



Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Māori Guidelines Hui 2007

A collaboration between SPEaR and anzea

SPEaR

Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Māori Guidelines Hui 2007

1. Project Title

Progressing SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines Māori – Research and Evaluation

2. Introduction

The Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee (SPEaR) was established by government, with a mandate to “oversee the government’s social policy research and evaluation purchase”¹. In undertaking this role, SPEaR has a number of specified functions, including:

- acting as a vehicle for gathering agency views on sectoral research capacity issues;
- sponsoring initiatives aimed at improving social policy research capability (including agency research practice); and
- promoting the utilisation of “best practice” approaches, tools and techniques through development (where necessary) and/or dissemination.

3. Background

The development of the SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines (Contracting, Ethics, Māori and Pasifika) is a key part of developing the research and evaluation capacity and capability of the social sector. Specifically the guidelines aim to:

- provide real world guidance,
- act as the basis for practical training,
- address cross-agency and cross-disciplinary needs, and
- provide examples, and
- suggest further resources (e.g., readings, places/people) for those wanting more detailed advice.

¹ SPEaR Terms of Reference <http://www.spear.govt.nz/SPEAR/common/home.do> and click About SPEaR.

The Guidelines are web-based so that they are easily accessible. They are intended to provide guidance to all stakeholders in social policy research and evaluation: public servants in management, policy, research and evaluation functions, academic researchers, private sector and third sector researchers and evaluators and practitioners in all sectors.²

SPEaR held two information collecting hui to test and further develop a good practice³ guideline 'product' to assist in setting standards for good practice in New Zealand social policy research and evaluation.

A series of principles were decided upon – respect, integrity, responsiveness, competency and reciprocity – and there is broad acceptance and agreement with the principles based approach that SPEaR has taken in the development of these guidelines.

Feedback from Māori participants attending a May 2005 workshop indicated that in order to meet the aim of providing real world guidance, there was a need to provide some rich illustrative examples to assist the application of these principles within research and evaluation contexts.

Principles, and in particular their application, were seen to occur within, and be subject to, the cultural context and values of the practitioner and the people/community party to the research/evaluation. For example, what counts as respect in the culture of the practitioner, may not be considered respectful in the eyes of the people/community participating in the research.

With rich descriptions and examples, individuals, organisations and groups who have very little, or no research or evaluation experience were more likely to be able to apply the Best Practice Guideline principles in their own real world settings.

4. SPEaR Best Practice Māori Guidelines Hui 2007

A one day hui was held on the 8th of July, at Solway Copthorne Hotel and Resort, Masterton, (to coincide with the Inaugural anzea Conference – July 8-11, 2007).

SPEaR had progressed the development of the guidelines to their present state by bringing together primarily Māori, individual researchers and evaluators from both the public and private sector.

In consultation with anzea's Māori board members, a different approach and process was utilised to contribute to the ongoing development of the guidelines; in particular to broaden the range/breadth of Māori contributing to the development of the guidelines. A more participatory

² Draft SPEaR Good Practice Guidelines Package for Workshop, 10-11 May 2005, Wellington, p3

³ To date, we have been using the term 'best practice' while aware that this begs the question "who defines best?" Draft SPEaR Good Practice Guidelines Package for Workshop, 10-11 May 2005, Wellington, p3

<http://www.spear.govt.nz/good-practice/index.html#good-practice-guidelines-consultation-document>

approach centres on the notion of creating a shared understanding and is consistent with tikanga Māori principles of whanaungatanga and mana.

An invitation was extended to a wide range of Māori researchers and evaluators and to iwi and Māori provider and community-based organisations. Travel assistance of \$80 was offered⁴ to community/NGO representatives. Participants were also offered accommodation for the night due to the hui completion time (expected to be around 7pm). For this hui the principle of koha, in this case reciprocity, was applied and individuals received no monetary remuneration for their involvement.

The involvement of community and hapū/iwi representatives was seen as imperative for ensuring that the practice guidelines take account of, and draw upon, the reality of Māori provider and whānau experience. It was also important that community and iwi/ Māori provider organisations were able to speak for themselves (i.e. give voice to their own experience and concerns), rather than researchers and evaluators, albeit Māori, speaking on their behalf.

5. Project Aim, Target Audience(s), Objectives and Outcomes

The primary aim of the project was to progress the development of the SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines Māori (SPEaR BPGM).

The objective of the hui was to develop a set of rich practice ‘vignettes’ that illustrate the application of the SPEaR BPGM Principles in a number of real world settings.

The output from the project was the development of two vignettes for each of the five Research and Evaluation principles that had been agreed upon (Respect, Integrity, Responsiveness, Competency, and Reciprocity).

The outcome from the project was the progression of the SPEaR BPGM, with this achieved through:

- Generation of the practice vignettes at a one-day hui,
- Circulation of the vignettes and relevant documentation BPGM to evaluation practitioners, other hui participants and the SPEaR secretariat,
- Incorporation (and modification) of the vignettes as part of the SPEaR BPGM, and
- Potentially, the generation of other illustrative applications of principles to research and evaluation with Māori.

⁴ To receive the travel assistance, there was a requirement to complete a travel assistance application form. A copy of this form is appended to this progress report.

6. Summary of the hui processes and proceedings⁵

Kataraina Pipi, a highly experienced Māori facilitator, was contracted by anzea to: determine the process for the hui, facilitate the hui, and prepare a brief summary of the hui proceedings. A hui recorder, Vivienne Kennedy, was also contracted to take notes during the hui and to transcribe/write up the vignettes that emerged.

The hui process began with mihi whakatau and karakia. Hui participants introduced themselves indicating their name, where they were from, why they came to the hui and their involvement in the research and evaluation field. Their reasons for attending the hui were primarily twofold:

- to contribute to the ongoing development of the BPGM; and
- to network and make connections with other Māori in the field of evaluation and research.

