or rejecting Pākehā culture.⁵⁵ It is about allowing a Māori worldview to be the norm, ‘a willingness to incorporate different world views into everyday knowledge and practice’.⁵⁶

One underlying issue to consider is how far the existing systems can change. In their work on local partnerships between councils, academics and communities, Lerner and Mayow warn that the rhetoric of partnership and collaboration in policy and research arenas is not always matched by the necessary reform of structures and programmes.⁵⁷ While it may seem easier to add Māori values and ideas to the existing system, the literature warns about the tokenistic nature of this approach. Cunningham notes that ‘Māori participation should not be mistaken for responsiveness to Māori!’⁵⁸ Responsiveness means Māori being involved in the decision making process, providing resources to allow for and encourage involvement, incorporating Māori values and aspirations in the work undertaken.

Structural impediments include funding and resource structures, evaluation and output measures. Such impediments can be a barrier to kaupapa Māori research, collaborative research with community-based outcomes (as opposed to publications), or research using mātauranga.⁵⁹ Structural impediments exist in a variety of sectors. The Human Rights Commission produced a report on structural barriers to ethnic equality with a focus on health, justice, education and the public sector. The aim of the project was to come up with ideas to address inequalities through systemic change.⁶⁰ Heather Came investigated structural impediments and institutional racism in relation to public health in New Zealand. She concluded that in order to engender change, senior

⁵⁴ Jenny Ritchie and Cheryl Rau, ‘Whakawhanaungatanga – partnerships in bicultural development in early childhood care and education, *Teaching and Learning Research Initiative*, 2006.

⁵⁵ Smith and Reid, ‘Māori Research Development’.

⁵⁶ Ritchie and Rau, ‘Whakawhanaungatanga’, p.4.

⁵⁷ Lerner and Mayow, ‘Strengthening Communities’, p.132.

⁵⁸ Cunningham, ‘A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge’, p.68

⁵⁹ Barnes, ‘Transforming Science’; Williams, ‘Mātauranga Māori and Taonga’; Lerner and Mayow, ‘Strengthening Communities’, p.121; Tom Roa, Jacqueline R. Beggs, Jim Williams, and Henrik Moller, ‘New Zealand’s Performance Based Research Funding (PBRF) model undermines Maori research’, *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.233–38; Cunningham, ‘A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge’.

⁶⁰ Human Rights Commission, *A Fair Go for All? Rite Tahī Tātou Katoa?: Addressing Structural Discrimination in Public Services*, Auckland, 2012.

staff, professional bodies and unions needed to be on-board, as well as systematic policy and procedural changes and greater transparency to support transformed practice.⁶¹

6.1 Resources

Effective engagement with Māori communities requires an increase of time allocated for the planning phase, consultation, and data gathering.⁶² One of the findings from the engagement process of the *Māori Plan* was that mana whenua and mataawaka both wanted better resourcing for engagement.⁶³ Hutchings, Taupo, Barnes say that Western based dialogic methods do not support kaupapa Māori processes of engagement, such as whitiwhiti kōrero (exchanging ideas), wānanga, or hui.⁶⁴ Hui, for example, are important spaces for research and project consideration and evaluation, but these take time to organise and time to hold, and budgets need to be adjusted accordingly.⁶⁵ Multiple meetings and hui might need to be considered, because if just one marae hosts a hui this can restrict the participation of Māori from other iwi or hapū, and of non-Māori participants.⁶⁶ As CLAW's MRP notes, 'The differing needs and expectations of Māori requires much effort, resource and time – this requires more careful and realistic project planning than is often allowed for'.⁶⁷ Time is also required to enable whakawhanaungatanga: building genuine, long-term, and co-beneficial relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka takes time and commitment from all.

As well as time, engagement and participation carries a financial cost. The literature advises that participation should be 'cost-neutral for tangata whenua', so funding structures or resource allocation needs to address this.⁶⁸ Some suggestions include financial reparation, providing resources or support for Māori or community-based projects, and establishing systems of runanga representatives on working parties.⁶⁹

Alongside relieving financial impediments, the literature warns about the burden that Māori staff can be placed under. Smith and Reid assert, 'The Māori social worker, like the Māori teacher in a mainstream school, is set up to be the spokesperson for all Māori, intensifying the emotional

⁶¹ Heather Came, 'Institutional Racism and the Dynamics of Privilege in Public Health', PhD, University of Waikato, 2012.

⁶² see Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*; Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 'Kaitiakitanga and local government'; Lerner and Mayow, 'Strengthening Communities'.

⁶³ IMSB, *The Māori Plan*, p.19.

⁶⁴ Hutchings, Taupo and Barnes, *Future Food Technologies*.

⁶⁵ Cram, 'Māori and Science', p.5.

⁶⁶ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 'Kaitiakitanga and local government', p.89.

⁶⁷ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*, p.8.

⁶⁸ Cram, 'Māori and Science', p.4

⁶⁹ Cram, 'Māori and Science'; Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*; W. Hodges, 'Maori Conservation Ethic: A Ngati Kahungunu perspective'. Conservation Advisory Science Notes No. 93, Department of Conservation, Wellington, 1994, p.11.

demands involved in this work.⁷⁰ A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment included a discussion on iwi liaison staff within Councils – the pressure on them, the potential for inappropriate appointments (regarding hapū and iwi relationships), the possibility of hapū and whānau providing their own representation, and the difficult position for iwi liaison trying to represent both Council and hapū/iwi.⁷¹

6.2 Capacity Building

Building an organisation's cultural competence can help with recognising and addressing structural impediments to participation and engagement as well as reducing the burden on individuals. Training current staff and induction for new staff to build cultural competence can include issues such as protocol, engagement, and commitment required, training in Te Ao Māori, te reo, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Such training can build a staff's capacity to work effectively in Māori settings.⁷² The Libraries and Information MRP talks about creating staff confidence and effortless responsiveness.⁷³ CLAW's MRP says 'With greater understanding we will become more confident and more comfortable, in our work and in our relationships with Māori.'⁷⁴

Capacity building also refers to building Māori capacity. A skilled Māori research workforce is invaluable to applying kaupapa Māori methods.⁷⁵ In her good practice guidelines, Fiona Cram recommends that 'rangatahi should be involved in collaborative research as this has multiple payoffs.'⁷⁶ The literature also mentions mentoring, including a tiaki model where authoritative Māori people act as guides and mediators for the process,⁷⁷ or following a teina/tuakana (older sibling/young sibling) model, as a way of capacity building.⁷⁸

⁷⁰ Smith and Reid, 'Māori Research Development', p.25.

⁷¹ Parliamentary Commission for the Environment, 'Kaitiakitanga and local government', pp.88–89.

⁷² Hutchings, Taupo and Barnes, *Future Food Technologies*.

⁷³ Libraries and Information *Te Pātaka Whakarūri Kōrero*, section 3, np.

⁷⁴ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*, p.10.

⁷⁵ Cunningham, 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge', pp.67–8.

⁷⁶ Cram, 'Māori and Science', p.4.

⁷⁷ Graham Smith, 'Research issues related to Maori education', Paper presented at the NZARE Special Interests Conference, Education Department, University of Auckland, 1990, p.8, cited in Fiona Cram, 'Ethics in Māori Research, Working Paper', in L.W. Nikora, ed, *Cultural Justice and Ethics*, Proceedings of a symposium held at the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, pp. 28–30.

⁷⁸ Michael Walker, 'He Whāinga Māramatanga, He Kimihanga Tūrangawaewae' in J. S. Te Rito and S. M. Healy, eds, *Te Ara Pūtaiao: Māori Insights in Science*, Auckland, 2008 (a monograph compilation of four papers by Māori scientists as part of Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga Policy Seminar Series, 3–4 November, 2005, Wellington. Convened by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga/New Zealand's Māori Centre of Research Excellence), pp.37–46; Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*.

6.3 Ethics

The development of ethical guidelines within Western research practice has been a process designed to protect research participants from unwanted or exploitative research. The issue of anonymity within research ethics is a part of this broader endeavour. However, for Māori, engaging in research as a participant, sharing knowledge and mātauranga means providing information that is tapu. Within Te Ao Māori there is a need to be accountable to that perspective and knowledge.⁷⁹ A researcher should always think ‘what is in it for the participants?’ and part of this is recognising that the ethical restrictions imposed by some research institutions around anonymity might prevent the research participants from determining their own level of acknowledgment and representation.⁸⁰ Therefore, the often unquestioned clause of ensured anonymity, can be seen as a reflection of Western research paradigms that do not necessarily fit Māori cultural research practice. Joanna Kidman highlights the problems that arise, ‘when negotiating ethical research practices between two competing traditions; namely tikanga Māori and academic convention’: both have ethical practices, and both are distinct cultures.⁸¹ There is an active literature on ethics in collaborative or partnership projects, and how ethical guidelines reflect the worldview of the institution they are created in, and imposing them infers that worldview is the moral or ethical adjudicator.⁸²

6.4 Reporting

Another area that reflects Western institutional research conventions is in writing and reporting styles. González y González and Lincoln have questioned how cross-cultural research is reported, arguing that it often follows a Western tradition of writing, rather than reflecting the cross-cultural nature of the work. They recommend reporting should consider five major areas: working with bilingual data, considering non-Western cultural traditions, multiple perspectives, multi-vocal & multi-lingual texts, and technical issues to insure accessibility.⁸³ One concrete example of a Western research convention is the literature review. Mikaere argues against starting research with

⁷⁹ Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*, p.208–9

⁸⁰ Jardine-Coom, *When Men and Mountains Meet*, pp.20–21.

