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Abstract: Kaupapa Māori is literally a Māori way. It is a reclaiming by Māori (Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand) of a future that is founded within a Māori worldview; a future where cultural knowledge and values inform understandings of and responses to Māori needs, priorities, and aspirations. Self-determination, cultural aspirations, and the importance of familial relationships and collectivity are among the central elements evident in Kaupapa Māori development initiatives. The culturally responsive evaluation of these initiatives builds upon traditional commitments to information management and the updating of Māori knowledge. Kaupapa Māori evaluation looks “inwards” to assess development on Māori terms, and “outwards” in a structural analysis of other facilitators of and barriers to that development. After more than 20 years of Kaupapa Māori evaluation, it is timely to ask what learning might helpfully be shared with other Indigenous peoples to support their desire for the culturally responsive evaluation of development initiatives they experience. A Kaupapa Māori evaluation lens will be described and then used to critique international development evaluation to facilitate decolonization. Audiences for this article include development efforts led by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs within the South Pacific, and international development efforts led by organizations such as UNESCO that are developing equity evaluation approaches.
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Résumé : Kaupapa Māori signifie littéralement « à la façon des Maoris ». C'est la revendication d'un avenir qui soit fondé sur une vision Maori (le peuple autochtone d'Aotearoa, la Nouvelle-Zélande); un avenir où la réponse aux besoins, aspirations et priorités des Maori serait ancrée dans leurs valeurs et savoir communautaire. L’autodétermination, les aspirations culturelles et l’importance des relations familiales et communautaires sont des éléments évidents dans les projets de développement Kaupapa Māori, et l’évaluation culturellement sensible de tels projets tient compte d’un engagement traditionnel envers la gestion de l’information et la mise à
jour du savoir maori. L’évaluation Kaupapa Māori regarde « vers l’intérieur » pour évaluer le développement en termes maoris, et « vers l’extérieur » pour effectuer l’analyse structurelle des éléments qui facilitent ou empêchent ce développement. Plus de vingt ans après les premières évaluations Kaupapa Māori, il est temps d’en tirer des leçons qui profiteront à d’autres peuples autochtones souhaitant une évaluation culturellement sensible de leurs projets de développement. Dans cet article, on décrit le filtre d’une évaluation « à la façon des Maoris », puis on s’en sert pour critiquer l’évaluation en contexte de développement international, dans le but de faciliter la décolonisation. Cet article pourra intéresser les intervenants en développement qui travaillent dans le Pacifique Sud sous la houlette du ministère des Affaires étrangères de la Nouvelle-Zélande, et ceux du développement international qui relèvent d’organisations comme l’UNESCO et s’efforcent de mettre au point des méthodes d’évaluation équitables.
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Kaupapa Māori literally means doing things a Māori way. It is an assertion of the sovereign status of Māori (Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand) and an expression of certainty that the sustenance and flourishing of Māori culture and Māori people rests in the ability of Māori to be Māori. Over the past 25–30 years a discourse of Kaupapa Māori has permeated government agencies and nongovernmental organizations, leading to the contracting of Kaupapa Māori services and programs, the exploration of Kaupapa Māori governance and management, and the funding of Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation. The last of these, Kaupapa Māori evaluation, is the focus of the present article. The lessons from this Indigenous evaluation practice within Aotearoa New Zealand are explored for how they might inform or reinforce evaluation practices within international development, especially when Indigenous communities are involved. The scene is set for this by an initial brief colonial history of Aotearoa New Zealand, followed by an overview of Kaupapa Māori theory. Kaupapa Māori evaluation is then described, with a deeper exploration of what it means to “be careful” (kia tūpato) within evaluation practice.

A COLONIZED LAND

When Māori signed the Treaty of Waitangi with British colonizers in 1840, they saw the opportunities that newcomers to these lands would bring. Tribes gifted land for the establishment of towns, schools, and hospitals, and for a short time commerce flourished between Māori and settlers (Orange, 1987; Walker, 2004). However, this tide of opportunity soon receded, as treaty guarantees of Māori sovereignty and continued tribal possession of lands and other treasures were swept aside by successive colonial governments (Orange, 1987).
Over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries Māori have faced the brunt of sickness, Christianity, warfare, loss of land, and an imposed system of justice, welfare, and education (Cram & Pitama, 1998). These colonial assaults undermined the Māori land and economic base, suppressed the Māori language, and overwhelmed the country with settler numbers that Māori never anticipated (Durie, 2001).

