55. Working with Indigenous methodologies: Kaupapa Māori meets diverse economies

Joanne Waitoa and Kelly Dombroski

INTRODUCTION

Many scholars of diverse economies have used community engaged methods to uncover and 'map' diverse economic practices in place, beginning with an open stance towards what is present and not assuming that everything will be subsumed into capitalism. Some Indigenous scholars such as Bargh (see Chapter 40 in this volume, and Bargh 2011) have argued that a diverse economies approach makes space for Indigenous ontologies and even cosmologies because of its recognition of multiple ways of being and doing in the world, and the more open framework for research (see also Ringham et al. 2016). Approaches that make space for academic recognition of Indigenous ontologies and economies are useful when Indigenous scholars are connecting with global conversations in social science and science (Chitondo and Dombroski 2019; Larsen and Johnson 2017), and can also be useful when applying for research grant funding (Underhill☐Sem and Lewis 2008). But making space is different from recognizing and appreciating the inherent significance of the research theories and methodologies inherited and developed by Indigenous scholars (Chilisa 2011). In this chapter we discuss Kaupapa Māori[1] methodology, an approach to research by, with and for Māori, the Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. We do so as a first step towards identifying instructive points of connection and dissonance with diverse economies methods and approaches.

Indigenous knowledges, informed by ancestors, have accumulated over generations, even millennia for many Indigenous peoples. This knowledge has provided the blueprint for how to live sustainably on and with the land and both human and non-human inhabitants. Much of this kind of knowledge has been accumulated by Māori, the Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. Māori ancestors voyaged across the Pacific 800–1000 years ago, settling in Aotearoa at a time when the prevailing thought in Europe was that the world was flat. They navigated with the knowledge passed down through generations of how to read the stars and landmarks (Ballara 1998). This body of knowledge is a form of *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge). *Mātauranga Māori* consistently informs Māori thought and cultural practice. It informs *tikanga* (custom) and *kawa* (rules), which lay out the theory and praxis of a culture embedded with values including *whanaungatanga* (relationships), *aroha* (love), *manaakitanga* (hospitality) and *utu* (reciprocity) (Mead 2003). These all form the basis of *kaupapa Māori*, which can be understood as action and plans that emerge from a Māori world view (Royal 2007).

British arrival and subsequent colonization disrupted Māori society violently. Colonial supremacy saw existing Māori social, cultural and political organization as primitive and European systems of education and governance as superior. This assumed supremacy was also evident in the privileging of knowledge. Enlightenment thinking, and specifically positivism in Western science, was valued over all other knowledge and has informed the research approach of the academy in Aotearoa New Zealand. Western approaches to science

were extractive in nature, taking knowledge from communities with no reciprocity. Linda Tuhiwai Smith notes that such research has 'dehumanised Māori' and led to practices 'which have continued to privilege Western ways of knowing, while denying the validity for Māori of Māori knowledge, language and culture' (Smith 1999, p. 183). The movement to reclaim the power for Māori to define themselves in research is an important step towards redressing the violent imbalance that the colonial hierarchy of knowledge systems imposed. Any future reciprocity between knowledge systems cannot proceed without recognition and support for Māori self-determination and the reclaiming of custom and culture.[2]

In writing this chapter, cognizant of our diverse global audience, we intend our attempt to explore the dissonance and connection between Kaupapa Māori and diverse economies methodologies as a small first step to a larger conversation between Indigenous, Settler and other scholars about methodology, epistemology, politics and making better worlds for all. Writing together as a Ngati Porou scholar with experience in diverse economies (Joanne) and a *Pākehā* (settler) diverse economies scholar with experience in *mātauranga Māori* (Kelly), we are connected by our relationship to our hometown in rural New Zealand and our journeys from there into higher education and work with *iwi*, university and government entities. From this base, we specifically explore how Kaupapa Māori approaches to methodology work alongside and at variance from diverse economies approaches, with respect to Māori knowledge and *kaupapa Māori*. Two themes emerge: the role of relationships in research, and the high priority placed on the principle of self-determination.