⁸¹ Joanna Kidman, *Engaging with Māori Communities: An Exploration of Some Tensions in the Mediation of Social Sciences Research*, Tehei Oreore Series for Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, Wellington, 2007, p.66.

⁸² For further discussion on ethics see Juan Marcellus Tauri, ‘Resisting Condescending Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand’, *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10, 2, 2014, pp.134–150; Vivienne Kennedy and Fiona Cram, ‘Ethics of Researching with Whānau Collectives’ *MAI Review*, 3, 2010; Kidman, *Engaging with Māori Communities*, pp.65–83; Adreanne Ormond, Fiona Cram and Lyn Carter, ‘Researching our Relations: Reflections on Ethics and Marginalisation’, *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship: Special Supplement, 2006 – Marginalisation*, 2, 1, 2006, pp.175–192; Martin Tolich, ‘Pākehā Paralysis: Cultural Safety for those Researching the General Population of Aotearoa’, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19, 2002, pp.164–78.

⁸³ Elsa M. González y González and Yvonna S. Lincoln, ‘Decolonizing Qualitative Research: Non-Traditional Reporting Forms in the Academy’, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7, 4, 2006.

a literature review, because she sees that this means ‘predetermining the direction that subsequent work takes, narrowing the boundaries of what might be possible’.⁸⁴

6.5 Language

The issue of language is an important element to consider as a possible impediment to participation and responsiveness. Culture-specific language, or jargon, can be seen as excluding people and preventing participation and engagement.⁸⁵ Because Kaupapa Māori research calls for it to make a difference and be empowering, then the language and distribution of the information must be accessible.⁸⁶ The use of te reo and Māori terminology is also debated. Cultural competency can involve an expectation of knowledge or use of te reo.⁸⁷ But some Pākehā have expressed recognition that sometimes their use of te reo is not appropriate and has the effect of ‘recolonising’ the language.⁸⁸ In her classic ‘Talking Past Each Other’, Joan Metge raised the problem of ‘describing the concepts of one culture with the language of another’ – using English to describe mātauranga is a good example of this.⁸⁹ Cram uses the term ‘tangata whenua’ instead of ‘Māori’ at the request of her participants and regional researchers.⁹⁰ Issues of translation need to be considered.⁹¹ Ani Mikaere posits that sometimes even the term ‘research’ can be seen as problematic – conjuring up ideas of elitism, being researched, loss of control. She says that other terms such as ‘creative activity’ and ‘whakatupu mātauranga’ (whakatupu = to raise, grow, cultivate) have found some favour at her institute.⁹²

6.6 Outcomes and Evaluation

The literature raises the question of evaluation, asking ‘whose perspective of ‘achievement’ is considered’?⁹³ Good practice guidelines for evaluation developed specifically for the social sector in New Zealand outlined five areas: Respect; Integrity; Responsiveness; Competency; Reciprocity. The Guidelines included a section, which clearly draws on kaupapa Māori principles, on how to

⁸⁴ Mikaere, ‘From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori’, p.30.

⁸⁵ Hutchings, Taupo and Barnes, *Future Food Technologies*.

⁸⁶ Mikaere, ‘From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori’, p.30.

⁸⁷ Jim Williams, ‘Towards a Model for Indigenous research’ in Brendan Hokowhitu, Nathalie Kermoal, Chris Andersen, Anna Petersen, Michael Reilly, Isabel Altamirano-Jiménez and Poia Rewi, eds, *Indigenous Identity and Resistance Research the Diversity of Knowledge*, Dunedin, 2010, pp.107-119; Wehi, et al, ‘Missing in translation’.

⁸⁸ Alex Barnes, ‘What can Pākehā learn from engaging in kaupapa Māori educational research?’, Working Paper 01, NZCER, 2013.

⁸⁹ Smith and Reid, ‘Māori Research Development’; Williams, ‘Mātauranga Māori and Taonga’.

⁹⁰ Cram, ‘Māori and Science’.

⁹¹ Jillian Walliss, ‘Lost in Translation: Language and Landscape in Bi-Cultural New Zealand’, *Globalisation and Landscape Architecture: Issues for Education and Practice – conference proceedings*, Polytechnic University Publishing House, St Petersburg, 2007, pp.170–74.

⁹² Mikaere, ‘From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori’, p.32.

⁹³ Mathea Roorda and Robin Peace, ‘Challenges to Implementing Good Practice Guidelines for Evaluation with Māori: A Pākehā Perspective’, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 34, 2009, pp.73–88.

apply the above principles for research and evaluation involving Māori.⁹⁴ Changing tools of evaluation can be a way of addressing structural impediments. Mikaere describes how the New Zealand Qualifications Authority designed a new audit tool to assess the wānanga (Te Wānanga o Raukawa) against the kaupapa agreed to in their charter and profile documents. The Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission showed acceptance of this evaluation framework.⁹⁵

The way information is disseminated needs to take into account the various participants in the project or process. Lerner and Mayow talk about the need for end-user outputs: information presented on outcomes that is accessible and relevant. End-user relevant outcomes they cite are websites with information, accessible language, shared learning groups and regular seminars for end-users involving local government, academics and community leaders.⁹⁶ Durie writes that 'performance measures contained in [government] contracts have also often been difficult to reconcile with Māori perspectives and expectations', often treating outcomes in an individual, rather than holistic way.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ SPEaR (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee), 'Good Practice Guidelines', 2008, www.spear.govt.nz/good-practice/statement-purpose.html. For research and evaluation involving Māori see pp.33–43.

⁹⁵ Mikaere, 'From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori', p.33.

⁹⁶ Lerner and Mayow, 'Strengthening Communities', p.124.

⁹⁷ Mason Durie, 'Public Sector Reform, Indigeneity and the Goals of Māori Development', Commonwealth Advanced Seminar, Wellington, 2004, p.9.

7.0 Indigenous Research Methodologies and Kaupapa Māori

Alterations to research methodologies can help with addressing many of the ideas already raised – such as relationship building, mātauranga Māori, and destabilising dominant paradigms. The previous section has already put forward examples of issues inherent in some Western methodologies. The scope of this literature review prevents full engagement with the various research methodologies that could encourage a more responsive and engaged relationship with Māori needs and aspirations. In brief, there are a few key texts on indigenous research and methodologies, many of which involve comparative work, highlighting similarities and differences in situation, approach and experience of indigenous researchers internationally.⁹⁸ Bagele Chilisa's *Indigenous Research Methodologies* identifies four key and connective elements of indigenous research: targets a local phenomenon instead of using existing Western paradigms to identify and define a research issue; is context-sensitive and creates locally relevant constructs, methods and theories derived from local contexts and Indigenous knowledge; can be integrative (combining Western and indigenous theories); in its most advanced form, its assumptions about what counts as reality, knowledge and values in research are informed by an Indigenous research paradigm.⁹⁹

Kaupapa Māori research methodology and practice has been influential in international discourse on indigenous methodologies, and is the most relevant to work undertaken in New Zealand.¹⁰⁰ Kaupapa means a way of structuring and framing how we think about practices and ideas, how we conceptualise the world and how this affects our practices and interpretations and understandings within that world. The aim of kaupapa Māori is to empower Māori to define what is important, what should be researched, who should be spoken to, and how the information could be received. In her influential text, *Decolonising Methodologies*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith urged that rather than continue to *be* researched, indigenous people should research back, using their own ethical boundaries, world views, addressing the needs of their people and using indigenous practices.¹⁰¹ The overall practice

⁹⁸ Donna M. Mertens, Fiona Cram, and Bagele Chilisa, eds, *Indigenous Pathways into Social Research: Voices of a New Generation*, Walnut Creek, CA, 2013; Kurtz, 'Indigenous Methodologies'; Bagele Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2012; Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies*; American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), *Indigenous Framework for Evaluation* 2010, <http://indigeval.aihec.org/Pages/Documents.aspx>; Wilson, *Research is Ceremony*; N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2008; Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras, *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Dunedin, 2005.

⁹⁹ Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, p.13.

¹⁰⁰ Smith, *Decolonising Research Methodologies*, 1999; Bishop and Glynn, 1999; Fiona Cram, 'Rangahau Māori: Tona tika, tona pono – the validity and integrity of Māori research' in M. Tolich, ed., *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*, Auckland, 2001, pp. 35–52; Pipi et al, 'A Research Ethic For Studying Māori and Iwi Provider Success', pp.141–153.