These impacts were not unanticipated by the colonizer, however, as Aotearoa New Zealand was one of the last places where the British entered into a treaty with Indigenous peoples (Barker, 2005). Experience had taught the British that colonization imposed high costs upon the first peoples of a land, be it treaty-endorsed or not. Unfortunately, any good intentions to treat with the Māori and colonize differently in Aotearoa New Zealand were undermined by missionaries and their “unchristian denial of Māori humanity [that] rationalized and justified their project of cultural invasion” (Walker, 1994, p. 103). The British then had to bend to the forces of commerce. By 1840, when Māori chiefs around the country were signing the Treaty of Waitangi, the Britain-based New Zealand Company had already sold the land out from under the tribes, and settlers were on their way to this “new land.” There was some clawback from these presales, but compromises were made to ensure that the demands of immigrants could be met. Māori could then only sell land to the colonial government, who then sold it on at a profit to fund itself (Orange, 1987).

Over time the colonial government suppressed Māori protests about the breaking of treaty promises by many means, including the denial of services, legislative restrictions, warfare, and *raupatu* (confiscation of land). The collapse of the Māori population over the course of 19th-century colonization was especially severe because Māori were dispossessed of their lands (Kunitz, 1994). The taking of land made Māori poor and more susceptible to diseases, destroyed Māori social networks (Kunitz, 1994), undermined cultural knowledge (King, 1996), and demoralized Māori (Orange, 1987).

This is not a unique story. Variations of this colonization experience have occurred in many lands, for many peoples, over many centuries (Alfred, 2005; Barker, 2005; Mertens, Cram, & Chilisa, 2013). Chilisa (2012, p. 18) lists these others as coming from

historically oppressed groups, marginalized and labeled, former colonies, descendants of slaves . . . those people in the third world, fourth world, developing countries, or those pushed to the margins on the basis of their gender, race/ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status, age, religion, or sexual orientation, and immigrants and refugees.

Indigenous peoples and others who have been marginalized and excluded know what it feels like “to be present while your history is erased before your eyes” (L. T. Smith, 1999, p. 29). When Māori chiefs signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, Captain Hobson shook each one’s hand and said, “He iwi tahi tātou” (We
are [now] one people). While Māori may have understood the sentiment behind Hobson’s statement as many peoples coming together to make a nation (Metge, 2010), the reality turned out to be a colonial government committed first to the assimilation and then to the integration of Māori into colonial society. These antisovereignty agendas for Māori left their mark in the wide-ranging disparities that Māori continue to experience through to the present day (Ministry of Health, 2015; Robson & Harris, 2007). When Māori leaders considered these disparities at the 1984 Hui Taumata (Māori Economic Summit), their conclusion was that assimilation and integration had not worked for Māori, and that the intervention needed to bring about positive changes for Māori well-being was for Māori to be Māori. Kaupapa Māori theory and Kaupapa Māori evaluation have been part of the ensuing movement to reclaim a Māori sovereign position where being Māori is seen as normal, and decolonization is about honouring the Treaty of Waitangi, decentring colonial ownership of Aotearoa New Zealand, and returning Māori land (Cram, Kennedy, Paipa, Pipi, & Wehi-peihana, 2015).

KAUPAPA MĀORI

The term Kaupapa Māori literally means a Māori way, and refers to Māori-defined philosophies, frameworks, and practices. Kaupapa Māori derives from distinctive cultural epistemological and metaphysical foundations (Nepe, 1991) that frame and structure how Māori think and practice (L. T. Smith, 1996). Contemporary expressions of Kaupapa Māori theory connect Māori sovereignty to Māori survival and cultural well-being, stress that this cultural survival is imperative, and take for granted that being Māori is both valid and legitimate (G. H. Smith, 1990, 2012). Six principles were at the core of Kaupapa Māori when it was developed within the academy: Tino rangatiratanga (Self-determination), He taonga tuku iho (Cultural aspirations), Ako (Culturally preferred pedagogy), Kia piki ake i nga raruraru o te kainga (Socioeconomic mediation), Whānau (Extended family structure), and Kaupapa (Collective philosophy) (G. H. Smith, 1990; see Cram, Kennedy, et al., 2015, for an overview of these principles). More recently, two additional principles have been proposed: Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi) and Āta (Growing respectful relationships) (Pohatu, 2005).