THE RISE OF KAUPAPA MĀORI METHODOLOGY IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

A Kaupapa Māori approach allows Māori to tell their own stories. Informed by *mātauranga Māori*, and underpinned by key Māori principles,[3] it is a research theory and practice that emerged in the 1980s out of the language reclamation movement of *kōhanga reo* (Māori language preschool) and *kura kaupapa* (Māori language primary school). This movement was influenced by the research of scholars Graham Smith and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, who in turn were influenced by critical scholars such as Franz Fanon and Paulo Freire. Graham Smith states that Kaupapa Māori presupposes that (a) the validity and legitimacy of Māori is taken for granted, (b) the survival and revival of Māori language and culture is imperative, and (c) the struggle for autonomy over cultural well-being, and over Māori lives is vital to Māori survival (Smith 1990, p. 100). As Leonie Pihama (2010, p. 6), reminds us, however:

> While the theoretical assertion of Kaupapa Māori theory is relatively new, *kaupapa Māori* as foundation is not. *Kaupapa Māori* is extremely old – ancient, in fact. It predates any and all of us in living years and is embedded in our cultural being.

Over time, Kaupapa Māori theory has been implemented outside of education; the approach is both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary. Highlighting the importance of Māori self-determination, and set within the context of the Māori language version of the Treaty of Waitangi (*Te Tiriti*), Kaupapa Māori theory and methodology asserts that Māori researchers and Māori communities should be part of *all* conversations and research that impact on Māori futures. As such, while any research method may be appropriate, the overall research

methodology should be transformative, beneficial to Māori, under Māori control, informed by *mātauranga Māori*, include an analysis of power, reject cultural deficiency theories, and be emancipatory and non-essentializing (Curtis 2016).

In practice, this means that even in research based on analysing statistical data collected by census or other state-led methods, Māori researchers should be involved in its interpretation and communication (Cram 2017; Cram et al. 2006; Kukutai and Taylor 2016). The sayings 'nothing about us, without us', or 'by Māori, with Māori, for Māori' apply here. Māori communities are not to be studied as objects of research, but retain sovereignty over their data and have the chance to lead, to grow their research experience, and to connect with Māori communities according to the obligations of *Te Tiriti* (Hudson 2016). *Pākehā* researchers are also, through a partnership relationship, educated in *Te Ao Māori* 'the Māori world(view)' in a hopefully transformative encounter that builds on and contributes to the nation through learning to value and respect *tino rangatiratanga* 'Māori sovereignty' over Māori lives, treasures and lands.

While Kaupapa Māori as an official 'methodology' is not required by any law, the New Zealand Government attempts to address its treaty obligations by incorporating the language of *mātauranga Māori* into government research grants. The Vision Mātauranga strategy is applicable to government-funded research grants and their monitoring and evaluation.[4] Researchers are invited to state how their proposed research applies to or draws from *mātauranga Māori* and may receive feedback (from funders and ethics committees) that Māori communities should be included further in research design and consultation. While it could certainly be argued that this consultation runs the risk of being 'tick box' or overstretching Māori communities,[5] it has served to raise awareness of situations in research where a form of Kaupapa Māori methodology might be appropriate. All scholars based in Aotearoa New Zealand will need to think about the relationship between their research approaches and *kaupapa* (and *mātauranga*) Māori.

DIVERSE ECONOMIES WITH KAUPAPA MĀORI: CONNECTIONS AND DISSONANCES

To date, there are few scholars working at the margins of diverse economies and Kaupapa Māori. As one of the few scholars who do, Joanne asked two foundational Kaupapa Māori scholars about the compatibility between Kaupapa Māori theory and Western approaches that emerge from critical theory. Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith pointed out that in general, non-Indigenous approaches need to be more open to other ways of asking and answering questions. Associate Professor Leonie Pihama stressed that Kaupapa Māori can't be forced to fit another methodology – it's either *tika* (correct) or it is not. Building on these discussions it is helpful to identify points of connection between Kaupapa Māori and diverse economies approaches and explore their fit.

Like the Kaupapa Māori approach, diverse economies approaches accept that research is not a neutral activity that produces objective, neutral knowledges, somehow separate from ethico-political processes – but also produces and reinforces the realities which it purports to describe (Gibson-Graham and Roelvink 2010). Thus, diverse economies methodologies engage deeply with the ethico-politics of knowledge production and representation, favouring participatory action methodologies with community researchers and partners evident in the

research process (see e.g. Chapter 46 by Rodrigues, Chapters 47 and 50 by Roelvink, Chapter 52 by Gibson-Graham, Chapter 56 by Cameron and Gibson, and Chapter 57 by Hwang, in this volume).