¹⁰¹ Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies*.

of kaupapa Māori research is to develop and use culturally appropriate research tools, methods and protocols. At a kaupapa Māori research hui in 2011, Smith said 'When I think about kaupapa Māori research, I see it really simply: it's a plan; it's a programme; it's an approach; it's a way of being; it's a way of knowing; it's a way of seeing; it's a way of making meaning; it's a way of being Māori; it's a way of thinking; it's a thought process; it's a practice; it's a set of things you want to do. It is a kaupapa and that's why I think it is bigger than a methodology.'¹⁰² Kaupapa Māori approaches need to respond to each individual situation, current discourse on kaupapa Māori recognises it as having multiple and fluid boundaries.¹⁰³ Laura Jardine-Coom reflects on how there is often an assumption that methodology is fixed, but in the reality of research, it has to be flexible. For her, getting involved – tangi, hui, marae – all provided knowledge and experience of tikanga.¹⁰⁴ Joanna Kidman suggests flexibility in ethical procedure to creating consent procedures in line with community expectations.¹⁰⁵

Considering a new set of questions can be a way for researchers to address or identify cultural bias or structural impediments. Russell Bishop put forward the following questions that are fundamental to kaupapa Māori research:

- Who initiates the research?
- Who is going to design the work?
- Who is going to do the work?
- What rewards will there be?
- Who is going to have access to the research findings?
- Who is the researcher accountable to?
- Who has control over the distribution of the knowledge?¹⁰⁶

Linda Smith also compiled a list of questions for researchers working in cross-cultural settings:

- Who defined the research problem?
- For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so?
- What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
- What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?
- What are some likely positive outcomes from this study?
- What are some possibly negative outcomes?
- How can the negative outcomes be eliminated?
- To whom is the researcher accountable?
- What processes are in place to support the research, the researched, and the researcher?
- Do individual researchers have an inherent right to knowledge and truth?¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Linda T. Smith, 'Opening Ketynote: Story-ing the Development of Kaupapa Māori – A Review of Sorts', in Hutchings et al, *Kei Tua o te Pae Hui Proceedings*, p.10.

¹⁰³ Jessica Hutchings, Helen Potter and Katrina Taupo, eds, *Kei Tua o te Pae Hui Proceedings – The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century*, NZCER, Wellington, 2011.

¹⁰⁴ Jardine-Coom, *When Men and Mountains Meet*, p.21.

¹⁰⁵ Kidman, *Engaging with Māori Communities*, pp.82–6.

¹⁰⁶ Russell Bishop, 'Initiating Empowering Research?,' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 1, 1994, pp.175–88.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies*, 1999, p.173.

8.0 Good Practice Guidelines for Collaboration

Good practice guidelines and collaborative projects that have documented their process and experience provide guidance on matters such as mātauranga Māori, funding structures, research protocols and design. This section considers good practice guidelines and the following section provides illustrations through case studies. However, there is some overlap between the two.

The term 'good practice guidelines' is used, rather than 'best practice guidelines'.¹⁰⁸ This is an intentional distinction. The idea of 'best practice' has been critiqued as a concept that is too prescriptive and not allowing for flexibility and responsiveness to different factors.¹⁰⁹ Russell Bishop's 1996 book, *Whakawhanaungatanga* provides well-documented examples of collaborative research within education and is still considered one of the definitive works on kaupapa Māori collaborative research.¹¹⁰ Garth Harmsworth's 'Good Practice Guidelines for working with Tangata Whenua' is similarly, a key text that provides a framework for collaborative research projects.¹¹¹ Joanna Kidman's 2007 work, *Engaging with Māori Communities* delves into the structural impediments to positive, responsive and effective collaboration with Māori communities.¹¹²

A truly collaborative endeavour needs to address issues of power relationships, and create a space where all those involved, and the knowledge they bring, is valued equally.¹¹³ Harmsworth asserts that 'the driving force for participation and collaboration should be the desire of parties to respect, consult, learn, and understand each other. These are crucial and fundamental and should be the reasons people of different cultures and backgrounds work together.'¹¹⁴

Durie outlines that, although difficult to measure, the state's responsiveness to Māori can be gauged by three indicators: the degree of involvement of Māori within the sector, performance measures that indicate progress towards strategic goals, objectives and outputs, and changes in actual outcomes for Māori. He also indicated a related expectation that Māori would contribute to

¹⁰⁸ For example Harmsworth 'Good practice guidelines'; Roorda and Peace, 'Challenges to Implementing Good Practice Guidelines'; SPEaR (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee), 'Good Practice Guidelines', 2008, www.spear.govt.nz/good-practice/statement-purpose.html; Ministry for the Environment, 'Iwi and local government interaction under the Resource Management Act 1991: Examples of good practice', ME 336. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment, 2000; Cram, 'Māori and Science'.

¹⁰⁹ See for example, Barnes, 'What can Pākehā learn', pp.14, 22; Juan Marcellus Tauri, 'The Māori social science academy and evidence-based policy', *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.

¹¹⁰ Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*.

¹¹¹ From Harmsworth, 'Good practice guidelines' pp.7-8.

¹¹² Kidman, *Engaging with Māori Communities*.

¹¹³ Bishop, *Whakawhanaungatanga*.

¹¹⁴ Harmsworth, 'Good practice guidelines', pp.7-8.

service design, delivery of services, and monitoring and evaluation.¹¹⁵ Te Awekotuku's early ethical guidelines similarly notes that responsiveness must be to Māori needs 'expressed from within the community, and not needs perceived by those outside it'.¹¹⁶

There are seven kaupapa Māori practices that form a 'code of conduct' (suggestive rather than prescriptive) related to kaupapa Māori research and that can guide collaborative projects and encourage participation with Māori communities:¹¹⁷

- aroha ki te tangata (a respect for people)
- kanohi kitea (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face)
- titiro, whakarongo ... kōrero (look, listen, speak)
- manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people, be generous)
- kia tupato (be cautious)
- kua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of people)
- kia ngākau māhaki (do not flaunt your knowledge).¹¹⁸

These guidelines need application in action, not just theory, because at the heart of kaupapa Māori is, as Graham Smith termed it, the praxis.¹¹⁹

There are also good practice guidelines, specifically outlined as such, or embedded within reports on consultation and engagement processes, collaboration or partnership, for specific sectors including health,¹²⁰ local/regional councils,¹²¹ the environment,¹²² internal affairs,¹²³ and

¹¹⁵ Durie, 'Public Sector Reform'.

¹¹⁶ Te Awekotuku, *He Tikanga Whakaro*, p.14.

¹¹⁷ Smith, *Decolonizing Research Methodologies*, 1999; Bishop and Glynn, 1999; Cram, 'Rangahau Māori'; Pipi et al, 'A Research Ethic For Studying Māori and Iwi Provider Success', pp.141–153.

¹¹⁸ This appears in a range of sources as "kua e māhaki", but given the translation of "māhaki" is "to be humble" believe that "Kia ngākau māhaki" is the correct phrase in this context.

¹¹⁹ Graham Smith, 'The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis', PhD, Education Department, University of Auckland, 1997.

¹²⁰ Chant, 'Hauora Kotahitanga'; Health Research Council (HRC), *Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Māori*, Wellington, 2010; Pūtaiora Writing Group (Maui Hudson, Moe Milne, Paul Reynolds, Khyla Russell and Barry Smith), *Te Ara Tika. Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members*, for the Health Research Council, Wellington, 2010; Health and Disability Advocacy, 'Māori Cultural Competencies for Health and Disability Advocates', 2006; M. H. Durie, *Characteristics of Māori Health Research*, A Paper Presented at the Hui Whakapiripiri: Hongoeka, 1 February 1996, Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1996.

¹²¹ Watercare, *Statement of Intent, 2014–2017*, 2014; Wairoa Council, 'Māori Policy', 2012; Wellington City Council, 'Issues for Tangata Whenua', *Wellington District Plan*, v.1, chapter 2.

¹²² Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), *Te Kotahitanga o te Whakahaere Rawa: Māori and Council Engagement Under the Resource Management Act 1991*, 2006; Ministry for the Environment, 'Effective Participation in Resource Consent Processes: A Guide for Tangata Whenua', ME 588. Wellington, 2005; Ministry for the Environment, 'Iwi and local government interaction under the Resource Management Act 1991: Examples of good

education.¹²⁴ The Waitangi Tribunal's series *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei* covers a range of ways of capturing how issues around mātauranga and kaitiaki are dealt with, and guidelines for sectors including environment, health, te reo, education, and science.¹²⁵

Fiona Cram took three case studies of Māori communities who had had reasonably positive interactions with scientists, and used those experiences to construct good practice guidelines designed to facilitate better interactions between tangata whenua and the scientific community.¹²⁶ The guidelines have application for people beyond the scientific community engaging and collaborating with Māori communities. Cram's 'Good Practice Guidelines' outline 12 points, listed under the three groups: tangata whenua, scientists and collaboration.

Tangata Whenua

1. Tangata Whenua (hapū/iwi) consult as a group to ensure that there is a shared agenda and purpose to initiating collaborative research relationship with scientists.
2. Scientific mediation may be an important component of collaborations and Tangata Whenua should consider building relationships with Māori and non-Māori scientists supplementary to any collaboration.
3. Rangatahi should be involved in collaborative research as this has multiple payoffs.

practice', ME 336. Wellington, 2000; T. Taiepa, 'Collaborative management: Enhancing Māori participation in the management of natural resources', *He Pukenga Kōrero: Journal of Māori Studies*, 4, 1999, pp.27–33; Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 'Kaitiakitanga and local government'; Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), 'Sites of significance process: A step-by-step guide to protecting sites of cultural, spiritual and historical significance to Māori', Wellington, 1996.

¹²³ Internal Affairs, 'Review of Selected New Zealand Government-Funded Community Development Programmes', Wellington, 2011.