Kaupapa Māori also opens up avenues for approaching and critiquing a colonial worldview that constructs Māori disparities as personal deficits. Kaupapa Māori has its roots in two intellectual influences—the validity and legitimacy of Māori language, knowledge and culture, as well as critical social theory. And this critical tradition demands we pay attention . . . to structural analysis . . . and to everyday practice, both of which inform the other. (G. H. Smith, 2012, p. 12)

Kaupapa Māori initiatives within education, health, justice, and other fields are now funded by government agencies and tribal organizations. While these
initiatives are governed by Māori and delivered according to Māori cultural values and practices, they are often for the whole-of-the-community rather than exclusively for Māori (Grennell & Cram, 2008). For example, Māori primary health organizations provide health services to their community, while Māori universities enroll a diversity of students who find the kaupapa (agenda) of the institutions compatible with their own values and aspirations. Kaupapa Māori evaluation provides a culturally responsive way of assessing the success of these initiatives, and also the success of “mainstream” initiatives that often deliver to Māori constituencies (Cram, Kennedy, et al., 2015). Kaupapa Māori evaluation is, simply, evaluation undertaken by Māori, for Māori, with Māori.

Evaluation practices with Māori have not always been able to represent their lived realities or endorse their right to be Māori (Hamerton, Mercer, Riini, McPherson, & Morrison, 2014). Instead, representations have often been, for example, based on the stereotyped understandings of the evaluators, and the deficit-based views held of the Indigenous peoples by the dominant culture (Kawakami, Aton, Cram, Lai, & Porima, 2007). Even in recent memory Māori communities can recall their negative experiences with non-Māori researchers and evaluators, and the harmful consequences of their representations of Māori realities that reinforced notions of deficits from colonizer “norms” that were seen as problematic differences and in need of adjustment (L. T. Smith, 1999). Like other Indigenous evaluators, Māori evaluators seeking to bring culturally responsive evaluation theories and methodologies to bear on the evaluation of Māori initiatives often stumble upon and have to negotiate a history of a community’s negative experiences with research and evaluation (LaFrance & Nicols, 2010; National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health, 2013).

Seven community-up research practices written about by Linda Smith (1999, 2006b) and by Cram and colleagues (Cram, 2001, 2009; Cram & Phillips, 2012; Kennedy & Cram, 2010; Pipi et al., 2004) provide practice guidance for Kaupapa Māori evaluation (Table 1). The practices endorse Māori assumptions about collective interdependence forged through whakapapa (genealogy) and other forms of connectedness with each other, with the environment, and with the cosmos (Henry & Pene, 2001). The practices provide guidance about the respect and care that need to be demonstrated within Kaupapa Māori evaluation in order for cultural and professional relationships to be strengthened so that all those involved are “enriched, empowered, enlightened and glad to have been part of it” (Mead, 2003, p. 318). As part of a decolonization project the practices reinforce a Māori “economy of affection” as a form of resistance to the colonizer’s capitalist “economy of exploitation” (Henry & Pene, 2001).

Cram, Kennedy, and colleagues (2015) provide an overview of these practices within Kaupapa Māori evaluation. The fifth of these practices—Kia tūpato—is expanded upon here to examine what it means to precede with care in a Kaupapa Māori evaluation.
Kia tūpato—be careful

In her 1999 book *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda Smith listed *Kia tūpato—be cautious*—as one of seven sayings that “reflect just some of the values that are placed on the way we behave” (L. T. Smith, 1999, p. 120) as researchers and evaluators. Shortly afterwards I expanded upon the relevance of these seven sayings for *Kaupapa Māori* (by Māori, for Māori) research, saying of *Kia tūpato* that it was “about being politically astute, culturally safe and reflexive about our insider/outside status” (Cram, 2001, p. 46). Linda Smith (2006a, p. 12) added that *Kia tūpato* “is also a caution to insiders and outsiders that, in community research, things can come undone without the researcher being aware or being told directly.” *Kia tūpato* might therefore be considered to be so much more than its often-used translation of “Be careful.” This conclusion may, however, underestimate what “being careful” requires in terms of understanding etiquette and being able to move with politeness within any culture. The three characteristics of being careful—being politically astute, culturally safe, and reflective about insider/outside status—guide this next discussion.