For diverse economies researchers, the key political act of knowledge production is to choose methodologies that bring to light ethically oriented community economic activities already in action, as a prefigurative strategy for imagining and enacting a postcapitalist world (DeMartino 2013). For Kaupapa Māori researchers, the key ethico-political act of knowledge production is to choose methodologies that recognize and privilege Māori ways of knowing and being in the world, as a prefigurative strategy for imagining and enacting *tino rangatiratanga*, Māori sovereignty. While capitalism (and the cultural practices of the societies most enamoured with capitalism) can certainly impinge on Māori sovereignty, particularly through processes of commodification, 'Westernization', Anglicization, and through increasing inequalities in income and so on, not all Māori scholars and activists necessarily frame *tino rangatiratanga* in postcapitalist terms. Yet a key point of methodological connection remains: the centring of ethical concerns and the performativity of research. In this, we can identify a fit that is *tika*.

Beyond the concerns of knowledge production, many of the values implicit in Kaupapa Māori research broadly coincide with community economies shared concerns. For example, *tino rangatiratanga* 'sovereignty/self-determination', *manaakitanga* 'hospitality and care' *kaitiakitanga* 'guardianship'[6] and *whanaungatanga* 'relationships and connections' cannot translate exactly but do intersect with 'caring for commons', 'negotiating surplus', and 'encountering others' (Gibson-Graham et al. 2013). In other words, both imagine a possible world where relationships and connections with human and more-than-human are privileged over profit-focused disconnection and destruction (Ringham et al. 2016).

It is also important to identify places where there are points of dissonance. For example, the shared concerns of community economies cannot (and do not necessarily need to be) translated into Māori (see Chapter 51 by Alhojärvi and Hyvärinen on translation in this volume). In her research on Māori economic activities, Maria Bargh (2012) does not attempt to translate or transliterate the 'ethical economic coordinates' she admires in the work of Gibson-Graham and Roelvink (2010). Instead, drawing on Māori law and concepts appropriate to Māori enterprise, she outlines an alternative set that animate Māori economies: *mana* (authority), *utu* (balance), *katiakitanga* (guardianship) and *whakapapa* (genealogical connections).[7] Commons, for example, is a term many Māori and Indigenous scholars are suspicious of, since the Left has often used this to celebrate commoning practices that are in fact occurring on stolen land that should be returned to the commons management of *iwi* 'tribes' (Bargh and Otter 2009; Diprose et al. 2017). The commons is not endlessly open to all, nor is it the project of a community becoming-in-common, but is subject to the coordinates Bargh outlines above: *iwi* and *hapū* 'clans' have the *mana whenua* or authority over the land, established through *whakapapa* 'genealogical connections' and they are responsible as *kaitiaki* 'guardians' alongside ancestors. Reclaiming and revitalizing these norms of land management is an essential part of *tino rangatiratanga*.

There are also important new connections to be made, sometimes out of these apparent dissonances: in her 2011 paper Bargh identified property and resource ownership as a major area of diverse economies scholarship that was at that point underdeveloped. The importance of land to Māori self-determination cannot be underestimated: battles for self-determination in areas as apparently diverse as Māori physical and mental health, economies, employment,

spirituality, education and more are linked to the return of land (Ringham et al. 2016). Bargh suggested that diverse property forms needed to be included alongside labour, transactions and enterprise in the diverse economy framing (Bargh 2011), an addition that makes sense for more than Māori economies. This dimension of economic and legal diversity is now being addressed (as is evident by the chapters in Part IV of this volume).

In what follows, we take two further case studies of intersection between diverse economies approaches and Kaupapa Māori approaches; in the first case, one where diverse economies approaches were experimented with, and in the second, where diverse economies framing was used primarily to communicate with funders rather than Māori participants and end users.

EXPERIMENTING WITH KAUPAPA MĀORI AND DIVERSE ECONOMIES FRAMINGS

Diverse economies approaches provided some inspiration for Joanne in her research on diverse forms of Māori political participation, and she found a number of convergences between diverse economies and Kaupapa Māori as outlined above. The kinds of political activity her research was interested in included food sovereignty and waste reduction activism, environmental education, protest and public awareness, and activism around transforming the constitution to centre *tikanga Māori* and *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*. All of these forms of political participation tended to be overlooked, and discussions on political participation instead focused on 'low Māori voter turnout'. Joanne's research took inspiration from the iceberg approach to economic diversity, whereby the 'above the waterline' aspects of the (capitalist) economy are contrasted with the multiple and diverse (non-capitalist) economic activities that might appear 'below the waterline'. She used a similar visualization in her research to 'reframe' how Māori political participation is often thought of as Māori voting behaviours, rather than the diverse forms of political activity that diverse groups of Māori might undertake. The convergences between diverse economies and Kaupapa Māori were therefore primarily around using methodologies to decentre conventional deficiency narratives, and make diversity and multiplicity more visible.