¹²⁴ Russell Bishop, 'Pretty difficult: Implementing kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.38–50; Tertiary Education Commission, *Doing Better for Māori in Tertiary Settings: A Review of the Literature*, 2012; Shelly Davies and Ngairo Eruera, 'Te Toka Āhuru: An indigenous framework for whakaako (academic development)', *MAI Review*, 3, 2009; Huia Woods, 'Indigenous Space in Institutions: Frameworks Around Māori Legal Academics at Waikato', *MAI Review*, 2, 2008; Smith and Reid, 'Māori Research Development'; Bishop and Glynn, *Culture Counts*; Ministry of Education, *Consultation and engagement with Maori: Guidelines for the Ministry of Education*. Ministry of Education: Wellington, 1999.

¹²⁵ Three reports: The Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: a report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity. Te taumata tuatahi*, Wellington, 2011 (short version); The Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: a report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity. Te taumata tuarua, Vol. 1*, Wellington, 2011; The Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: a report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity. Te taumata tuarua, Vol. 2*, Wellington, 2011. This series was the long-awaited result of the WAI 262 flora and fauna claim to the Waitangi Tribunal. For a discussion on WAI 262 see Williams, 'Mātauranga Māori and Taonga'; Maui Solomon, 'A Long Wait for Justice', in Maria Bargh, ed, *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Wellington, 2007, pp.75–84.

¹²⁶ Cram, 'Māori and Science'.

Scientists

4. Scientists wishing to build relationships with Tangata Whenua need to develop an understanding of their worldviews and cultural values.
5. Scientists and technologists need to acknowledge, respect and value the kaitiakitanga roles of Tangata Whenua.
6. The impact of timing and relationship building (e.g. hui) on project timeframes and budgets should be carefully considered.
7. Opportunities for Tangata Whenua to train and upskill should be allowed for within research budgets and timeframes.

Collaboration

8. Scientists should consult with appropriate Tangata Whenua and allow sufficient time for the determination of common research interests and priorities. Time needs to be set aside to develop understandings of each others' views and values.
9. That scientists take the opportunity to conduct needs analyses alongside Tangata Whenua to ensure clear understandings of each groups' needs and expectations of the interaction, as well as current knowledge bases.
10. That both parties engage in specific negotiations prior to interaction that clearly define shared goals and expected outcomes; including how information will be shared and disseminated.
11. That issues around intellectual property are discussed in the initial stages of a research relationship.
12. That a Memorandum of Understanding (or other significant documentation) be established to protect the rights and responsibilities of both parties.¹²⁷

There are some words of caution about cross-cultural collaboration. Jones has advocated for a rethinking of “indigene-colonizer” collaborative research: to ask troubling questions in order to unsettle it, allow it to be uneasy and ultimately to produce a better working relationship.¹²⁸ Jones focuses on the hyphen as a metaphorical statement of the collaborative relationship and argues for focusing on that relationship, what happens in it, and how. Jones suggests that indigene-colonizer collaboration should aim for ‘[l]earning from the Other, that is from the difference, from the hyphen’ rather than ‘learning about the Other’.¹²⁹ Canadian academic, Celia Haig-Brown investigates the structural impediments inherent in her position as academic and non-native, as well as her institution and her discipline and questioning how these might hinder effective collaboration. She raises the issue of how the process of sharing a collaborative project with a wider audience can in

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp.4–5.

¹²⁸ Alison Jones, (with K. Jenkins) ‘Rethinking collaboration: Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen’ in N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2008, p.471.

¹²⁹ Ibid., p.476.

fact be to the detriment of that project, and the intended consequences and outcomes desired by all involved.¹³⁰ In New Zealand, Joanna Kidman examines structural impediments specifically as inhibitors of successful collaborations and Māori engagement.¹³¹

¹³⁰ Celia Haig-Brown, 'Continuing Collaborative Knowledge Production: Knowing When, Where, How and Why', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22, 1, 2001, pp.19–32.

¹³¹ Kidman, *Engaging with Māori Communities*.

9.0 Case studies

Alongside the clearly labelled, ‘good practice guidelines’, embedded within many of the case studies are good practice guidelines, formulated in the experiences of cross-cultural engagement, collaboration and partnership.

Maynard and Wood’s instructive article ‘Tatou Tatou’ provides a model for government/non-government collaboration. They document their experience of a collaborative working process undertaken as part of a broader policy directive to improve government and community interaction, so policy and decision-making incorporates ‘the knowledge, wisdom, and practical experience of the community sector’.¹³² This article is not about collaboration with Māori specifically, but involves collaboration with any non-government organisation (NGO). Constraints and challenges discussed are: resource, time and practical constraints; political dynamics; overcoming a history of distrust; identifying when and how to involve communities in policy development; and reconciling diverse perspectives.¹³³

The University of Waikato undertook a process of introducing bicultural training into clinical psychology training and therapy methods in the late 1990s, and created a values-based Code of Ethics for the New Zealand Psychological Society. Behind the change was a belief that ‘operationalising the underlying principles of the Treaty provides the foundation for changes in research, training and practice’.¹³⁴ The six protocols they introduced were: biculturalism and Māori self-determination; equity and equal access; mana whenua; eliminating cultural racism; recognising diversity; and personal development. A student evaluation of the new training indicated an increased understanding of Treaty and bicultural issues, and an awareness of the role of culture in establishing a worldview.¹³⁵

Larner and Mayow’s article on a social research project into local partnerships between Auckland University academics, Waitakere City Council researchers and local facilitators provides fascinating insights into how local partnerships can work, but also the many challenges they faced.¹³⁶ Their intention was to ‘link research, policy and practice in mutually beneficial ways’ and this brought them up against ‘implications of current funding, differing institutional cultures, and the impact of “competitive contractualism”’.¹³⁷ Local partnerships can enable a locally responsive government, but are often disjointed, short-term or discrete projects. Rather than present a partnership methodology, the authors provide key areas to consider when engaging in

¹³² Maynard and Wood, ‘Tatou Tatou’, p.80.

¹³³ *ibid.*, pp.79–91.

¹³⁴ Averil Herbert, ‘Bicultural Partnerships in Clinical Training and Practice in Aotearoa/New Zealand’, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 31, 2, 2002, p.112.

¹³⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 114–15.

¹³⁶ Larner and Mayow, ‘Strengthening Communities’.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p.121.

partnerships, and conclude that partnership can be a fraught business, that structures and programmes need to change to engender true partnership, and that partnership is a process. They conclude that 'a definitive model' of partnership is 'an ideal whose time may never come'.¹³⁸

A collaborative partnership between researchers from Victoria University and Te Atiawa Manawhenua Ki Te Tau Ihu (Te Atiawa) has resulted in a number of small projects related to tuatara conservation. It is a good example of a long standing, flexible and shifting collaborative partnership, where both sides initiate research, and both build capacity, with a shared desired goal (of long-term tuatara survival). The success is based on a number of factors, such as interacting kanohi ki te kanohi, connections and trust built over time, transparency in communications and intentions, and a focus on applicability of the shared goal of tuatara survival.¹³⁹ The team recognise the potential difficulties in having a relationship with an organisation, when in reality 'collaborations are based on personal relationships among individuals'.¹⁴⁰ For this project, having a number of small, specific projects, with long time frames (2-3 years) seems to have helped with maintaining steady relationships. Another element of success has been the focus on 'tangible outcomes that can speak to communities with different worldviews', with findings published in academic journals as well as popular magazines, in film format for public viewing, private archival audio and visual archives for iwi, and educational resources for zoos and sanctuaries.¹⁴¹ Such dissemination of the information indicates a good understanding of meeting the needs of all those involved in the project, as well as understanding the importance of mātauranga Māori.

In an early childhood education (ECE) case study, Jenny Richie outlined the difficulties in implementing the bicultural spirit of Te Whāriki Early Childhood Curriculum in ECE centres predominantly run by Pākehā educators with little or no te reo or Māori literacy and often with a lack of understanding about how their approaches perpetuate a dominant Western bias. 'Pākehā educators, as representatives of the dominant culture, are likely to define their educational objectives (such as "quality" early childhood provision) in ways that perpetuate the hegemonic dominant Pākehā discourse, unless they somehow manage to adopt a reflexive, critical stance.'¹⁴² This case study illustrates the importance of recognising structural impediments, and building cultural competency amongst staff.

The three pilot MRPs created by CLAW, Libraries and Information, and Parks, Sports and Recreation, as well as Auckland Council Property's (ACPL) recently completed MRP can work as

¹³⁸ *ibid.*, p.132.

¹³⁹ Kristina M. Ramstad, Glenice Paine, Dawson L. Dunning, Amelia F. Geary, Susan N. Keall & Nicola J. Nelson, 'Effective partnerships between universities and indigenous communities: A case study in tuatara conservation in Aotearoa', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.229–231.

¹⁴⁰ *ibid.*, p.230.

¹⁴¹ *ibid.*

¹⁴² Jenny Ritchie, 'Whakawhanaungatanga: Dilemmas for mainstream New Zealand early childhood education of a commitment to bicultural pedagogy', 2003.

case studies to provide some direction on developing an MRP.¹⁴³ The Libraries and Information department reviewed their current state regarding Māori responsiveness, undertaking staff surveys, a number of discussions and a hui of Māori staff. ACPL stated that their MRP required a thorough review of business activities and practices over 18 months ‘beginning with self-evaluation, progressing through improvement planning and culminating in a statement of commitment to current activities and to priority improvements for immediate action’.¹⁴⁴ Both these cases indicate an organisation audit is a good place to start, recognising the potential for structural impediments and the need for broad organisational change.