A short vignette about a recent evaluation of the InZone Project (IZP) opens each section (Cram, Sauni, Kennedy, Field, McKegg, & Pipi-Takoko, 2015). Terrance Wallace, a youth pastor and community worker from Chicago, began IZP in 2011 to provide Māori and Pasifika (from the Pacific Islands, Polynesia, who reside in *Aotearoa* New Zealand) young men with an opportunity

### Table 1. “Community-Up” Approach to Defining Research Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Values (L. Smith, 1999)</th>
<th>Researcher Guidelines (Cram, 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroha ki te tangata</td>
<td>Have respect for people—allow people to define their own space and meet on their own terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He kanohi kitea</td>
<td>Be a face that is known and seen within a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titiro, whakarongo … kōrero</td>
<td>Look and listen (and then maybe speak)—develop understanding to find a place from which to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki ki te tangata</td>
<td>Share, host, and be generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia tūpato</td>
<td>Be careful—be politically astute, culturally safe, and reflective about insider/outside status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata</td>
<td>Do not trample on the status or dignity of a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia māhaki</td>
<td>Be humble—do not flaunt your knowledge; find ways of sharing it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source.* Adapted from L. Smith (2006b, p. 12, Diagram 1)
to live in-zone so they can attend a prestigious secondary school, Auckland Grammar School.

**Political Astuteness**

Before beginning the evaluation of IZP the evaluators sought to understand why the initiative was needed. The views of the IZP founder were sought and research, strategy, and policy related to Māori and Pasifika education were accessed and read. Explanations were developed for the disparities in the educational success experienced by Māori and Pasifika secondary school students, and the history of Māori engagement with church boarding schools was examined. It was also important to note that the zoning for Auckland Grammar School prevented the majority of Māori and Pasifika students from attending the school as their families could not afford housing in the expensive in-zone suburbs. Our questioning continued during the mixed method evaluation: students, families, key informants, and school and hostel staff were asked “why” IZP was needed, and media representations of the initiative were examined for answers to the same question. The answers helped expand the evaluators’ understanding of what success looked like; namely, that it was more than access to a prestigious secondary school, it was also about Māori and Pasifika young men succeeding in many aspects of their lives, including educational achievement, while having their cultural identity nurtured and their aspirations for themselves, their families, and their communities supported.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation calls upon evaluators to have a nuanced understanding of the social, cultural, and political context for their evaluation work (Ormond, Cram, & Carter, 2006). The very brief history of the colonization of Aotearoa New Zealand and the development of a Māori agenda (of being Māori) outlined at the start of this article implicates colonization in the marginalization and vulnerability of Māori, and highlights the importance of interventions and development that reclaim a sovereign space for Māori to be Māori. Cram (2015) asserts that this includes inquiring about whose agenda is being served by the initiative being evaluated; for example, how the “problem” that the initiative is seeking to address was identified, whether the “problem” is a priority for key stakeholders (e.g., community members), and if key stakeholders were involved in the development of the initiative. In addition, the institutions funding programs and program evaluation are often the same ones implicated in the colonization of Indigenous peoples (Malezer, 2013). Kaupapa Māori evaluators need to have “an active awareness of the extent to which . . . government agencies and affiliated institutions have oppressed, discriminated against, and engaged in culturally biased practices with these communities” (Kelley, Belcourt-Dittloff, Belcourt, & Belcourt, 2013, p. 2146).

A key lesson for evaluators is about seeking out the “root causes” of the problem that any initiative they are evaluating is purporting to address. For example, if a Māori parenting program is being evaluated, then evaluators might enquire about whether the over-representation of Māori children in child maltreatment statistics can be explained in a more nuanced way than a simple attribution to bad
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parenting. A theory of the problem that is co-designed with an organization and their community will unpack layered explanations and perhaps also culturally responsive solutions and desired outcomes.

Indigenous people argue that [child maltreatment statistics are] the result of a combination of factors, including assimilationist policies of colonial governments leading to the fragmentation of families, inequitable distribution of the goods and resources of society . . ., systemic racism of a child welfare protection system imposing white middle-class notions of family and child-rearing upon indigenous families, and racial bias in reporting of maltreatment and in child welfare agency decision-making. (Cram, Gulliver, Ota, & Wilson, 2015, p. 2)

Māori are often confronted by “wicked problems” (Rittel & Webber, 1973) that have a complex etiology and require multilayered interventions. Overlooking this complexity puts evaluators (and others) at risk of endorsing assimilationist or integrationist agendas and the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples. Asking after such issues when stakeholders in various positions of power or powerlessness might have conflicting answers requires evaluators to have a “thirst for [this] knowledge and the courage to pursue it” (Ormond et al., 2006, p. 181).