Briefly, the process involved the following⁶:

- Raewyn Good presented background information on SPEaR
- Nan Wehipeihana summarised the activities to date in developing the guidelines, Māori involvement in the process and the intended outcomes of this hui.
- Juan Tuari shared his involvement in the development of background papers to inform the development of the guidelines and also presented the five principles and shared examples of how these principles were arrived at.
- Kataraina Pipi (in tandem with Juan) facilitated discussion on each of the principles

The presentations and group discussion were interspersed with two creative writing exercises. Participants were given an opening line and three minutes to write a story in relation to a topic area (bread pudding, koha and manaaki) as a lead in/warm up to the small group work to be undertaken in the afternoon.

The following are two examples of the stories/vignettes generated from this process⁷ and are indicative of the types of output that will be presented in the final hui report.

⁵ Laurie Porima, Nan Wehipeihana and Kate McKegg were responsible for the planning, administration and overall conduct of the hui.

⁶ A copy of the hui programme is appended to this progress report.

⁷ The process was adapted for the afternoon small group work, to include asking participants to identify the lesson/s learnt or insight gained from the stories/vignettes.

Once upon a time... koha

... a solo parent was ready to korero about his experiences with someone he hadn't met before. The parent was only too happy to korero and was told he would receive a koha. The trouble was, the koha wasn't very useful to the parent.

It makes sense to awhi in an appropriate matter

Once upon a time... reciprocity

... while working on a project the issue of koha came up. The question by one of our colleagues was, "What is 'koha'?" (She was non-Māori). I wanted to say "Ko te ha manawa o te tangata." Yeah right, it was easier to say, "Reciprocity." But I knew koha meant much more than that...

It's our way of saying "thank you."

It's our way of giving recognition

It's our way of giving acknowledgement

It's our way of sharing love

*Iti te kupu, nui ake te korero*⁸

7. The process used to generate the vignettes

Kataraina Pipi, in consultation with Nan Wehipeihana, developed the approach used to generate the vignettes. Key to the design of this approach was the need to ensure that:

- the hui provided an environment for the successful sharing/generation of stories/ vignettes,
- the process supported and facilitated the sharing/generation of stories/vignettes, and

⁸ Possible meanings include "a few words, generates a rich discussion" or "one word contains a depth of meaning."

- the process allowed for the capture of each of the individual stories/vignettes to facilitate the selection and write-up of vignettes.

Briefly, the process was as follows:

1. Participants were invited to reflect on an experience they have had where the principle has been prominent or apparent and they were asked to:
 - write a short story about that experience (two to three minutes writing time) – deliberately short so that the story was brief and to the point; or
 - write a whakatauki (proverb) that supports the principle; or
 - draw a picture that captures the essence of the principle
2. Individuals then shared their stories with other group members
3. Each group shared with the wider group a minimum of three stories and the overall learnings and insights the group identified/had gained of the principle as a result of the shared stories and discussion.
4. Participants gave their story/writing/picture to the hui recorder.
5. At the end of the small group exercise, the hui recorder had a minimum of ten stories on each principle.

This process was repeated twice (with participants choosing another principle and a different set of people to work with). Throughout the process, participants had the benefit of listening to the stories generated by participants (which both acted as a prompt for participants, but also minimised duplication of the “same” story or lesson learnt). The process also facilitated whakawhanaungatanga, that is, the process of “becoming whānau”, and getting to know one another. Importantly the skills of Kataraina Pipi, an internationally accredited NLP trainer; the use of te reo Māori me te reo tauīwi (Māori and English language); and Kataraina’s talents as a musician, songwriter, composer and facilitator extraordinaire made the day fun for all involved.

8. Write up of the vignettes⁹

Vivienne Kennedy, an independent evaluation contractor, attended the hui and thus heard first hand the presentation of the stories/vignettes. Vivienne completed the transcribing of the hui notes/audio recordings and the compilation and initial write up of the hui proceedings and vignettes. The draft document was then reviewed and edited by Nan Wehipeihana.

Originally it had been envisaged that the next stage in the process would be review of the vignettes by Dr Fiona Cram and Juan Tauri, and then the reviewed document would be forwarded to SPEaR.

However, it became evident that an intermediary process was needed because some vignettes:

- Appeared not to directly relate to the practice principle, under which they were generated,
- Did not translate well in the written form,
- Illustrated the same example or practice, and/or
- Were more easily understood than others.

As a result, there were a number of decisions that needed to be made in relation to the vignettes in terms of: the final selection of the set of vignettes, and the refinement or editing of the vignettes to aid understanding and/or better illustrate the point being made.

In addition, some of the vignettes generated in the creative writing phase of the process, did not 'neatly' fit under specific best practice principles, but rather offered some useful insights in relation to the conduct of research and evaluation with Māori. The question therefore became how these vignettes might be retained or utilised within the document.

The initial draft was subsequently circulated to Vivienne Kennedy, Kataraina Pipi, Laurie Porima, Kellie Spee and Nan Wehipeihana. The final selection and editing of the vignettes was carried out by Kataraina Pipi and Nan Wehipeihana (with assistance from Fiona Cram). Even given this process, it is likely that the services of an editor might be needed to tailor the vignettes for publication on the SPEaR website.

⁹ Hui participants agreed that Nan Wehipeihana, Laurie Porima, Kataraina Pipi and Vivienne Kennedy could, without reference to the group, provide the final report (hui proceedings and at least two vignettes for each principle) to SPEaR.

9. Utilising the vignettes

Ideally, hui participants sought that the report - both the proceedings and the vignettes - would be published in its entirety, rather than only two vignettes being included within the BPGM. It was felt that publishing the report in full would:

- Acknowledge the contribution of participants to the guidelines development (as none of the vignettes are personally attributed),
- Allow for more than two vignettes to be utilised,
- Acknowledge the inter-relatedness of the principles (as opposed to being distinct and separate),
- Document the process of generation, which was seen as having been key to the generation of stories/vignettes, and
- Allow for /support the process being replicated by Māori (and non-Māori with respect to the other best practice guidelines).

