NGĀ RARANGA I MAKERE: STITCHES DROPPED IN TIME

AN ORAL HISTORY STUDY OF MĀORI COMMUNITY ARCHIVING IN
TARANAKI 2014–2017

BY

CLAIRE HALL

A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
New Zealand Studies

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Te Wāhanga Aronui
Victoria University of Wellington
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

2019

Abstract

Community archiving is a movement with its origins in the grass-roots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in a way that focuses on community participation and ownership of records. This research was about a Māori archiving community of practice from Taranaki and investigated how the training they received created outcomes for their taonga archives and families. It did this by answering three research questions designed to identify how post-custodial trends in community archiving resonated with, or differed from, the methods employed by 11 former students of Te Pūtē Routiriata o Taranaki community archive in New Plymouth.

This research took a qualitative oral history approach to data gathering and used thematic analysis to examine evidence gathered from three generations of whānau archivists. It investigated whether community archiving had enhanced their collections of whānau history passed down from generation to generation and connected the close family groups that were looking after them. This study proposes a concept of whānau-led collection management as a model of practice for flax-roots communities and public heritage institutions that work with taonga Māori. It explains the link between collectively caring for archival collections and positive outcomes for whānau engagement with te reo Māori and other forms of cultural identity building. It draws on international examples to suggest ways that practices of community archiving, such as digitisation and digital archiving, can bridge the gap between community-led and institutional methods of caring for tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Keywords

Table of contents

List of abbreviations

COMET   City of Manukau Education Trust

NOHANZ   National Oral History Association of New Zealand

NSW   New South Wales

SNS   Social Networking Sites

UK   United Kingdom

Statement of original authorship

The work contained in this thesis has not been previously submitted to meet requirements for an award at this or any other higher education institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

Ehara tēnei he toa takitahi, he toa takitini kē.

I would like to acknowledge my supervisors Anna Green and Annie Te One (Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Mutunga, Taranaki Whānui ki te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui) for their guidance through the writing of this thesis. I am sincerely grateful for the Marsden Fund Family Memory scholarship funding I received to do this research. To my Taranaki whānau whānui who contributed – your generosity in sharing your stories and your contribution to helping other whānau care for their taonga archives is deeply appreciated. Carol Dawber, your support, mentoring and gentle encouragement through the hard times will not be forgotten. To my family, the Ashworth-Halls, Craig, Felix, Angus and Hana Te Iorangi, thank you for understanding why this work was so important to me and for enduring my absences when we could have been playing together. Finally, to my Mum, Kathleen Hall, who died not long before this work was finished. This thesis is dedicated to your memory. Nei rā āku mihi mutunga kore ki a koutou katoa nō runga i te tika, te pono me te aroha anō o tētehi ki tētehi.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Summary

The practice of community archiving has its origins in the grass-roots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in a way that centres community participation and ownership of records.[1] This is in contrast with institutional modes of archiving that centre on public collection building, a method known for removing records from the ownership and control of their communities of origin[2] and writing over them with European settler history.[3] Aotearoa New Zealand communities of origin are indigenous tangata whenua and include whānau (Māori family and community) that look to archives as sources of knowledge for reuniting their language and cultural base in the wake of national and global dispersal linked to colonisation. Rules of institutional collecting can prevent these families from engaging with their own archival records and knowledge in the ways they want. Similarly, the rule of *quid pro quo* access dictated by public memory institutions is a deterrent to whānau archivists seeking help to care for their archives.

As a result, Māori community archives are emerging in Aotearoa New Zealand. Some are iwi-based and driven by autonomous cultural

---

[1] Andrew Flinn, 'Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges,' *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 28, no. 2 (2007): 153.

[2] Michelle Horwood, 'Worlds Apart: Indigenous Re-engagement with Museum-held Heritage: A New Zealand – United Kingdom Case Study' (PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2015), 2. Citing Laura Peers and Alison K. Brown from '*Museums and Source Communities*', (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), Horwood applied this term in an Aotearoa New Zealand context in relation to 'cultural groups from whom museums have collected'.

[3] Nēpia Mahuika, '"Closing the Gaps": From Postcolonialism to Kaupapa Māori and Beyond'. *The New Zealand Journal of History* 45, no. 1 (2011): 65.

revitalisation efforts linked to Treaty of Waitangi Settlements; the Ngāi Tahu iwi archive[4] is one example of this. Others are linked to language revitalisation efforts; the Taranaki pan-iwi community archive in New Plymouth is an example of this and it was the starting point for this research. Between 2014 and 2017, around 50 students trained with Te Pūtē Routiriata o Taranaki in New Plymouth. The research cohort for this thesis is a subset of this archiving community, made up of 11 former students who volunteered for oral history interviews about the motivations for their community archiving practice and the outcomes of their training.