In their Kaupapa Māori evaluation of a “Healthy Eating, Healthy Action” program, Hamerton et al. (2014) describe the rationale for the initiative, beginning with an acknowledgement of Māori as tangata whenua (Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand). They offer a multilayered explanation for Māori health disparities that includes social and economic factors. This then allows them to manage the expectations of the program they are evaluating, including proposing a theory of change that is aligned with people’s lived realities.

While it is not possible for health programmes to directly address structural factors that lead to health inequalities, one implication is that programmes need to be targeted at the level of the family or community while not neglecting the importance of individual change. (Hamerton et al., 2014, p. 61)

Developing explanatory pathways and surfacing root causes may also increase the chances that evaluation can be part of a broader decolonization agenda. The odds of this can be improved by evaluators asking themselves and those they are working with pointed questions, such as these three adapted from Linda Smith (2006b):

- How can we decolonize evaluation so that it serves Indigenous peoples better?
- How do we create evaluation spaces that allow Indigenous stories to be told and heard?
- How do we use evaluation to destabilize existing power structures that hold Indigenous peoples in the margins?

Penelope and Doherty (2013) conclude their Kaupapa Māori evaluation of an adaptation of Mellow Parenting for Māori mothers by endorsing the importance
of culturally responsive programs. They also call for a reduction of the barriers to such programs and services being delivered in the community. These conclusions are founded upon their understanding of the problem that the program adaptation was aiming to address. This included the highlighting of individual and institutional racism as well as the existence of “successful traditional Māori parenting practices . . . in the 1800s and before significant contact with Europeans” (Penehira & Doherty, 2013, pp. 371–372).

Cultural Safety

The IZP evaluation began with a formal welcome for three of the evaluators by the young men and staff in the IZP hostel. This was an opportunity for the evaluators to introduce themselves—where they were from (i.e., their genealogical connections) as well as their motivations and expertise—and to provide a brief introduction to the evaluation itself. Karakia (prayer) also played a role in this welcome. This seemed most appropriate, as the large open room where the welcome was held also functioned as the hostel’s chapel. These rituals of encounter were repeated in more intimate ways in face-to-face encounters with the young men and with others who were involved in the evaluation (e.g., their families, hostel staff, key informants). Introductions between the evaluators and those they encountered were about acknowledging connections and inviting people to participate in the evaluation of IZP.

Kathy Irwin (1994, p. 27) describes how researchers and evaluators should engage in processes that are “culturally safe”; in other words, processes “where Māori institutions, principles and practices [are] highly valued and followed.” Being careful is therefore about being tika (right), which comes from being guided by tikanga (cultural rules and protocols) so there is a shared understanding of roles, responsibilities, and expectations (Mead, 2003).

Māori are careful not to trample over etiquette, and others move in like bulls in so many china shops and break so many cups. (Rangihau, 1992, p. 185)

Moving in alignment with protocol requires an understanding of Māori culture, as well as knowledge about tribal variations within that culture. The mentorship of kaumatua (elders) is an important part of Irwin’s (1994) definition of Kaupapa Māori research, while Pipi and colleagues (2004) described the senior Māori women in their evaluation team as having the cultural expertise to keep the team and their work culturally safe. Part of this cultural safety is knowing how to appropriately identify the connectedness between people (Bishop, 1996; Kerr, 2012). The relationships that are forged or strengthened for an evaluation through cultural rituals of encounter are the foundation upon which all other evaluative activities take place, because the Māori world is these relationships (Marsden, 1992).

The spiritual safety aspect of Kia tūpato was more intensively spoken about during a recent wānanga (discussion forum) of Māori and Pasifika (New Zealanders of Pacific Island descent) evaluators (Kennedy, et al., 2015). In this forum
evaluators talked about taking care by ensuring they were prepared and in a good state of mind to undertake an evaluation, and also that they were responsive to the context they were in and the people they were with.