We understand that SPEaR is open to exploring this aspect further once this final report has been completed and signed off by SPEaR.

Exploring the Application of the SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines Principles in relation to Māori

This section documents the discussion and vignettes that arose out of a hui of Māori researchers, evaluators and community providers. The hui, sponsored by SPEaR and anzea, was held in Masterton, Aotearoa/New Zealand, on July 8, 2007.

SPEaR has developed Best Practice Guidelines (Contracting, Ethics, Māori and Pasifika) to support the development of research and evaluation capacity and capability in the New Zealand social sector. Five principles – *respect, integrity, responsiveness, competency and reciprocity* – underpin the SPEaR guidelines.

The purpose of the hui was to provide rich illustrative examples to assist in the application of the principles within research and evaluation contexts. The ultimate aim is to support the application of the Best Practice Guideline principles by individuals, organisations and groups who have little to no research or evaluation experience.

The following section is presented as follows:

- The SPEaR Best Practice Guideline principle is stated.
- A brief summary of the hui discussion and reflection on the principle is presented.
- A series of vignettes (stories and illustrative practice examples) are described.

Please note, some of the stories are general stories about experiences relevant to the principle and other stories are couched in research- and/or evaluation-specific experience of the ‘principle in action’. In addition, some vignettes could be used to illustrate more than one principle, and this is particularly so for the vignettes generated in relation to respect, reciprocity and responsiveness. For this report, the vignettes have been retained within the original principle section in which they were developed.

Participants were given one line ‘openers’ to begin their exploration of the principle within the context of a writing exercise. Some of the stories start with an opening line of ‘Once upon a time...’ and others with ‘If only...’

The hui generated many stories and practice examples, some being deemed to be of more relevance than others. Kataraina Pipi and Nan Wehipeihana made the final selection¹⁰ of vignettes that appear and some editing of the vignettes was undertaken to aid clarity.

¹⁰ Hui participants agreed that Nan Wehipeihana, Laurie Porima, Kataraina Pipi and Vivienne Kennedy could, without reference to the group, provide the final report (hui proceedings and two vignettes for each principle) to SPEaR.

The Principle of Reciprocity

Relationships between social sector officials, researchers and participants should enable reciprocal, balanced exchanges of knowledge, resources and time that recognise the value of diverse contributions in a respectful and appropriate manner¹¹

Reflecting on the principle of reciprocity

Initial reflections from the brief group discussion prior to the generation of the vignettes about the principle of reciprocity were that:

- The value of reciprocity should be assessed through the eyes of the recipient and what makes a positive difference for participants, both individual and communities, over and above the provision of research/evaluation reports, payment or koha. Examples given of such reciprocity included:
 - Community capacity building (e.g. training of participants, development and gifting of tools or resources),
 - Facilitating/brokering access to resources (people, knowledge, networks),
 - Assistance with social and economic development.
- Sometimes government programmes (including research and evaluation) result in financial benefits for those implementing the programme and/or undertaking the research. When financial benefits accrue from government projects (including research and evaluation) it is important that these be shared equitably with whānau, hapū, iwi and/or Māori stakeholders.
- Whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori organisations must be given the opportunity to:
 - understand the implications, immediate and future, personal and community, of participating in a project, and
 - change their minds about participating.

¹¹ SPEaR Draft Guidelines, 4.3.5 Reciprocity, p16

Reciprocity Vignettes

Once upon a time...

1. Reciprocity can evolve into a process of giving

... I was contracted to do an evaluation of a youth programme that was looking at sustainable youth development. Over the term of the contract I developed a good working relationship with the community coordinator, and he became a mate, a friend. As the evaluator, I was grateful for the coordinator's openness in support of my work; and the coordinator told me he was grateful for the insights and guidance I was able to provide through my evaluation work. It was a sad day when my contract ended with his organisation, or so I thought.

Three months after the contract had finished I got a ring from the coordinator, "Bro, could you look at a proposal I put together for some funding?" "Sure" I told him. Unfortunately I didn't realise he had no experience writing proposals and I eventually had to re-write the whole thing. But I thought, "Kei te pai, this is reciprocity."

About a year later I got another call from my mate the coordinator. "Bro, could you do a keynote speech for a youth course I'm running?" "Sure bro, when is it?" "Tomorrow!" he said. I was pretty busy with reports at the time, but I thought, "Sweet – reciprocity!"

Then about 18 months later I get another call from my mate the coordinator. "Bro, could you come and talk to a group of young people about photovoice?" I said, "Sweet bro, when?" "I can come and pick you up in an hour!" and I thought, "Sweet, reciprocity!"

Just because the contract ends, the giving doesn't.

2. Reciprocity can be about the exchange of wisdom and youthful thought

... a little boy passed by an old man who had a big, beautiful veggie garden. In it he was growing tomatoes. The little boy asked the old man if he could have one; it was the biggest, juiciest, reddest tomato in the garden. The old man said if the little boy had a dollar, he could have that tomato. The little boy said, "I only have ten cents." The old man replied, "I'm sorry boy, you don't have enough." The little boy asked if he could pick one for ten cents. The old man said, "Well, which one do you think is worth ten cents?" The little boy said, "How about that one over there?" He pointed to a green one, which was the biggest on the vine, even bigger than the ripe tomato. The old man looked and smiled, and said, "Okay boy, you can have that tomato. It's yours for ten cents." The boy politely gave him the ten cents and calmly told the old man, "I'll come over and pick it up next week."

Reciprocity comes back with intrinsic value intact

3. Koha is a form of reciprocity

... while working on a project the issue of koha came up. The question by one of our colleagues was, “What is ‘koha’”? (She was non-Māori). I wanted to say “Ko te ha manawa o te tangata.” Yeah right, it was easier to say, “Reciprocity.” But I knew koha meant much more than that:

It’s our way of saying “thank you.”