The MRPs from CLAW and Libraries and Information both celebrated the areas where they were already engaging Māori or being responsive to Māori. CLAW’s MRP says ‘We need to celebrate and share our successes with our major projects while improving “business as usual”’.¹⁴⁵ For Libraries and Information, they felt that their current state revealed that they were already engaged with and responsive to Māori, but that more is required. They identified gaps in Māori leadership within their workforce, expectations and isolation for people in specialist Māori roles, issues around resourcing for Māori service delivery and outcomes, and a need for education and training for staff around when to engage with Māori stakeholders and how to obtain the right level of support.¹⁴⁶ Once gaps were identified, the each MRP provided action plans to address the gaps, and align the new approaches and changes with the Framework’s drivers and goals, as well as provide ways of assessing action and achievement of real change, beyond simply policy change. The MRPs also recognised the fluid and changing nature of the needs, aspirations and directives, and have recommended MRPs are revisited and updated regularly.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*; Libraries and Information, *Te Pātaka Whakarūri Kōrero*; Parks, Sports and Recreation, *Te Waka Oranga: Māori Responsiveness Plan for Parks, Sports and Recreation*, Auckland, 2014; Auckland Council Property (ACPL), *Māori Responsiveness Plan*, 2014, <http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/SiteCollectionDocuments/aboutcouncil/cco/aucklandcouncilproperty/maoriresponsivenessplan.pdf>.

¹⁴⁴ ACPL, *Māori Responsiveness Plan*, 2014, <http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/SiteCollectionDocuments/aboutcouncil/cco/aucklandcouncilproperty/maoriresponsivenessplan.pdf>.

¹⁴⁵ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*, p.8.

¹⁴⁶ Libraries and Information, *Te Pātaka Whakarūri Kōrero*, np, section 2.

¹⁴⁷ CLAW, *He Waka Eke Noa*; Libraries and Information, *Te Pātaka Whakarūri Kōrero*; ACPL, ‘Report: Māori Responsiveness Plan’.

10.0 Facilitating change at RIMU

RIMU engages in environmental, cultural, economic and social research and evaluation. RIMU's MRP will provide an opportunity to deliver on the Council's commitments to Māori: giving guidance to ensure policies and actions consider the protection and recognition of Māori rights and interests within Tāmaki Makarau, and how to address and contribute to the needs and aspirations of Māori. This will mean building RIMU's cultural competency. Cultural competency can be defined as responding to and encouraging indigenous involvement and reflecting indigenous values and aspirations. As indicated in the section on structural impediments and recognising bias, facilitating change requires a dialogue about RIMU's organisational culture. The literature shows that some people remain resistant to change, to acknowledging cultural bias in themselves or their organisations, and to recognising why change is necessary. This is part of the challenge ahead: not just in creating an MRP, but also in implementing it.

The aim of building RIMU's cultural competency is to achieve an organisation whose structure, processes and outputs reflects its unique position of a council research, investigations and monitoring unit in Tāmaki Makaurau. These elements are interwoven. Changing organisation structures and processes will result in a change in research design and delivery. Changing research design and delivery will necessitate a change in structure and process. By embedding the four drivers of the Framework in RIMU's processes and motivations, the research output will start to fulfil the outcomes of the goals. Using a holistic lens we can imagine how addressing the specific goals through actions contribute to addressing the four drivers. For example, addressing knowledge gaps RIMU workers may have about Te Ao Māori, through education, training and support, will enable the goal, 'An empowered organisation', but also contribute to all four drivers.

Some of the ways of achieving Te Tiriti principles in the work RIMU does (and aligning with the *Long-Term Plan* and the *Māori Plan*) is through collaborative work with Māori communities, including Māori in decision-making processes, recognising Māori cultural values and perspectives including mātauranga (knowledge), tikanga (core values), kawa (processes and protocols), and kaitiakitanga (guardianship), and contributing to Māori capacity through skills sharing and employment opportunities.¹⁴⁸ Again, these approaches may address multiple principles at any one time, while also achieving the goals of the Framework. Just as the Treaty principles are not to be considered in isolation, neither do the Framework's drivers and goals exist alone.¹⁴⁹ Changes would also tie in with the *Māori Plan* action areas of culture, social, economic and environmental advancement, and the cross-cutting themes of effective engagement and consultation processes, capacity building for Māori and Council, effective Māori representation, and establishing strategic relationships between Māori, Council, Government and the private sector.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ Auckland Council, *Long-Term Plan*, p.28.

¹⁴⁹ Parks, Sports and Recreations' MRP pictorially represents the intertwined nature of the drivers. See Parks, Sports and Recreation, *Te Waka Oranga*.

¹⁵⁰ IMSB, *The Māori Plan*, p.24.

RIMU could incorporate or employ elements of kaupapa Māori practice through tikanga, through recognition of Te Ao Māori and mātauranga Māori, and by allowing research projects to operate under a kaupapa Māori framework. The term 'kaupapa Māori' might seem intimidating to some people who have not come across it before, or who have not explored the nature of their working practice and consciously examined what inherent biases might be lurking in their approaches, processes, research, or writing. The literature on non-Māori organisations and Pākehā uses of kaupapa Māori methodologies could be instructive here.¹⁵¹ A RIMU framework could be developed based on the ideas of tino rangatiratanga, whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga, and wairuatanga. These ideas would come into play in everything RIMU is involved in – research, investigations, and monitoring. They would be inherent in how RIMU conducts its organisational processes (such as hiring, staff support and mentoring, funding allocation, project prioritisation) and research (design, processes, protocols, consultation, engagement and involvement of others, reporting). RIMU's 'We Know Auckland' must be an Auckland known in relationship with Māori.

Enabling Māori responsiveness is more than simply Māori participation. It needs to include the possibility of process change. Māori responsiveness could include Māori determining the direction for research and areas of interest, being involved in the research design and methodologies being used, having opportunities to independently lead the project, using a kaupapa Māori methodology to undertake and analyse the results. Where Māori might not be directly involved in a project or in RIMU's work, staff can still operate with an understanding of Māori culture, values and needs.

Changing an organisational culture requires awareness of the artefacts of the existing culture, removing or adjusting these to represent the new culture, and giving staff the message that the new culture is desirable and permanent. Organisational culture refers to the assumptions, values and beliefs inherent in an organisation which are perpetuated by the staff and may be unconsciously upheld through a process of normalisation. The assumptions, values and beliefs manifest in observable symbols and signs such as physical spaces, language and processes. Getting staff on board with organisational change is generally more successful with a combination of staff involvement, education, and time to reflect. It is also important that those in leadership positions reinforce the new culture, and that new staff are selected and socialised relating to the new culture.

¹⁵¹ See for example, Alison Jones, 'Dangerous liaisons: Pākehā, kaupapa Māori, and educational research', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.101–112; Barnes, 'What can Pākehā learn'; Micheal W. Brown, 'Decolonising Pākehā Ways of Being: Revealing Third Space Pākehā Experiences', PhD, University of Waikato, 2011; Health Research Council, *Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Māori*, p.2; Jones, 'Rethinking collaboration', pp. 471–86; Chris Cunningham, 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge', p.64; Tolich, 'Pākehā Paralysis'; M. Tolich and B Smith, *New Zealand Ethics Review: Changes, challenges and solutions (for Maori, health and social research)*, Auckland (forthcoming 2015).

One practical approach to assist RIMU's organisational change is having staff experience – in a tangible way – why change is necessary.¹⁵² Consider the multiple effects of having RIMU staff go to meet with Māori groups, individuals and communities. This would begin a process of relationship building, involve a kanohi kitea (face-to-face approach, which is a kaupapa Māori methodology), take place within Māori spaces, involve hui (both elements of kaupapa Māori), illustrate the diversity of Māori needs and aspirations, demonstrate where Council and Māori priorities meet and where they diverge, and many other potential outcomes. It could also involve, for some RIMU staff, an experience of being out of their comfort zone, in an environment where they are not considered the experts, listening to language they might not understand, and trying to follow unfamiliar protocols. This, then, can illuminate the way some Māori may experience Council, or non-scientists may experience a scientific paradigm. Unless communities are listened to, they will always feel dissatisfaction, and be less likely to be responsive.

Working in collaboration, engaging Māori and being responsive to Māori needs and aspirations will result in capacity building for all involved. The literature, recommends targeting rangatahi in capacity building and engagement.¹⁵³ As RIMU build their capacity in cultural competency, research, evaluation and monitoring techniques, Māori collaborators develop their skills in areas such as research, investigations and monitoring techniques, and in Council processes. This promotes all three goals of the Framework: An Empowered Organisation; Effective Māori Participation in Democracy; Strong Māori Communities.

10.1 Issues for RIMU to consider

Below is a list of issues, informed by the literature, for RIMU to consider when developing their MRP. These fall under the broad categories of process, resourcing and staff.