While Gibson-Graham have successfully used inventory strategies to describe the diversity of indigenous economic activities found in communities in the Philippines (Gibson-Graham 2005b, 2008), Joanne's experiments adapting these approaches to her research in political activism eventually led to her embracing a more fully Kaupapa Māori approach. As Joanne talked more to other Kaupapa Māori researchers and read more, she questioned her initial goal of creating a visual table representation of political activism, which would appear to rigidly categorize activities into boxes. Māori participant world views which emphasize multiple understandings and interrelationships between all things seemed at odds with a categorizing type of research analysis. Joanne was prompted to revitalize and reclaim Māori understandings of politics rather than introducing further European concepts, however consonant. This reveals the limits of non-Indigenous methodologies in Indigenous research: not only may they have difficulty representing Indigenous approaches to reality, they may not be the appropriate ethical choice in Indigenous communities, where the *whakapapa* 'genealogy' of a methodology is significant and Indigenous approaches are struggling for recognition.

Because the *whakapapa* of methodology is important, and the battle for recognition real, in the end Joanne moved away also from the language of reframing and the visualization that

went with it. While value can exist in finding a new language to redefine systems, within the context of Māori communities, Joanne's research found that the appropriate language to describe political and economic activity is already there, but has been *ignored* by scholars and Eurocentric methodologies, theories and approaches. While reframing was a methodological strategy often useful in overcoming deficiency approaches, in the end it was appropriate for Joanne to put aside the language of reframing. She instead incorporated the diverse economies language of 'decentring' and worked at 'recentring', reclaiming and revitalizing indigenous ontologies and epistemologies that have been pushed aside for too long. For Indigenous scholars, there is an ongoing struggle to validate Indigenous knowledges and perspectives, which have been commonly devalued by practitioners of mainstream science, yet are key to living sustainably on Earth with human and non-human others. As a Māori scholar, it was to this struggle of recognition and self-determination, and the relationships with other *kaupapa* scholars, that Joanne aligned herself in the process of her research, despite useful initial insights from diverse economies methodologies.

THE POLITICS OF RESEARCH FUNDING: DIVERSE ECONOMIES AND RESEARCH WITH AND FOR *IWI*

In 2005, geographers Nick Lewis and Yvonne Underhill-Sem of the University of Auckland were approached by Te Puni Kokiri (the Ministry of Māori Development) to work with Te Runanga o Te Rarawa (the administrative council of the Te Rarawa *iwi*) to assist in rapidly writing a grant proposal to access funding streams for Te Rarawa research development projects (Underhill☐Sem and Lewis 2008). Neither Lewis nor Underhill-Sem is Te Rarawa, although Lewis had family ties to the *iwi* and Underhill-Sem is Ngaputoru (a related but distinct people hailing from a group of nearby Pacific islands known as the Cook Islands), Niuean and *Pākehā*. Neither was experienced in Kaupapa Māori research methodologies, but both were well-versed in decolonizing and post-development methodologies due to their development studies fieldwork. Cognizant of the importance of Māori-led research and development, they envisioned their role as place-holders, as professionals with the time, space and skill set to rapidly write a research grant proposal that could then be used to gain access to the funds in the timeframe set by government, while making space for Te Rarawa researchers to pick up the threads of the project when time permitted. They used the open framework of assets-based community development (ABCD) as a way to structure this, drawing on the work of diverse economies scholars (Gibson and Cameron 2005; Gibson-Graham 2005a, 2005b). They were not themselves undertaking research with Māori communities, but using diverse economies methodologies to make a case for the kinds of revitalizing and reclaiming strategies Te Rarawa might take up in their own self-directed project.

For Lewis and Underhill-Sem, ABCD is a research methodology that sits well with Kaupapa Māori approaches for two reasons. Firstly, it emphasizes the economic activities and ways of being that are already providing for communities – that is, it moves away from the deficiency approach so often used in research on Indigenous peoples. Using a strengths based approach is important when Māori communities are routinely pathologized by the research process. Deficit narratives are constantly being challenged by Kaupapa Māori researchers across a range of sectors, for example in justice (Jackson 1988), health (Durie 1994) and education (Smith 2000), and in Joanne's research on Māori political participation discussed

in the previous section. Secondly, ABCD emphasizes the importance of community-based researchers – people from within the community who operate as researchers with their own communities rather than outsiders coming in to 'assess' or 'observe'. This means that the politics of knowledge production is front and centre to the methodology and tilted towards community knowledges, as it is in a Kaupapa Māori project.