It’s our way of giving recognition

It’s our way of giving acknowledgement

It’s our way of sharing the love

Iti te kupu, nui ake te korero¹².

It’s the value we give to what we receive – we give mana to that which is meaningful

4. Reciprocity is about giving something back that is meaningful to the recipient

... officials did a research project with youth gang members in an urban centre. This project involved an evaluation of a mediation project with gangs to help stop tensions and violence; and research on the drivers of gang membership, their wants and needs.

In return officials helped match the young people to social services that met their needs, such as driver’s licence courses, trade training and education courses.

This practice had a number of positive outcomes. It ensured we put into practice the principle of reciprocity by giving something meaningful back to the young people who helped us with our work, not just by way of reports, but by assisting with their social and economic development.

Considered reciprocity can make a difference in peoples lives

¹² Possible meanings include “a few words, generates a rich discussion” or “one word contains a depth of meaning.”

5. Reciprocity involves both giving and receiving

... Koha was included in the budget of a major national research project I worked on. I wasn't comfortable giving a monetary incentive like vouchers, and the ladies I interviewed weren't comfortable with an actual koha. As the interviews progressed I realised that the ladies valued the opportunity to share their stories. They appreciated that there was someone who was willing to listen for as long as it took to tell their stories, and that person was respectful and caring. Our koha to them was the consideration accorded to them as part of the research process and the handing back of their story as documented by the research. Their koha was the sharing of their stories and the contribution they made to the research.

There is potential for the research process itself to be an act of reciprocity

6. Reciprocity requires consideration about the value of what is given and what is received

... I had a conversation with a colleague of mine who was getting a Ta Moko done as part of an exhibition. This Ta Moko, which was going across her back, had been designed specifically for her by the Kaita. It included her whakapapa and all sorts of things that she had wanted. I asked her how much it cost to have the Ta Moko done. She said she didn't know. The Kaita had said payment was by way of koha, and she had thought about eighty bucks would do it. So I said, "So you've thought about what it is you're getting and what it means to you, and obviously you've decided eighty dollars is okay for what you're going to get?" She thought some more and then said, "Nah, I guess it's not enough aye?"

Ensure that what you give matches what you receive

7. Reciprocity is about the mutual sharing of knowledge and expertise

As a formative evaluator working primarily with community action projects, I experience reciprocity in what I think is a unique way. While I am not 'invited', but rather 'assigned', it is my responsibility to establish the relationships required for me to work effectively with project staff. It is my privilege to work with people who are endeavouring to support and lift their communities. I am in a position to make a contribution to the processes, as they are being developed and implemented. The reciprocity is in the project staff accepting me and the skills I am offering; and the process whereby I am providing services, knowledge and expertise in a way that is meaningful and valuable. We are learning, therefore we are building our capacity simultaneously. The value of this process is in the sustainability of the initiatives that are developed.

Reciprocity in research can be about the mutual exchange of knowledge and expertise

8. Reciprocity can involve creative ways of sharing

Most respondents of research seem to receive koha in the form of cash or vouchers, and/or are ensured that their korero will be used to improve programmes that will benefit them individually and/ or future programme participants. They might also be 'promised' a copy of key findings of the research. How can respondents receive other benefits? How can the principles of reciprocity be enacted for them, and what will this look like? Not enough time is spent thinking about how respondents/ communities can be compensated for their involvement in research and evaluation.

Think about the possibilities of how reciprocity can be enacted

The Principle of Responsiveness

The methods of engagement and the technologies of all researchers and evaluators should ensure they acknowledge, understand and respond to differences in institutional, professional and cultural practice, including the appropriate provision of means for a suitable level of engagement¹³.

Reflecting on the principle of responsiveness

Initial reflections from the brief group discussion prior to the generation of the vignettes about the principle of reciprocity included:

- Talking to participants about how they want to be researched rather than assuming we know what is best for participants. Get feedback about how they want to participate in the research and be responsive to their suggestions.
- Be open to using different approaches, for example a Kaupapa Māori research paradigm, adherence and inclusion of tikanga, practices of manaakitanga, etc. One example cited was the identification of key community personnel to be research coordinators in each of the communities where research was being carried out. The payback for taking a different approach (being responsive) was greater engagement by the various communities and an increased sense of community ownership of the research because it came from the people themselves.
- Make no assumptions about what it means to be Māori. An example was the use of te reo Māori in a research project involving rangatahi Māori in gangs. During the interviews the rangatahi were very quiet and did not say much at all. On checking with one participant, we found out that they felt whakamā because they did not speak Māori. Ask participants if they prefer English or Māori, and whether they prefer individual or group interviews.
- Research should value and utilise current and historical relationships. For example, Māori organisations have typically been the subject of more than one research or evaluation project and have often told their stories many times over. Contracting with the same group of researchers or evaluators, where trust and confidence exists, facilitates engagement because of the established relationships and saves time because organisational history and profile information is already known and documented.

¹³ SPEaR Draft Guidelines, 4.3.3 Responsiveness, p15

Responsiveness Vignettes

Once upon a time....

1. Responsiveness means putting aside your own ego

... five kuia and kaumatua shared their stories about an important historic happening with a researcher; me. I loved the fabulous stories, the rich data, and how wonderfully well their variations of the story fitted with my theories around presenting multiple voices and allowing Māori to speak for themselves. I presented their rich diversity with their multiple stories in book form. They hated it. They wanted me to re-write it as a single narrative. To me, responsiveness was about re-writing their stories as a single narrative. This is a work in progress. I had to put aside my ego.

Despite ones best intentions, it's the recipient who ultimately decides what constitutes responsiveness.

2. Responsiveness is not about paying 'lip service'

... a government department I worked for had the task of assessing how responsive other government departments were to the needs of Māori . As a new analyst I was listening to a senior analyst explain the framework and process our department used for this. I asked a question, "Who determines the criteria for responsiveness, and what involvement did Māori affected by those agencies being assessed have in the assessment process? The response was, "Not much really." I am pleased to say that some things have changed now.