10.1.1 Processes

A genuinely collaborative relationship requires flexibility and appreciating different forms of knowledge and expertise. Can the system be flexible if, for example, a junior RIMU staff member might have more 'knowledge' than a senior staff member on research projects? Can a person in a management position accept a person might be appointed via a hui rather than through RIMU's existing hiring process?¹⁵⁴ Can 'embedded knowledge' or 'lived knowledge' be accepted with same weight and value as academic knowledge, within RIMU practices and processes?

¹⁵² W. Chan Kim and Renee Mauborgne, *Blue Ocean Strategy: How to Create Uncontested Market Space And Make the Competition Irrelevant*, expanded edn, Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, Boston, 2015, pp.147–170.

¹⁵³ IMSB, *The Māori Plan*, p.20; Cram, 'Māori and Science', p.4.

¹⁵⁴ See examples of this in Bishop, *Whakawhānaungatanga*.

At what stage can Māori be involved in projects. The literature recommends Māori are involved from the start so they can engage with designing the project, its development and its outcomes. The literature also shows that Māori less likely to engage if they are not interested in or cannot see the benefit of the research.

Can research topics be Māori led? How would this work when RIMU needs to fit research into Council objectives? Most literature encourages involvement from the beginning.

Can new forms of evaluation be considered that allow for kaupapa Māori research, investigation and monitoring approaches?

Māori and mainstream research priorities might not match, and research priorities might differ amongst Māori. RIMU need to consider some processes for acknowledging and working with diverse Māori realities (participants, researchers, kaitiaki).

Outcomes – need perceptible benefit for Māori (personally, their whānau, hapū, iwi) involved. Often the information contributed by Māori will be tapu, and for there to be no good outcome can mean the tapu has been transgressed. This might mean projects RIMU see as important will not be seen as important to Māori partners. Will this mean the project stops? Or would RIMU continue without Māori support?

Evaluation – what is being evaluated? Whose perspective of ‘achievement’?

Intellectual Property – need to consider ways to protect the cultural and intellectual property rights of Māori (Codes of Ethics, free and informed consent, issues of anonymity (or not), recognition of past knowledge that has informed ‘new’ knowledge).

Language – need to consider the importance of language, whether Māori is used or not, the language used during engagement with Māori, the language used in reporting and presentations of outcomes.

10.1.2 Resources

Length of time for projects will increase – planning phase, consultation, data gathering.

Whanaungatanga: time is needed for building genuine and committed relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka. Face to face interactions strengthen these relationships and encourage greater engagement and participation. Need to consider how staff changes within RIMU effect these relationships, how ‘work hours’ might need to be flexible.

Need to consider ways to ensure that participation is cost-neutral for tangata whenua.

10.1.3 Staff

Recruitment, hiring practices and promotion considerations: actively recruiting Māori staff (need to assess suitability based on wide ranging considerations, eg. not just specialisation, but what would they bring to the team). What is the remuneration criteria and can this be flexible to consider non-academic qualifications for the job?

Are Māori in visible and effective leadership roles?

Capacity building for Māori and non-Māori.

Recruitment, mentoring, internships. Need to consider programmes for Māori students and staff to promote Māori skills in the research areas RIMU is involved in.

Need to be aware of the burden that can be placed on Māori employees – to be a spokesperson, to try and reflect views of their hapū and Council – and provide resourcing to support them.

Training current staff and induction for new staff to build cultural competence.

11.0 Bibliography

Aboriginal Peak Organisations, Northern Territory, 'Principles for a Partnership-Centered Approach for NGOs Working with Aboriginal Organisations and Communities in the Northern Territory', 2013.

Allen, W., J. M. Ataria, J. M. Apgar, G. Harmsworth, and L. A. Tremblay, 'Kia pono te mahi putaiao—doing science in the right spirit', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.239–42.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), *Indigenous Framework for Evaluation*, 2010.

Ātaria, J., 'Environmental Research', in J. S. Te Rito J. S. and S. M. Healy, eds, *Te Ara Pūtaiao: Māori Insights in Science*, Auckland, 2008, pp.7–25.

Auckland Council, *Long-Term Plan 2012-2022, Vol. One: An Overview of Our next 10 Years*, Auckland, 2012.

Auckland Council Property (ACPL), *Māori Responsiveness Plan*, 2014, <http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/SiteCollectionDocuments/aboutcouncil/cco/aucklandcouncilproperty/maoriresponsivenessplan.pdf>

Auckland Regional Council (ARC), 'Māori consultation principles', Auckland: Iwi Relations Team, Auckland Regional Council, 2004 (see Appendix 2 Harmsworth, 2005 for table outlining these).

Australian Health Minister's Advisory Council, 'Cultural Respect Framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health, 2004–2009', Department of Health, South Australia, 2004.

Agrawal, A., 'Why "indigenous" knowledge?', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.157–8.

Barefoot Collective, *Barefoot Guide to Working with Organisations and Social Change*, 2009.

Barefoot Collective, *Barefoot Guide 2: Learning Practices in Organisations and Social Change*, 2011.

Barnes, A., 'What can Pākehā learn from engaging in kaupapa Māori educational research?', Working Paper 01, NZCER, 2013.

Bargh, M., ed, *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Wellington, 2007.

Berkes, F., 'Indigenous ways of knowing and the study of environmental change', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.151–6.

- Bishop, R., 'Pretty difficult: Implementing kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.38–50.
- Bishop, R., 'Initiating Empowering Research?', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 1, 1994, pp.175–88.
- Bishop, R., *Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative Research Stories*, Palmerston North, 1996.
- Bishop, R. and T. Glynn, *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*, Palmerston North, 1999.
- Brown, M. W., 'Decolonising Pākehā Ways of Being: Revealing Third Space Pākehā Experiences', PhD, University of Waikato, 2011.
- Came, Heather, 'Institutional Racism and the Dynamics of Privilege in Public Health', PhD, University of Waikato, 2012.
- Chambers, C., 'Mixing methodologies: The politics of research techniques', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.197–99.
- Chant, L., 'Hauora Kotahitanga: Maori health experiences as models for co-operative co-existence between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples', PhD, University of Auckland, 2013.
- Cherrington, L., 'Te hohounga: Mai i te tirohanga Māori. The process of reconciliation: Towards a Māori view. The delivery of conduct problem services to Māori', Report prepared for Ministry of Social Development, 30 June 2009.
- Chilisa, B., *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2012.
- Coastal, Air, Land, and Water Unit (CLAW), *He Waka Eke Noa. Mō Te Taiao: Our CLAW Māori Responsiveness Plan*, Auckland, 2014.
- Cooper, G., 'Kaupapa Māori Research: Epistemic Wilderness as Freedom?' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.64–73.
- Cram, F., 'Appreciative Inquiry' *MAI Review*, 3, 2010.¹⁵⁵
- Cram, F., 'Ethics in Māori Research, Working Paper', in L.W. Nikora, ed, *Cultural Justice and Ethics*, Proceedings of a symposium held at the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, pp. 28–30.

¹⁵⁵ Note that the journal *MAI Review* is an online-only publication and does not include page numbers.

Cram, F., 'Māori and Science: Three Case Studies: Final Report' prepared for the Royal Society of New Zealand, 2002.

Cram, F., 'Rangahau Māori: Tona tika, tona pono – the validity and integrity of Māori research' in M. Tolich, ed., *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*, Auckland, 2001, pp. 35–52.

Cram, F. and V. Kennedy, 'Researching with Whānau Collectives', *MAI Review*, 3, 2010.

Crawford, S., 'Mātauranga Maori and western science: The importance of hypotheses, predictions and protocols', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.163–66.

Cunningham, C., 'A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge in Research, Science and Technology', *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7, 1, 2000, pp.62–9.

Davies, S. and N. Eruera, 'Te Toka Āhuru: An indigenous framework for whakaako (academic development)', *MAI Review*, 3, 2009.

Denzin, N.K., Y. S. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2008.

Durie, M., 'Characteristics of Māori Health Research', A Paper Presented at the Hui Whakapiripiri: Hongoeka, 1 February 1996, Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1996.

Durie, M., 'Exploring the Interface Between Science and Indigenous Knowledge', presentation at the 5th APEC Research and Development Leaders Forum, Capturing Value From Science, Christchurch, 2004.

Durie, M., 'Public Sector Reform, Indigeneity and the Goals of Māori Development', Commonwealth Advanced Seminar, Wellington, 2004.

Eketone, A. 'Theoretical Underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori Directed Practice', *MAI Review*, 1, 2008.

Foster, G., 'Facilitating improved achievement of Maori students in science', New Zealand Science Teacher, 2013: www.nzscienceteacher.co.nz/putaiao/facilitating-improved-achievement-of-maori-students-in-science/#.VHe7yGe0S8C

González y González, E. M. and Y. S. Lincoln, 'Decolonizing Qualitative Research: Non-Traditional Reporting Forms in the Academy', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7, 4, 2006.

Graham, J., 'Nā Rangī tāua, nā Tūānuku e takoto nei: Research methodology framed by whakapapa', *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.