This introductory chapter outlines the motivation for research and the way it builds on current scholarship and methodologies for oral history research and thematic analysis. It assesses current community archival practice in this country and overseas, as well as the way these fields intersect with current literature on flax-roots[5] and Māori community archiving. It introduces the three key concepts used as a framework for the thematic analysis of the interview data. These are whanaungatanga (relationships), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and taonga (treasured Māori objects).[6] Finally, this chapter provides an overview of the oral history methodology adopted to investigate

---

[4] Speakers from Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu presented on the iwi archive at the National Library of New Zealand event 'Mā Te Mātauranga, Te Iwi Ka Ora: Projects from the Ngāi Tahu Archive' on June 14, 2018, accessed May 17, 2019, https://natlib.govt.nz/events/ma-te-matauranga-te-iwi-ka-ora-projects-from-the-ngai-tahu-archive-june-14-2018.

[5] A colloquial term drawing on the origins of the English equivalent 'grass roots', used here to refer to community-archiving efforts led by Māori, for Māori.

[6] Hereafter, the term taonga is used to refer to both tangible and intangible cultural heritage, both the artefacts and objects, and the stories and knowledge in whānau collections.

why this intergenerational group has engaged with community archiving to care for their memory collections at home.[7]

The purpose of this thesis is to compare community archiving as an international field of study against current trends in Aotearoa New Zealand by surveying and analysing the experiences of a group of Taranaki-based Māori community archivists. It aligns their first-hand, qualitative evidence with contemporary scholarship in the fields of digital archiving for indigenous knowledge management. This research seeks to identify whether global definitions for community archiving are relevant (or irrelevant) to Māori practitioners in charge of private sets of photographs, manuscripts, artefacts and stories.

Community archiving is a broad term that encompasses the proliferation of approaches, definitions and theories of records and data management in a post-custodial, digital age.[8] This research positions the definitions that these scholars collectively present for alternative archiving as a standpoint for comparing Māori community archiving with current descriptions for this practice. Māori archiving is deliberately left undefined at the outset of this research. Rather than setting out to test any conclusive definition of this term, this thesis constructs a continuum of conceptual interpretations for Māori archiving that can inform future research into the nuances of indigenous practice in Aotearoa New Zealand.

---

[7] The term 'home' refers to the spaces outside of collecting institutions where taonga are housed, looked after or linked to through historical events.

[8] Lisa Darms, 'Radical Archives (Introduction)', *Archives Journal Special Issue* (November 2015), accessed May 18, 2019, https://www.archivejournal.net/essays/radical-archives/. See also Flinn, 'Community Histories, Community Archives', 151–176; Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J. Lau, eds., *Research in the Archival Multiverse* (Victoria, Australia: Monash University Press, 2016).

New York University archivist Lisa Darms[9] posited that currently, the most radical[10] approach to creating community archives is the post-custodial model. The American Society of Archivists defines post-custodial theory as 'the idea that archivists will no longer physically acquire and maintain records, but that they will provide management oversight for records that will remain in the custody of the record creators'.[11] This signals a shift in archival practice to a model that does not rely on the physical transfer of collections to institutions. Instead, it positions professional archivists as facilitators and enablers in charge of managing records in the custody of their creators, inheritors and owners. This current research examines whether mainstream definitions for community archiving also relate to home-based Māori archiving for privately owned collections.

The literature review for this study reveals a limited pool of published research about Māori community archiving outside of memory sector institutions.[12] The research that exists provides valuable perspectives on the work of Māori archivists and librarians within public sector institutions but it stops short of exposing the experiences of iwi (tribes), hapū (sub-tribes) and whānau (family) operating outside the mainstream view. This research aims to fill this gap identified in the literature review.

---

[9] Darms, 'Radical Archives (Introduction)'.

[10] According to Darms, 'radical archiving' is a term coined within archival scholarship in the context of extreme social and political change within marginalised communities. The author noted that this could often be at odds with institutional collecting and she recommended further discussion to define this term.

[11] 'A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology', Society of American Archivists, 2005, accessed March 4, 2019, https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/p/postcustodial-theory-of-archives.

[12] Encompassing public galleries, libraries, archives and museums.

United States (US) Archival Studies scholar Anne Gilliland[13] noted increasing interest from researchers into the relationships between memory and communities, and records and archives. While this trend can be seen in Aotearoa New Zealand as well, local research has focused largely on the outreach role of institutions *into* communities, or community consultation about collection management processes. Exposition into Māori participation in mainstream community archiving has focused on tangata whenua experience as clients and not on their authority as owners of archival collections.[14]

This research aims to address this information gap by answering the following three key questions:

1. In what ways are community archiving and Māori community archiving the same and in what ways are they different?

2. How does community archive training delivered in Taranaki between 2014 and 2017 align with the demands of caring for whānau taonga archives at home?

3. Are there differences between generations in opinions about sharing whānau archives in the digital realm?

---

[13] Anne J. Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives* (Chicago: American Library Association Editions, 2014), 17.

[14] Belinda Battley, 'Archives as Places, Places as Archives: Doors to Privilege, Places of Connection or Haunted Sarcophagi of Crumbling Skeletons?', *Archival Science* 1 (2019): 1–26; Jared Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum: Archives, Access, and Power', *Archifacts* (April 2015): 17–24; Mark Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea: Ngā Hua o te Whakamamatitanga. The Impacts of Digitised Te Reo Archival Collections* (Victoria University Wellington and The Alexander Turnbull Library, 2016); Sarah Welland, *The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives in New Zealand: A Research Paper* (The Open Polytechnic, 2015); Vicki-Anne Heikell, 'Our Future Lies in the Past: Me Hoki Whakamuri, Kia Ahu Whakamua, Ka Neke', *International Preservation News* 61 (2013), 12–14; Joanna M. A. Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives' (MA Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2010).