Māori views, perspectives and values should be the basis for determining the success of programmes that touch the life of Māori.

3. Responsiveness means starting from a place of others' 'knowing'

... I was asked to develop a pakeke health plan. I undertook to have conversations with forty pakeke in [Primary Health Organisation]. The conversations touched on their childhood stories around health, their use of Rongoa and tohunga, their physical activities as young people, adolescents, and adults, and their prospective needs and use of rest homes in their aging years. The tape recordings were returned to the pakeke, who have since shared their stories with their children and moko.

It's often easier for participants, to tell their story, when interviews start with their experiences and their knowledge of the situation or context.

4. Ensure that discussion starts at a place that is relevant to the person or people involved

...I travelled six hours by car to interview someone in his environment. This was responsive, but I wished I had flown.

I took an empty bag with the intention of filling it with knowledge. After talking to a gentleman for two hours, it was clear he either had not seen anyone in quite some time, or he was simply passionate. I left, taking my bag, which was barely quarter full of knowledge. I did notice on my way out however, that he had a bag full of satisfaction, having been listened to far more intently than he had been accustomed.

Being responsive may not always yield what we want, but it sure can make people feel really good.

Being responsive may be more beneficial to the respondent.

5. Responsiveness means responding when you're asked, and being prepared to go beyond expectations

Responsiveness means responding when asked and when you're not asked. It means going beyond what's stated in your contract as to what will happen and how things will happen.

People have shared their stories with me, let me into their whare, which has had flow-on effects. Although some aspects weren't part of what I was contracted to do, I needed to do those things for them and for me.

When you're asking people to share part of who they are and what they've experienced, they need to be able to determine the responsiveness and you need to be able to respond.

Being responsive means you may need to be reactive in some situations and proactive in others.

6. Responsiveness means recognising and valuing past relationships

... A General Manager of a Māori Health organisation said of evaluators, "Well it's like they're going to live in your whare for the next three years, sit at the table and eat of your kai. You wouldn't want just anyone to live with you over the next three years!" I realised then that organisations should have a say in who evaluates them; they should be able to select evaluators whom they've worked with in the past, and they should be able to do all of this - have a say at the table - at the time the evaluation is being contracted.

Being responsive means looking to build on past research relationships and not assuming that an 'independent' tender process is the best way to select researchers.

The Principle of Respect

Relationships between all stakeholders in social sector research should be based on respect for the inherent value of each contributor (be they researcher, contractor, policy manager, project manager or participant) and the skills, experience and knowledge each person brings to the research and evaluation process.¹⁴

Reflecting on the principle of respect

Prior to the generation of the vignettes, initial reflections from the group discussion were that respect could be ensured or shown by:

- Having enough resources. For example, when undertaking a research or evaluation project ensure there is enough resource to compensate communities for their contribution / participation.
- Incorporating Māori views into all aspects of the research. For example, ensuring appropriate discussion takes place before, during and on completion of the project and by allowing Māori to play a meaningful (as opposed to tokenistic) role in the project.
- Allowing sufficient time to consult with whānau, hapū, iwi and community organisations and by being aware of the competing demands and priorities of stakeholders and participants.

¹⁴ SPEaR Draft Guidelines, 4.3.1 Respect, p13

Respect Vignettes

Once upon a time...

1. Respect means not trampling on people's pride, feelings or ideas

... I was working with a senior researcher, (well-known in some circles, but known at times as a tyrant in other circles). We were running late, trying to compile a draft report and send information out for an advisory group meeting the following week. The senior researcher told us we had no mana for being behind time.

Our dilemma was that we did not agree to her approach to the research design, as we were dealing with our people, our reo and our tikanga. That day it was her mana (respect) that was diminished. In the end our advisory group played a huge role in designing the research project.

Respect within a research process can be comprised when driven by single, non-inclusive, agenda. Disrespectful behaviour can impact on everyone involved in the research, both researchers and participants.

2. Respect in theory can differ from respect in practice

... If only we could turn back the clock and not engage that researcher! On paper the credentials and experience looked fine; a good match with the provider seemed guaranteed.

However, little did we know that the researcher had another agenda and was mainly interested in getting across their own personal views and bug bears they had with the particular provider and our evaluation process. So in a respectful way we met to discuss the concerns the researcher had. We listened and talked about how we could move forward and went away from that meeting with what we thought was a shared pathway forward.

However, it turned out that the issue was not settled for the researcher and within a few days the email traffic ran hot and things had escalated. There was potential impact on the provider as well as the risks to the reputation of our organisation.

You can deal with someone in a respectful manner, but that doesn't mean they will act respectfully in return.

3. Respect can be compromised by the things we do or say

... I attended the opening of [name] Marae. A well-known Māori dignitary, when entering the whare, didn't take his shoes off at the door. He told my Dad later that the Queen [of England] doesn't take her shoes off for anyone, and because he was a

representative of the Queen, he wasn't going to either." Everybody else did, but he didn't. He lost the respect of everyone attached to the marae. Everybody noticed, everybody pointed; nobody gave two hoots that he was a well-known dignitary. There are two points of note around that; one was that he took off his korowai Māori and two, he thought having the Queen's korowai was going to give him more respect, but it had the opposite effect.

Respect is about following local etiquette, no matter what position you hold

4. Respect is about ensuring different perspectives are considered



How you see the palm tree depends on where you're standing and your view of it. So when designing research with Māori, it's important to ensure that all the different perspectives are considered.

Getting the full picture means standing in everyone's shoes.

5. Respect is a process often based on knowledge and understanding of relationships

... I saw these two brothers speak on a marae, and I watched how they did it. It was done with the utmost respect for one another, their whānau and the people at the marae (they were on the manuhiri side). One was the tuakana; the other was the teina, but the process they went through was just as important as the actual act. Within the process was mana, wairua, whakapapa, aroha and tikanga. Respect is the process that you go through, rather than the actual act of what you do, and it's the understanding of that process.