- Haig-Brown, C., 'Continuing Collaborative Knowledge Production: Knowing When, Where, How and Why', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22, 1, 2001, pp.19–32.
- Harmsworth, G., 'Collaborative research with Maori groups as part of the Motueka integrated catchment management (ICM) programme', c.2004.
- Harmsworth, G., 'Good Practice Guidelines for Working with Tangata Whenua and Māori Organisations: Consolidating Our Learning', Landcare Research Report (LC0405/091), Prepared for Integrated Catchment Management Programme, Motueka, 2005.
- Harmsworth, G., 'Indigenous Values and GIS: a Method and a Framework', *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor*, 6, 3, 1998, pp.1–7.
- Harmsworth, G., 'Māori Values in the Māori Business Approach: An interim report investigating the incorporation of tikanga in Māori business and organisations', for Mana Taiao, 2006.
- Harmsworth, G., 'The role of Māori values in Low-impact Urban Design and Development (LIUDD)', Discussion paper, Landcare Research NZ, 2003.
- Harmsworth, G., K. Barclay-Kerr, and T. Reedy, 'Māori Sustainable Development in the 21st century: The Importance of Māori Values, Strategic Planning and Information Systems', *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 3, 2, 2002, pp.40–68.
- Harmsworth, G. R., R. G. Young, D. Walker, J. E. Clapcott and T. James, 'Linkages between cultural and scientific indicators of river and stream health', *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 45, 3, 2011, pp.423–36.
- Hayes, L., 'Kaupapa Māori in New Zealand Public Libraries', MA (Information Science), Victoria University, 2012.
- Health and Disability Advocacy, 'Māori Cultural Competencies for Health and Disability Advocates', 2006.
- Health Research Council (HRC), *Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Māori*, Wellington, 2010 (includes Te Ara Tika, see Pūtaiora Writing Group).
- Henderson, A., "Nursing a Colonial hangover" – 15 years on', Paper prepared for NZPI "Winds of Change" Conference, Wellington, 2011.
- Herbert, A., 'Bicultural Partnerships in Clinical Training and Practice in Aotearoa/New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 31, 2, 2002, pp.110–16.

Hikuroa, D., A. Slade and D. Gravley, 'Implementing Māori indigenous knowledge (mātauranga) in a scientific paradigm: Restoring the mauri to Te Kete Poutama', *MAI Review*, 3, 2011.

Hodges, W., 'Maori Conservation Ethic: A Ngati Kahungunu perspective'. Conservation Advisory Science Notes No. 93, Department of Conservation, Wellington, 1994.

Hoskins, R., 'Our Faces in Our Places: Cultural Landscapes – Māori and the Urban Environment' in the Public Health Advisory Committee, *Rethinking Urban Environments and Health*, Wellington, 2008, pp.27–33.

Hoskins, T. K., 'A Fine Risk: Ethics in Kaupapa Māori Politics', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.85–99.

Human Rights Commission, *A Fair Go for All? Rite Tahi Tātou Katoa?: Addressing Structural Discrimination in Public Services*, Auckland, 2012.

Hutchings, J., H. Potter, and K. Taupo, eds, *Kei tua o te pae hui proceedings. The challenges of Kaupapa Maori research in the 21st century*, New Zealand Council for Education Research, Wellington, New Zealand, 2011.

Hutchings J. and P. Reynolds, 'Maori and the "McScience" of new technologies: Biotechnology and nanotechnology development', *Matariki: a Monograph Series*, 2007, pp.81–111.

Hutchings, J., K. Taupo and A. Barnes, *Future Food Technologies an Māori Well-Being. He Peka Kai, He Peka Taonga*, Ministry of Science and Innovation CO 2X 0801, 2012.

Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB), *Schedule of Issues of Significance to Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau*, Auckland, 2014.

Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB), *Te Tiriti o Waitangi Audit. Executive Summary*, Auckland, 2012.

Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB), *The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau*, Auckland, 2012.

Internal Affairs, 'Review of Selected New Zealand Government-Funded Community Development Programmes', Wellington, 2011.

International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education (IRI), 'Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights: Economics, Politics & Colonisation', vol. 2, Series: Critical Issues in Contemporary Māori Society, 1997.

Jaram, D. M., 'Joe Harawira: The emergence of a mātauranga Māori environmentalist', *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.

- Jardine-Coom, L., *When Men and Mountains Meet: Rūiamoko, western science and political ecology in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2010.
- Johnson F. and J. Walliss, 'Reconciling History: Inserting an Indigenous Space into the University of Melbourne Campus', *Landscape Review*, 15, 1, 2014, pp.47–63.
- Jones, A., 'Dangerous Liaisons: Pākehā, kaupapa Māori, and educational research', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.101–112.
- Jones, A., (with Jenkins, K.) 'Rethinking collaboration: Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen' in N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2008, pp. 471–86.
- Jones, R., S. Crengle and T. McCreanor, 'How Tikanga Guides and Protects the Research Process: Insights from the Hauora Tāne Project', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 29, 2006, pp.60– 77.
- Kennedy, N for Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua, 'Maatauranga Maaori in Urban Planning: A Taamaki Makaurau Case Study', 2012.
- Kennedy, V., and F. Cram, 'Ethics of Researching with Whānau Collectives' *MAI Review*, 3, 2010.
- Kidman, J., *Engaging with Māori Communities: An Exploration of Some Tensions in the Mediation of Social Sciences Research*, Tehei Oreore Series for Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, Wellington, 2007.
- Kim W. C. and R. Mauborgne, *Blue Ocean Strategy: How to Create Uncontested Market Space And Make the Competition Irrelevant*, expanded edn, Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, Boston, 2015 (esp chp 7, 'Overcome Key Organizational Hurdles, pp.147–70).
- Kurtz, D. L. M., 'Indigenous Methodologies: Traversing Indigenous and Western Worldviews in Research', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 2013, pp.217–29.
- Larner, W., and T. Mayow, 'Strengthening Communities through Local Partnerships: Building a Collaborative Research Project', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 20, 2003, pp.119–33.
- Libraries and Information, *Te Pātaka Whakarūrū Kōrero – Te Kauhanganui: Libraries and Information Māori Responsiveness Plan 2014–2017*, Draft, 2014.
- Local Government New Zealand, 'Frequently Asked Questions on Council-Māori Engagement: A resource to support councils', 2007.

Lowe, B. J., D. J. Carr, R. E. McCallum, T. Myers, A. Gorham, H. Holmes, C. Holtham, L. Matenga, L. Miller, R. Ngarimu-Cameron, W. Raumati and K. Te Kanawa, 'Consultation, collaboration and dissemination', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.225–28.

Lyver, P., C. Jones and H. Moller, 'Looking past the wallpaper: Considerate evaluation of traditional environmental knowledge by science', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.219–23.

Maaka R. and A. Fleras, *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Dunedin, 2005.

Macleay, K. and L. Cullen, 'Research methodologies for the co-production of knowledge for environmental management in Australia', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.205–208.

Mane, J., 'Kaupapa Māori: A community approach', *MAI Review*, 3, 2009.

Māori Perspective Advisory Committee, *Pūao-te-ata-tū (Day Break)*, for the Department of Social Welfare, Wellington, 1986.

MartinJenkins [sic], 'Workplace Health and Safety Culture Change: Final Report', Prepared for the Secretariat to the Independent Taskforce on Workplace Health and Safety, 2013.

Maynard, K., and B. Wood, 'Tatou Tatou – Working Together: A Model for Government/Non-Government Collaboration', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 18, 2002, pp.79–91.

McGregor, D., 'Lessons for Collaboration Involving Traditional Knowledge and Environmental Governance in Ontario, Canada', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10, 4, 2014, pp.340–53.

McShane S. L., and M. A. Von Glinow, *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Knowledge, Global Reality*, 6th edn, 2013.

Mead, A. T. P., 'Understanding Māori Intellectual Property Rights', The Inaugural Māori Legal Forum, 2002.

Mercer, J., I. Kelman, L. Taranis and S. Suchet-Pearson, 'Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction', *Disasters*, 34, 1, 2010, pp.214–39.

Mertens, D. M., F. Cram, and B. Chilisa, eds, *Indigenous Pathways into Social Research: Voices of a New Generation*, Walnut Creek, CA, 2013.

Mikaere, A., 'From Kaupapa Māori Research to Re-Searching Kaupapa Māori: Making Our Contribution to Māori Survival', in J. Hutchings, H. Potter and K. Taupo, eds, *Kei Tua o te Pae Hui Proceedings – The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century*, NZCER, Wellington, 2011, pp.29–37.

Ministry for the Environment, 'Iwi and local government interaction under the Resource Management Act 1991: Examples of good practice', ME 336, Wellington, 2000.

Ministry for the Environment, 'Effective Participation in Resource Consent Processes: A Guide for Tangata Whenua', ME 588, Wellington, 2005.

Ministry of Education, *Consultation and engagement with Maori: Guidelines for the Ministry of Education*, Wellington, 1999.

Moewaka Barnes, H., 'Transforming Science: How our Structures Limit Innovation', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 29, 2006, pp.1–16.

Moller, H., P. O'Blyver, C. Bragg, J. Newman, R. Clucas, D. Fletcher, J. Kitson, S. McKechnie, D. Scott, and Rakiura Titi Islands Administering Body, 'Guidelines for cross-cultural Participatory Action Research partnerships: A case study of a customary seabird harvest in New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of Zoology*, 36, 3, 2009, pp. 211–41.

Ormond, A., F. Cram and L. Carter, 'Researching our Relations: Reflections on Ethics and Marginalisation', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship: Special Supplement, 2006 – Marginalisation*, 2, 1, 2006, pp.175–92.