Part of finding this quiet place is about the rituals that take place in our encounters when I’m often asking people how they would like to begin. Part of this is about me not wanting to impose spirituality on a situation that may be inappropriate, and part of it is about wanting to acknowledge the *rangatiratanga* [sovereignty] of those I’m with to both protect and direct the context. (F. Cram, as quoted in Kennedy et al., 2015, pp. 160)

The maintenance of everyday, customary practices such as *karakia* (prayer) are protective and reflective mechanisms for evaluators when practiced privately. They are also an important part of how people engage with one another and, as stressed in the quote above, heed should be taken of the *tikanga* (protocols) of the host organizations and communities.

The late Irihapeti Ramsden (1988) coined the term “Cultural safety,” or *Kawa whakaruruhau*, within nursing education so that nurses would graduate with a critique of colonization and its impact upon Māori health. For Ramsden cultural safety was more about nurses having an understanding of how Māori patients are positioned within the power structures of our society rather than them having an intimate understanding of culture and protocols. In a similar vein Symonette (2004) proposed a broader understanding of the concept of cultural competency. The first component, “Inside/Out,” requires evaluators to develop an understanding of power and privilege hierarchies, including how they and others are located within these hierarchies. The second component, “Outside/In,” encompasses the development of “diversity-relevant knowledge and skills.” These two components—colonial critique and cultural knowledge—should therefore complement one another in Kaupapa Māori evaluation, as they do in Kaupapa Māori theory (see above).

**Insider/ Outsider Reflexivity**

*The welcome at the hostel for the evaluators was a time for the young men to meet the evaluators who they would be interacting with the most: a senior Māori male evaluator and a senior Samoan male evaluator. The involvement of these evaluators recognized their skill and expertise as well as the evaluation context of the IZP hostel that was largely male and Māori and Pasifika. These evaluators also remembered their own secondary education and the struggles and triumphs they had experienced. So while they were older than the young men in the hostel, they were insiders by virtue of their sex, ethnicity, and life experiences. They could also be considered insiders because they were matua (uncles) within their cultures. In addition, the Samoan evaluator had been involved with the hostel in its previous life as part of a church-based initiative to provide a base for Māori and Pasifika young men learning trades. It was also acknowledged that the young men in the hostel were of a new generation, facing new*
challenges while living away from home, and attending a prestigious secondary school where the demands upon them were great. The task of the evaluators was therefore to acquaint themselves with the lived reality of these young men and seek to represent it well within the IZP evaluation.

Trinh Minh-ha (1989, p. 74) writes that when we speak about the cultural group we belong to we need to do so by looking “in from the outside while also looking out from the inside.” Linda Smith (1996) illustrates the complexity of doing this by writing about the layers of similarity and difference that occurred for her as a Māori woman carrying out research with Māori women:

I was at three levels at least an “insider” as a Māori, as a woman and as a mother and at another set of levels an “outsider,” as a postgraduate student, as someone from a different tribe, and as an older mother and as someone who actually had a partner. (pp. 197–198)

Within research and evaluation the insider/outsider issue is discussed in at least two ways. The first is that illustrated above, of the dilemma a Kaupapa Māori evaluator faces when they are conducting evaluation within their own community and needing to negotiate the many ways in which they are simultaneously both an insider and an outsider on multiple, interacting levels (Kerstetter, 2012). This insider/outsider dilemma is described as the positionality of the evaluator and is most often discussed in relation to qualitative methodologies.

It’s very hard working in your home community . . . They really hold you to what you say and it’s not just that they hold you, you hold yourself because you just have this real sense of responsibility. To do what is right for them, represent them in a way that is fine with them and fine with the institution. It’s a lot of work in your mind to get that settled so that you’re at peace with it. (A. Ormond, quoted in Ormond, Cram, & Carter, 2006, p. 185)

The second way is the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of being an insider/internal evaluator compared to an outsider/external evaluator (Conley-Tyler, 2005). This discussion is more focused on being internal to an organization and conducting the evaluation from the “inside” than on racial/ethnic concordance or an evaluator’s genealogical relationships with those they are evaluating.