What you do is important – understanding why you do it is even more so

The Principle of Integrity

The actions and behaviour of social sector officials advancing research and evaluation should work to establish, maintain and enhance the integrity of all stakeholders, and the professional and ethical integrity of the research and evaluation, policy and service delivery functions¹⁵.

Reflecting on the principle of integrity

Initial reflections from the brief group discussion that took place prior to the generation of the vignettes about the principle of integrity included:

- Ensure development of a consultation plan that identifies likely participants. Integrity is ensuring we talk to the appropriate people and making sure that we spend time identifying the right people to talk to.
- Being honest and upfront about the purpose of the research and the benefits, be they positive or negative. Integrity is the need to tell the truth about what we are looking for. Often surreptitiously or through ignorance there can be a bit of dishonesty; promising to change the world, but knowing we can't deliver.
- Integrity means:
 - Telling people the whole story.
 - Telling them what the limitations are.
 - Telling them what you can and cannot do.
 - Telling them that release of the research or evaluation report is at the discretion of the commission agency.
 - Telling them that a change in government policy or the operating environment may result in a lukewarm or muted response on the part of the government agencies involved, even if the findings are positive.
- Researchers have control over the research process and research participants are reliant on the researcher to act with integrity. It is the personal and professional integrity and mana of the researcher that is at stake in any research project. One example cited was of a kuia who agreed to be interviewed as part of a health

¹⁵ SPEaR Draft Guidelines, 4.3.2 Integrity, p14

research project. Upon reflection she decided that she did not want some of the information she had given in the interview to be used, and a whānau member asked the researcher to delete/withdraw that information from the research. The integrity of the researcher was such that whānau were confident that their request would be carried out.

Integrity Vignettes

Once upon a time...

1. Integrity means being mindful of wider implications

... I was thinking about doing research on the effect of dialysis on whānau and hapū. One of my uncles had been on dialysis for a number of years and I had observed a range of responses from the whānau, to uncle's condition.

I went to talk to my aunt and she was so open to sharing uncle's story, her story, and their experiences. However I felt I needed to talk to my cousins about whether they were happy with me doing the research in which their father featured so prominently. Despite my aunt being one hundred percent okay and consenting to the research, there were implications for my cousins, and I felt whānau consent was needed. So for me, acting with integrity means thinking about the wider implications, not only for those you are dealing with directly, but also their whānau, hapū and iwi.

Integrity means thinking through possible implications and ramifications, for all concerned, before you get started

2. Integrity can be affected by the actions of others

... I opened the fridge at work and there were urine samples being stored in there despite previous conversations about tikanga (appropriate cultural practices). This action lacked integrity. We need to be really vigilant about the people we align ourselves with because when they lack integrity, we lack integrity. In that situation it was us who were affected, but quite often it's the communities who are damaged because of the lack of integrity of those who work with them.

We need to stay aware of how our own and others' behaviours can impact on integrity

3. Integrity means only taking on work you know you can do well

... there was a research project conducted with Māori by a Māori researcher. She could whakapapa to the area, but was not well known in the community. She had no previous experience and there was a lot of disappointment in the consultation and research process.

People shared their information with her..... personal stories and experiences and the report was never sighted, leaving the participants feeling disappointed and disillusioned.

Acting with integrity means doing what you say you'll do

4. Acting with integrity can be difficult in the face of political realities

... a government agency was asked by their Minister to do research with Māori. Officials developed a research plan, consent forms and went through a research ethics process. Participants were promised a copy of the research notes and a copy of the final report. In the end participants were not given a copy of the final report because some of the content was seen as too politically sensitive.

As a consequence Māori were reluctant to participate in future research projects and the agency has since had difficulties engaging with Māori. However in the end the Māori community does not benefit from the research either.

Researchers need to be astute about how political realities can impact on their personal and professional integrity

5. Integrity is your test of character

... I interviewed a koro, who said to me, "A lie will travel halfway around the world before truth puts on its shoes." I think it might have been a quote of Mark Twain's. What he meant within the context of our korero was that if you compromise your integrity, your name, you are nothing. "Integrity is your character litmus test." he said. "Bugger it up and you bugger up everything." You can't teach integrity; there are no university courses called 'The Principles of Integrity Encounters'. It's not like learning skills in research and intervention. Integrity is life-long and is never consistent or static. Tied to integrity is self-confidence. I don't mean whakahihi; I mean whakaiti. Don't compromise your principles, but you might have to compromise your priorities. If only...

Integrity follows you for life. You can't teach it. In order for you to know you have integrity, it has to be tested.

6. Integrity is about meaningful consultation processes and acknowledging the contributions of all

...the [city] Cancer Society were needing some data for a DHB as they were trying to get permission to use natural therapies in the hospital. As there are a large number of Māori affected with cancer in our region I was interested in how they were going to collect this information in a four-week timeframe. Three months later I saw the report and was appalled at the information it contained. Information gathered from cancer workshops

that I had participated in with friends, and our personal stories were included without our permission. (We were all Māori) I did not respond to or criticise the report or process as I would have liked to, in case it jeopardised the introduction of natural therapies into the hospital.

Acting with integrity can be a moral dilemma when having to put aside actions that lack integrity for the greater good

The Principle of Competency

All research and evaluation officials and contractors involved in the development and execution of social research and evaluation should possess the core competencies necessary for performing their duties to a high level¹⁶.