Panoho, J., and Ralph Stablein, 'A Post-Colonial Perspective on Organizational Governance in New Zealand: Reconciling Māori and Pākehā Forms', Paper for CMS 4. Stream: Postcolonial Theory, Department of Management, Massey University, 2005.

Parks, Sports and Recreation, *Te Waka Oranga: Māori Responsiveness Plan for Parks, Sports and Recreation*, Auckland, 2014.

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 'Kaitiakitanga and local government: Tangata whenua participation in environmental management', Wellington, 1998.

Peter, E., 'Four things NGOs should know for successful engagement with indigenous peoples', The Hauser Center for Non-Profit Organizations at Harvard University, 2011.

Pihama, L., 'Tungia te Ururua, kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke: A critical awareness of parents as first teachers', MA Thesis, University of Auckland, 1993.

Pihama, L. and M. Penehira, 'Building Baseline Data On Maori, Whanau Development and Maori Realising their Potential. Literature Review: Facilitating Engagement (Final Report)', Prepared for Te Puni Kokiri, Wellington, 2005, pp.9–11 and pp.46–8.

Pipi, K., F. Cram, R. Hawke, S. Hawke, T. M. Huriwai, T. Mataki, M. Milne, K. Morgan, H. Tuhaka, and C. Tuuta, 'A Research Ethic For Studying Māori and Iwi Provider Success', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23, 2004, pp.141–53.

Pūtaiora Writing Group (Maui Hudson, Moe Milne, Paul Reynolds, Khyla Russell and Barry Smith), *Te Ara Tika. Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members*, for the Health Research Council, Wellington, 2010.

Ramstad, K. M., G. Paine, D. L. Dunning, A. F. Geary, S. N. Keall and N. J. Nelson, 'Effective partnerships between universities and indigenous communities: A case study in tuatara conservation in Aotearoa', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.229–31.

Ratima, M., 'Making Space for Kaupapa Māori within the Academy', *MAI Review*, 1, 2008.

Ritchie, J., 'Whakawhanaungatanga: Dilemmas for mainstream New Zealand early childhood education of a commitment to bicultural pedagogy', 2003.

Ritchie, J. and C. Rau, 'Whakawhanaungatanga – partnerships in bicultural development in early childhood care and education', *Teaching and Learning Research Initiative*, 2006.

Roa, T., J. R. Beggs, J. Williams, and H. Moller, 'New Zealand's Performance Based Research Funding (PBRF) Model Undermines Maori Research', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.233–38.

Robson, J. P., A. M. Miller, C. J. Idrobo, C. Burlando, N. Deutsch, J. Kocho-Schellenberg, R. D. Pengelly and K. L. Turner, 'Building communities of learning: Indigenous ways of knowing in contemporary natural resources and environmental management', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.173–77.

Roorda, M. and R. Peace, 'Challenges to Implementing Good Practice Guidelines for Evaluation with Māori: A Pākehā Perspective', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 34, 2009, pp.73–88.

Rotarangi, S. and D. Russell, 'Social-ecological resilience thinking: Can indigenous culture guide environmental management?', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.209–13.

Simpson, M. and T. Ake, 'Whitiwhiti Korero: Exploring the Researchers' Relationship in Cross-Cultural Research', *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 39, 3, 2010, pp.185–205.

- Smith, C., 'Cultures of Collecting', in M. Bargh, ed, *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Wellington, 2007, pp.65–74.
- Smith, G., 'The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis', PhD, Education Department, University of Auckland, 1997.
- Smith, G., 'Interview: Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 2, 2012, pp.10–20.
- Smith, L. T., *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 1st edn, New York, 1999, 2nd edn, London, 2012.
- Smith, L.T., 'Opening Ketynote: Story-ing the Development of Kaupapa Māori – A Review of Sorts', in, J. Hutchings, H. Potter, and K. Taupo, eds, *Kei tua o te pae hui proceedings. The challenges of Kaupapa Maori research in the 21st century*, New Zealand Council for Education Research, Wellington, New Zealand, 2011, pp.10–15.
- Smith, L. T. and P. Reid, 'Māori Research Development: Kaupapa Māori Principles and Practices: A Literature Review' for Te Puni Kokiri, 2000.
- Solomon, M., 'A Long Wait for Justice', in M. Bargh, ed, *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Wellington, 2007, pp.75–84.
- SPEaR, 'Good Practice Guidelines', 2008. (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee) (www.spear.govt.nz/good-practice/statement-purpose.html).
- Stephenson, J. and H. Moller, 'Cross-cultural environmental research and management: Challenges and progress', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.139–49.
- Stuart, K., 'From a footprint to a (sustainable) place to stand: Where to from here?', in K. Stuart and M. Thompson-Fawcett eds, *Tāone Tupu Ora: Indigenous knowledge and sustainable urban design*, Wellington, 2010, pp. 100–106.
- Stuart K. and M. Thompson-Fawcett eds, *Tāone Tupu Ora: Indigenous knowledge and sustainable urban design*, Wellington, 2010.
- Taiepa, T., 'Collaborative management: Enhancing Māori participation in the management of natural resources', *He Pukenga Kōrero: Journal of Māori Studies*, 4, 1999, pp.27–33.
- Tauri, J. M., 'The Māori social science academy and evidence- based policy', *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.
- Tauri, J. M., 'Resisting Condescending Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10, 2, 2014, pp.134–150.

Te Awekotuku, N., *He Tikanga Whakaro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community: A Discussion Paper*, Wellington, 1991.

Te Papa National Services Te Paerangi, *Bicultural Governance: Governance, Management and Planning. Resource Guide*, issue 22, Wellington 2004.

Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), 'Measuring Performance and Effectiveness for Māori: Key Themes from the Literature', Wellington, 2013.

Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), 'Sites of significance process: A step-by-step guide to protecting sites of cultural, spiritual and historical significance to Māori', Wellington, 1996.

Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), *Te Kotahitanga o te Whakahaere Rawa: Māori and Council Engagement Under the Resource Management Act 1991*, 2006.

Te Rito, J. S. and S. M. Healy, eds, *Te Ara Pūtaiao: Māori Insights in Science*, Auckland, 2008.

Tertiary Education Commission, *Doing Better for Māori in Tertiary Settings: A Review of the Literature*, 2012.

Thomas, W. H., 'The forest stewards initiative: A new institution for safeguarding traditional ecological knowledge in Papua New Guinea', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.187–91.

Tolich, M., 'Pākehā Paralysis: Cultural Safety for those Researching the General Population of Aotearoa', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19, 2002, pp.164–78.

Tran, T., L.M. Strelein, J.K. Weir, C. Stacey, and A. Dwyer, *Native title and climate change. Changes to country and culture, changes to climate: Strengthening institutions for Indigenous resilience and adaptation*, National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility, Gold Coast, 2013.

Tumoana Williams, L. R., and M Henare, 'The Double Spiral and Ways of Knowing', *MAI Review*, 3, 2009.

Uhlmann, S. S. and B. S. Almstadt, 'Beyond the great divide: Do cross-cultural partnerships require spiritual scientists?', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.215–17.

Wairoa Council, 'Māori Policy', 2012.

The Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: a report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity. Te taumata tuarua, Vol. 1 and Vol 2.*, Wellington, 2011.

- Walliss, J., 'Lost in Translation: Language and Landscape in Bi-Cultural New Zealand', *Globalisation and Landscape Architecture: Issues for Education and Practice – conference proceedings*, Polytechnic University Publishing House, St Petersburg, 2007, pp.170–74.
- Walker, M., 'He Whāinga Māramatanga, He Kimihanga Tūrangawaewae' in J. S. Te Rito and S. M. Healy, eds, *Te Ara Pūtaiao: Māori Insights in Science*, Auckland, 2008, pp.37–46.
- Watercare, *Statement of Intent, 2014–2017*, 2014.
- Webber, M., 'The multiple selves and realities of a Māori researcher', *MAI Review*, 1, 2009.
- Wehi, P.M., H. Whaanga and T. Roa, 'Missing in translation: Maori language and oral tradition in scientific analyses of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK)', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.201–204.
- Wellington City Council, 'Issues for Tangata Whenua', *Wellington District Plan*, v.1, chapter 2.
- Williams, D., 'Mātauranga Māori and Taonga: The Nature and Extent of Treaty Rights Held by Iwi and Hapu in Indigenous Flora and Fauna, Cultural Heritage Objects, Valued Traditional Knowledge', Waitangi Tribunal Publication, 2001.
- Williams, J., 'Towards a Model for Indigenous research' in B. Hokowhitu, N. Kermoal, C. Andersen, A. Petersen, M. Reilly, I. Altamirano-Jiménez and P. Rewi, eds, *Indigenous Identity and Resistance Research the Diversity of Knowledge*, Dunedin, 2010, pp.107–119.
- Wilson, S., *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*, Black Point, Nova Scotia, 2008.
- Woods, H., 'Indigenous Space in Institutions: Frameworks Around Māori Legal Academics at Waikato', *MAI Review*, 2, 2008.
- Zurba, M., 'Bringing local synthesis into governance and management systems: The Giringun TUMRA case in Northern Queensland, Australia', *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4, 2009, pp.179–82.