Yet Underhill-Sem and Lewis, as they report it, held the ABCD method lightly: they used it to lay out an achievable research project backed up with an internationally tested research methodology that *required* that the research project ultimately be handed over to community – that is, *iwi*, researchers. This handover was so successful that a report on the project from the Te Rarawa researchers who eventually took over makes no mention of ABCD, diverse economies, or indeed Underhill-Sem and Lewis (Henwood and Harris 2007). The project used an entirely different methodology emerging from the knowledges of Te Rarawa researchers. In this way, we see a model for appropriate relationships between diverse economies methodologies and Kaupapa Māori, to make way and enable appropriate research engagements that support Indigenous self-determination and *tino rangatiratanga*.

CONCLUSION

In contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand, researchers can no longer ignore either *matauranga Māori* or Kaupapa Māori. As discussed above, both Kaupapa Māori and diverse economies research approaches are about respectful relationships that honour the aspirations of communities. We have emphasized that diverse economies have the capacity and the impetus to embody respectful relationships with Indigenous approaches such as Kaupapa Māori. In our case studies, Kaupapa Māori has been the central research approach, with diverse economies providing tools to express ideas. Researchers in both traditions prioritize the *tikanga* (Mead 2003) of the place in which they work, seeking to ally with others in solidarity for change. Concepts emerging from diverse economies approaches can be held lightly: 'reframing' and 'rethinking' are central themes in diverse economies scholarship, yet for Indigenous scholars, these words could be seen to presume a deficiency in Indigenous approaches – other words such as recentring fit better. But as Roelvink (in Chapter 50 in this volume) points out, letting go of control is a central ethic of diverse economies scholarship, enabling diverse economies methodologies to make way for Indigenous ontologies and methodologies as needed. We may find that many of the ideas we have been struggling to express are already present in Indigenous thinking, useful for challenging and educating non-Indigenous scholars (Sepie 2017). If diverse economies methodologies have any role in Kaupapa Māori research it is this: to make way for *tangata whenua* 'the people of the land', to start where we are with what we have to enact respectful relationships and support Indigenous self-determination.

NOTES

1.   We use Kaupapa Māori (non-italicized, capitalized) to refer to the English language usage of the theory and methodology known as Kaupapa Māori. However, following publisher guidelines, we italicize non-English words throughout the text, including *kaupapa Māori*, which refers to Māori ways of doing things in general (that is, not a methodology). Although Māori words in general New

2. We agree with Pihama that any Western theory should be seen as a *hoa mahi* 'collegial' relationship, working alongside Māori theory where 'the defining parameters of that relationship are negotiated from a Kaupapa Māori framework' (2001, p. 105).

Zealand English usage are not commonly italicized in Aotearoa New Zealand (since Māori is not a foreign language), we have done so here for our international audience.

3. See http://www.rangahau.co.nz (accessed 13 June 2019) for more information about these.
4. See https://www.mbie.govt.nz/science-and-technology/science-and-innovation/agencies-policies -and-budget-initiatives/vision-matauranga-policy/ for more information (accessed 12 March 2019).
5. It has also increased the workload of many Māori scholars who end up providing unremunerated or unrecognized informal support in their institutions, or end up with reduced research outputs or other performance indicators due to this expectation.
6. While *kaitiakitanga* has become a principle widespread in conservation management in Aotearoa New Zealand, we stress that this human-centred view of *kaitiaki* 'guardians' is not consistent with Māori use of the concept. The spiritual *kaitiaki* of Joanne's hapū Ngāti Putaanga, manifests as the native owl, ruru, for example. When humans are extending *kaitiakitanga* it is in a partnership of *mana whenua* 'those with authority over the land' which can include the non-human (see Mutu 2010).
7. While in this work Bargh did not use a 'full' Kaupapa Māori methodology of engaging with community throughout the research process, she argues that it would have been irresponsible to take up the time of *iwi* leaders and members who have already provided the full details of the enterprises under examination on their website and through published reports.

REFERENCES

Ballara, A. (1998), *Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945*, Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Bargh, M. (2011), 'The triumph of Maori entrepreneurs or diverse economies?', *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, **1** (3), 53–69.

Bargh, M. (2012), 'Rethinking and re☐shaping indigenous economies: Māori geothermal energy enterprises', *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, **6** (3), 271–83.

Bargh, M. and J. Otter (2009), 'Progressive spaces of neoliberalism in Aotearoa: A genealogy and critique', *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, **50** (2), 154–65.