Reflecting on the principle of competency

Prior to the generation of the vignettes, initial reflections from the brief group discussion about the principle of competency included:

- Not assuming being Māori equates to linguistic or cultural competence and confidence. Not all Māori speak te reo, have knowledge of tikanga or feel competent to lead engagement processes with whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori organisations. Talk to and confirm with Māori the areas that they feel confident to lead and participate in.
- Not elevating Māori to positions outside of their skill, experience or knowledge base -without providing quality support and guidance. Sometimes Māori get tagged to do jobs because they are Māori. However, they may lack certain skills and not be an appropriate choice. For example, a Māori male was asked to lead a research project that sought to capture the views and experiences of Māori women in relation to a key health concern. He declined to work on the project as he had limited research expertise. Being a study, which sought the views of women, he felt that it would be more appropriate for a woman to work on the project. He was, however, able to recommend a suitable researcher, who had knowledge and previous research experience in the area.
- Government agencies need to take responsibility for enhancing their organisational capacity to work appropriately with Māori. An agency can become dependent on a small number of staff to manage their relationships/research with Māori. This can result in burn out of the staff involved and diminish the organisational capacity to engage appropriately with Māori.

¹⁶ SPEaR Draft Guidelines, 4.3.4 Competency, p15

Competency Vignettes

Once upon a time...

1. Competency is about the maintenance of mana

... I heard my koroua say, “If you can’t do the job properly, then don’t do it at all”. Mena kaore te mahi e mahia, kaua e mahi... What he meant was that the whānau had a certain set of standards when it came to doing certain things, and this relates to the concept of mana. If you’re not competent, then your failure reflects and has implications on the mana of your whānau. And your whānau belong to hapū, who belong to iwi, so there is that triple effect in terms of the implications of incompetency.

Competency goes beyond personal and professional credibility. It’s about mana; the maintenance of whānau, hapū and iwi mana.

2. Competency is supported by an organisation having appropriate systems and processes

In an agency context, if you’re not given the right tools to do the job and/or if you don’t find the right people, then you’re setting yourself up for failure and being incompetent. Sometimes it’s not the fault of an individual, but it is about the structures and processes of the organisation and the lack of support or resources provided to the research project by an agency.

Organisations have a responsibility to ensure they employ or contract competent people and provide the necessary support to enable the research to be carried out.

3. Competency in a Māori context is not necessarily understood by all

... there was a competent Māori provider who had a competent program. The provider was introduced to a government department employee who, not being competent in their kaupapa, made them tick the boxes and dot the ‘i’s. This made no sense to the provider, nor did they see how it fitted with their kaupapa. Then a competent evaluation team came along, who worked well with the provider and understood them, but they didn’t understand the funding client (the government department). The competent evaluator had to work hard to stay looking competent against a system that didn’t really protect or promote competence when working with Māori .

Whose capacity/ competency are we building? Everyone has to know their own kaupapa and that of others.

4. Competency depends on perspective

... there was a teacher who told her tamariki to write a story every day. She believed they were competent enough to do this and that it was good practise for them. When the tables were turned and the teacher was told to write many stories, she realised what a big ask she wanted from her students, and how incompetent she suddenly felt.

Who defines competence or incompetence – funders, providers, evaluators?

5. Competency can be about having a shared understanding

... a mother went shopping for food for a birthday. She told the older kids to get the jelly ready, and when she returned home, she saw the jelly outside in the sun. She asked what the jelly was doing in the sun and was told, “Mum, it’s Sunshine Jelly!”

Pick the right team, the right workers; keep in mind the different makeup of the people doing the research, the different levels of understanding and different paradigms people come from. Make sure you take all those things into consideration before sending in kids to do an adult’s job.

6. Competency is listening to the sage advice and wisdom of elders

... mehemea i whakarongo au ki ooku kuia/ koroua, kua tu rangatira pakari au ki roto i nga tikanga, kawa, me oona aahuatanga katoa.

Ko raatou hoki i maarama, i matatau ki te aaronga o taatou te iwi Maaori, aa, kia noho puumau tonu ki roto i eenei raarangi koorero.

Ko raatou hoki i maarama i matatau, ki te aaronga o taatou te iwi Maaori, aa, ka noho puumau tonu ki roto i eenei raarangi koorero.

Some concluding thoughts

As the first iteration in a process that seeks to enhance our understanding of the application of practice principles in research and evaluation contexts, and in real world settings, there is much to celebrate in the process that generated these illustrative examples, and in the vignettes themselves.

It is also evident that some vignettes could be used to illustrate more than one principle, and this is particularly so for the vignettes generated in relation to respect, reciprocity and responsiveness, and to a lesser extent integrity. The principle of competency, and the exploration and generation of vignettes in this process, appears to be somewhat different to the other four principles. It is hoped that future hui will be able to tease out what is common to each of the principles, and importantly, the unique difference between principles.

Participants saw this hui as part of process. Firstly, to generate knowledge and understanding about the application of principle based guidelines, in relation to Māori . They expressed a desire, secondly, for further hui to build on the tentative understandings which have emerged from this process and to refine and or add to the vignettes documented herein. The application of these principles particularly in relation to whānau, hapū and iwi was a third area where they felt further discussion was merited.

Application for Travel Subsidy to Māori Best Practice Guidelines Hui

Who can apply?

Some funding is available to assist students, unwaged and people representing community-based organisations.

How do you apply?

1. Indicate which category of delegate you belong to below.

Category (tick one)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Full-time student
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Based Organisation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unwaged

2. Your application must be accompanied by a letter or email from someone who can endorse your eligibility under the category you are applying for. (If you are also applying for an anzea Conference scholarship, you may use the same letter of endorsement).

For students, a letter or email signed by the Head of Department or similar at the institution you are attending, verifying that you are undertaking a course of full-time study at an accredited tertiary institution (Letters or emails of verification must be on the letterhead of the organisation verifying your eligibility).

For unwaged, a letter or email of endorsement from someone who knows you well and can verify your status. This might be a community leader or someone of high standing in your community (e.g., Kuia, Kaumata, Justice of the Peace, etc) OR a letter or email signed by Work and Income New Zealand verifying that you are in receipt of a benefit.

For community based participants, a letter or email of endorsement from a Manager (or similar) of the organisation you will be representing, verifying that you are representing that organisation.