The positionality of an evaluator and the negotiation of insider/outsider status is undertaken initially through the acknowledgement of whakapapa (genealogical) connections. As Keefe-Ormsby (2008) notes, however, a whakapapa connection will only open a door. The journey that happens through that door also depends very much on the evaluator’s professionalism. This professionalism is about the development of a trust relationship within which all informants are acknowledged as holders of expert knowledge about a program and listened to and engaged with respectfully (Hamerton et al., 2014).
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In Aotearoa New Zealand, colonization led to Māori land and resources being confiscated and redistributed to non-Māori newcomers, with a resulting status quo of Māori marginalization and disparities across numerous outcome areas. Prior to the invigoration of Kaupapa Māori, evaluation was often associated with the justification of this status quo, with Māori seen as “failures” within colonial systems of education, justice, health, and so on and needing to change to be a better fit if “success” was to be achieved (Battiste, 2000). Nobles (1991) described this as scientific colonialism and presented it as a companion of, and often the supportive mechanism for, political colonialism. Kaupapa Māori arose out of a belief that Māori being Māori is a pathway to Māori revitalization. Stemming from this, Kaupapa Māori evaluation is the assertion that the evaluation of Māori initiatives should be undertaken by, with, and for Māori. This philosophical stance is backed up by seven practice principles, one of which—Kia tūpato—has been reviewed here for lessons that might be useful for those undertaking evaluations with Indigenous and other vulnerable groups involved in development projects.

The extension of a Kaupapa Māori stance to an international development context indicates that Indigenous people have a right to have programs and services developed by Indigenous people in response to their own needs, priorities, and aspirations in their own communities, and to have these programs and services evaluated by Indigenous evaluators. The right of Indigenous peoples to these things comes from their status as first peoples of the land, and is reinforced in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations, 2007) as well as various local and international treaties, conventions, and declarations (Cram & Mertens, 2015). Unfortunately many Indigenous peoples have been subjected to some combination of colonization, marginalization, segregation, and impoverishment. If “colonialism teaches people to think that they are someone else” (Daes, 2000, p. 3), then the part that evaluation can play in decolonization is allowing Indigenous peoples to know and to be Indigenous. As Linda Smith (1999) writes, decolonization is about seeing Indigenous peoples as fully human. Thus the first Article of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is about being human:

> Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law. (United Nations, 2007, Article 1)

The examination of Kia tūpato—being careful within Kaupapa Māori evaluation—has highlighted some ways in which evaluators can be part of a decolonization project that has at its heart an “economy of affection” and a desire to showcase Indigenous peoples as fully human:

1. Acknowledge the sovereign status of Indigenous peoples regardless of the forces that seek to undermine that status. At the same time be
aware of those forces and understand how the Indigenous peoples in any territory—whether they live as a majority within their own lands or in minority spaces among other ethnic groups—are positioned within the power structures that govern that territory. A knowledge of the history of any territory should be gained before an evaluation is begun.

2. Seek to understand and describe a theory of the problem for an initiative that is being evaluated. Strongly resist the urge to take for granted a funder's version of why an intervention might be needed. Instead ask “why?” questions that enable local informants to describe their understandings and talk about their explanations. When Jones (2008) did this within a Native American community, he built a layered picture of the root causes and pathways to domestic violence. When this understanding surfaced, the community came to new understandings of its own circumstances and was then able to make suggestions about what types of interventions might be helpful.

3. Be mindful of the cultural protocols of Indigenous peoples, especially rituals of first encounters. Seeing people as fully human is about respecting that evaluators will often be visitors to their place and should be mindful of the manners they need to display to negotiate that space. Do the homework and preparation needed so that insults are not offered, and the relationships needed for the evaluation to proceed are started under good circumstances. Consider using intermediaries such as elders to enable encounters to be conducted according to local custom and protocol.

4. Acknowledge your insider/outsider status, along with any motivations to be involved in the evaluation.

There are tensions in pulling these lessons out from Kaupapa Māori evaluation philosophy and practice. It is effectively taking an internal—by Māori, for Māori—with Māori—evaluation model and applying it to what will most likely be non-Indigenous evaluation practice within Indigenous settings. While the number of Indigenous evaluators is increasing, they are unlikely—in the short term—to be able to meet the demands for the evaluation of programs and services for Indigenous peoples. It is important, then, for Indigenous peoples to be able to rely on non-Indigenous evaluators to be on their side in terms of their knowledge and understanding of, and ability to represent Indigenous realities. This is not necessarily news, as other evaluators writing about development evaluation have expressed their views on the importance of evaluators walking and working alongside Indigenous peoples (Hopson, Kirkhart, & Bledsloe, 2012; Mertens, 2012). The inter-evaluator agreement within this wider conversation holds the promise that evaluation can and will contribute to decolonization.

Nāu te rourou nāku te rourou ka ora ai te iwi

With your basket and my basket the people will live
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