Chilisa, B. (2011), *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, London: Sage Publications.

Chitondo, M. and K. Dombroski (2019), 'Returning water data to communities in Ndola, Zambia: A case study in decolonising environmental science', *Case Studies in the Environment*, doi: 10.1525/ cse.2018.001552.

Cram, F. (2017), 'Kaupapa Māori health research', in P. Liamputtong (ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, Singapore: Springer, pp. 1–18.

Cram, F., T. McCreanor, L. Smith, R. Nairn and W. Johnston (2006), 'Kaupapa Maori research and Pakeha social science: Epistemological tensions in a study of Maori health', *Hulili*, **3** (1), 41–68.

Curtis, E. (2016), 'Indigenous positioning in health research: The importance of Kaupapa Māori theory-informed practice', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, **12**, 396–410.

DeMartino, G. (2013), 'Ethical economic engagement in a world beyond control', *Rethinking Marxism*, **25** (4), 483–500.

Diprose, G., K. Dombroski, S. Healy and J. Waitoa (2017), 'Community economies: Responding to questions of scale, agency, and Indigenous connections in Aotearoa New Zealand', *Counterfutures: Left Thought and Practice Aotearoa*, **4**, 167–84.

Durie, M. (1994), *Whaiora: Maori Health Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gibson, K. and J. Cameron (2005), 'Alternative pathways to community and economic development: The LaTrobe Valley community partnering project', *Geographical Research*, **43** (3), 274–85.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2005a), 'Building community economies: Women and the politics of place', in W. Harcourt and A. Escobar (eds), *Women and the Politics of Place*, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, pp. 130–157.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2005b), 'Surplus possibilities: postdevelopment and community economies', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, **26** (1), 4–26.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2008), 'Diverse economies: Performative practices for other worlds', *Progress in Human Geography*, **32** (5), 613–32.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., J. Cameron and S. Healy (2013), *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. and G. Roelvink (2010), 'An economic ethics for the Anthropocene', *Antipode*, **41** (S1), 320–346.

Henwood, W. and Harris, A. (2007), 'Innovation as necessity: Te Rarawa and the challenges of multi-purpose research', *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, **3** (2), 146–62.

Hudson, J. (2016), 'The world's most liveable city – for Māori: Data advocacy and Māori wellbeing in Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland)', in T. Kukutai and J. Taylor (eds), *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*, Canberra: ANU Press, pp. 179–92.

Jackson, M. (1988), *Maori and the Criminal Justice System: He Whaipaanga Hou – A New Perspective*, Part 2, Department of Justice, Wellington, New Zealand.

Kukutai, T. and J. Taylor (2016), 'Data sovereignty for indigenous peoples: Current practice and future needs', in T. Kukutai and J. Taylor (eds), *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*, Canberra: ANU Press, pp. 1–22.

Larsen, S.C. and J.T. Johnson (2017), *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More than Human World*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mead, H.M. (2003), *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Mutu, M. (2010), 'Ngāti kahu kaitiakitanga', in R. Selby, P. Moore and M. Mulholland (eds), *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*, Wellington: Huia Publishers, pp. 13–35.

Pihama, L. (2001), 'Tihei mauri ora: Honouring our voices: Mana wahine as a kaupapa Māori theoretical framework', Doctoral Dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Pihama, L. (2010), 'Kaupapa Māori theory: Transforming theory in Aotearoa', *He Pukenga Korero*, **9** (2), 5–14.

Ringham, S., N. Simmonds and L. Johnston (2016), 'Māori tourism geographies: Values, morals and diverse economies', *MAI Journal*, **5** (2), 100–112.

Royal, Te Ahukaramū C. (2007), 'Papatūānuku – the land', *Te Ara – The Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, accessed 3 May 2019 at http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/papatuanuku-the-land.

Sepie, A. (2017), 'More than stories, more than myths: Animal/human/nature(s) in traditional ecological worldviews', *Humanities*, **6** (4), 78.

Smith, G.H. (1990), 'Taha maori: Pakeha capture', in J. Codd, R. Harker and R. Nash (eds), *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*, Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press, pp. 183–97.

Smith, G.H. (2000), 'Māori education: Revolution and transformative action', *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, **24** (1), 57–72.

Smith, L.T. (1999), *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London: Zed Books.

Underhill☐Sem, Y. and N. Lewis (2008), 'Asset mapping and Whanau action research: "New" subjects negotiating the politics of knowledge in Te Rarawa', *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, **49** (3), 305–17.