3. Attach this form to the hui registration form.

Please email both forms to: Paulette Masson at pmasson@xtra.co.nz

OR Post to: Paulette Masson, PO Box 68, Te Awamutu

For all enquiries in relationship to the hui and the travel subsidy, please ring Paulette Masson on 029 2788258, or email her at pmasson@xtra.co.nz

SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines Māori July 2007 – Hui Agenda



Good Practice Guidelines Māori

Hui Programme

8 July 2007

Solway Copthorne and Resort Hotel, Masterton

Timing	Activity	Rationale
Sunday		
9.30 am	Gather & Morning Tea	Travel distances
10.30 am	<p>Mihi Whakatau</p> <p>Mihimihi/Introductions</p> <p>Summary of activity since 2004 workshops, the principles and draft application, agenda for hui and work to do (Raweyn Good, Nan Wehipeihana, Kataraina Pipi)</p>	<p>Whanaungatanga - Meet and greet</p> <p>Share the background to the development of the guidelines</p> <p>Ensure the aims of the hui are clear</p>
11.30 - 12.30 pm	<p>Presentation of the five principles (Juan Tauri, Nan Wehipeihana, Kataraina Pipi). Facilitated group discussion on principles</p>	<p>To ensure that hui participants are informed of the five principles</p> <p>To seek feedback and share examples of applying the principles</p>

12.30 - 1.30 pm	Lunch & informal discussion	
1.30 – 4.00 pm	<p>Small groups - discuss the principles</p> <p>Respect</p> <p>Integrity</p> <p>Responsiveness</p> <p>Competency</p> <p>Reciprocity</p> <p>Five groups are formed. Each group discusses the principle and is asked to:</p> <p>write a story in relation to the principle (2-3 min)</p> <p>individuals share stories with group members</p> <p>group members identify/share lessons in relation to the principle</p> <p>Each group selects a minimum of 3 stories to feedback to the wider group</p> <p>This process is worked through twice with individuals forming new and different groups. Approximately 30 minutes spent on each principle, and approximately 45 mins on the group feedback</p> <p>Afternoon tea</p>	<p>Each hui participant has the opportunity to contribute ideas to each principle.</p> <p>A range of creative responses are invited</p> <p>Participants are invited to record/write/draw examples in each group</p> <p>Groups use personal experience as base for stories</p>

<p>4.30 - 6.00 pm</p>	<p>Wrap up and where to from here:</p> <p>Small groups discuss and feedback on small group process</p> <p>Small groups considered 'where to from here wish list'</p> <p>Nan & Laurie responded to wishes</p> <p>Agreements were made amongst hui</p> <p>Nan and Laurie wrapped up and thanked people for participation</p> <p>Feedback invited from the floor</p> <p>Karakia</p> <p>Close of Hui</p>	<p>Opportunity for summarising discussion on principles</p> <p>Seek participant feedback on the hui</p> <p>Acknowledgement of participant wishes</p> <p>Consideration of where to from here with regards to:</p> <p>fulfilling SPEaR contractual obligations</p> <p>participant wishes</p>
<p>7.00 pm</p>	<p>Dinner & informal discussion</p>	<p>A time for further discussion and making connections</p>

SPEaR Best Practice Guidelines Māori – Hui participant list

- 1 Shaun Akroyd , independent researcher shaun.akroyd@clear.net.nz
- 2 Vyletta Arago-Kemp, Te Puni Kōkiri aragv@tpk.govt.nz
- 3 Renee Campbell, NZCER renee.campbell@nzcer.org.nz
- 4 Ngapera Hoerara, independent researcher komua@xtra.co.nz
- 5 Hector Kaiwai, Whariki, Massey University H.Kaiwai@massey.ac.nz
- 6 Vivienne Kennedy, independent researcher vppk@snap.net.nz
- 7 Shirley Keown, Turanga Health Shirley@turangahealth.co.nz
- 8 Sandy Kerr, Whariki, Massey University S.M.Brown@massey.ac.nz
- 9 Reece Kohatu, Te Puni Kōkiri reece_kohatu@yahoo.co.nz
- 10 Maria Maniapoto, The Family Centre maniapoto.m@fc.org.nz
- 11 Peter Mataira, University of Hawaii mataira@hawaii.edu
- 12 Verne McManus, Whariki, Massey University vmm@xtra.co.nz
- 13 Jason Mika, Indigecom Ltd Jason@indigecom.co.nz
- 14 Iris Pahau NGO Community Sector Taskforce awe@paradise.net.nz
- 15 Werata Pahau NGO Community Sector Taskforce awe@paradise.net.nz
- 16 Molly Pardoe, Sandy Lane Health Spectrum mollypardoe@xtra.co.nz
- 17 Kataraina Pipi , Fem 2006 kpipi@xtra.co.nz
- 18 Laurie Porima, LLE Research laurie.lynn@xtra.co.nz
- 19 Justine Ropata, Ministry of Social Development justine.ropata001@msd.govt.nz
- 20 Diane Ruru, Kōkiri Marae diane@kokiri-hauora.org.nz
- 21 Kiri Simpson

- 22 Kellie Spee Independent evaluator Kellz@xtra.co.nz
- 23 Zena Tamanui Kōkiri Terahuitangi zena@kokiri.co.nz
- 24 Juan Tauri, Te Puni Kōkiri
- 25 Nan Wehipeihana, REC Ltd nanw@clear.net.nz

Apologies

- Fred Bishop, Ministry of Education fred.bishop@minedu.govt.nz
- Jorgette Maaka, Ministry of Education jorgette.maaka@minedu.govt.nz
- Charlie Tawhiao, Department of Corrections Charlie.Tawhiao@corrections.govt.nz
- Danny Hauraki, Department of Corrections
- Tina Parata, Hospice Auckland tinap@nshospice.org.nz
- Bridgette Masters, University of Waikato bridge@waikato.ac.nz