Research into these questions focuses on these related hypotheses:

1. Māori community archiving is whānau archiving. It is a collective process characterised by the use of tikanga (cultural protocols) and its focus on caring for collections for the benefit of family relationships.

2. Whānau collections were enhanced by the practical archiving skills that kaitiaki gained in digitisation, oral history recording, digital archiving and taonga conservation.

3. Older generations have views about online sharing that are more conservative than those of younger generations.

The three guiding concepts selected to guide the thematic analysis are whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and taonga. The literal translations provided for these concepts are compared against the meaning that interviewees ascribed to them in relation to Māori community archiving and the definitions established in this study's literature review.[15]

Research into Māori archiving reveals a surfeit of case studies and academic literature on the way memory sector practices have changed over the past three decades in response to moral and legislative expectations[16] for bicultural practice in the cultural heritage sector.[17] This corpus bears an

---

[15] Alan Bryman, *Social Research Methods* (Oxford University Press, 2004): 45.

[16] New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: A Report into Claims Concerning New Zealand Law and Policy Affecting Māori Culture and Identity* (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2011).

[17] See Horwood, 'Worlds Apart'; Arapata Tamati Hakiwai, 'He Mana Taonga, He Mana Tangata: Māori Taonga and the Politics of Māori Tribal Identity and Development' (PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2014); Conal McCarthy, 'Museums and Māori: Heritage Professionals', *Indigenous Collections, Current Practice* (Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2011, https://www.tepapa.govt.nz/sites/default/files/museums_and_maori_sample_pages.pdf; Ana Sciascia, 'Iwi Exhibitions at Te Papa: A Ngāi Tahu Perspective' (MA diss., University of Victoria Wellington, 2012); Conal McCarthy, *Exhibiting Maori: A History of Colonial Cultures*

important relationship to this study for the information it contains about efforts to re-centre Māori authority over taonga owned or held in trust by collecting institutions. While this corpus sits adjacent to devolved models of community archiving, it is significant to this study for two reasons. First, it alleviates the paucity of scholarly literature on the topic of this study. Second, it charts a change in professional attitudes with regard to the nuances of ownership and caretaking of institutionalised cultural heritage that has its roots in source communities.[18] The correlating impetus within communities to restore and uplift the mana (prestige) of their own privately held taonga is unexplored. These two fields are both distinct and interrelated when whānau taonga archives are viewed as distributed collections that sit variously within institutions *and* in private hands. This thesis argues that a clearer understanding of the intersection between private and public collecting through the lens of Māori community archiving can fill the gap in knowledge with regard to what whānau, iwi and hapū need to care for their taonga at home and to seek help from collecting institutions on their own terms.

The findings of this research are relevant to iwi, hapū and whānau seeking strategies for approaching community archiving, as well as to researchers and professionals working with tangata whenua in the fields of record keeping and taonga collection management. The next section distinguishes the nature and contents of Māori community archives from those held in mainstream collections, explaining why they were selected as the focus of this study. It introduces the archiving community of practice[19] that provides

---

of Display (Oxford: Berg. 2007); Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal, *Mātauranga Māori and Museum Practice: A Discussion* (Wellington: National Services Te Paerangi, 2007).
[18] Horwood, 'Worlds Apart', 2.
[19] Ruakere Hond, 'Matua Te Reo, Matua Te Tangata: Speaker Community: Visions, Approaches, Outcomes' (PhD thesis, Massey University, 2013), 31. Hond cited Etienne

the Taranaki community context, framing the discussion and analysis that follows in Chapters 2 and 3. This is followed by a statement positioning this researcher in relation to the study cohort.

Thesis title – explanation

Me titiro hoki

   Ki ngā raranga i makere

   Nā te mea, he kōrero anō kei reira.

We should also look

   At those stitches which have been dropped,

   Because they also have a message.[20]

The title of this thesis draws on the concepts in a whakataukī (significant saying) composed by kaumātua (learned elder) Kūkupa Tirikātene for the City of Manukau Education Trust, COMET. This verse was presented in a discussion paper about intergenerational family learning and it described education as a complex, interconnected tapestry created by many strands and many hands. The resulting metaphorical whāriki (ceremonial mat) that Tirikātene referred to was one outcome; however, the final lines of the full version of this whakatauākī (proverb) challenged the reader to consider what the dropped stitches could reveal as well: 'With its completion let us look at

---

Wenger's (1999) development of the term 'community of practice' in relation to 'situated learning', a concept that he related to language acquisition as knowledge shared and constructed by active practitioners.

[20] Kukupa Tirikātene, cited in *A Tapestry of Understanding: Intergenerational Family Learning*. (City of Manukau Education Trust [COMET] Discussion Paper, 2006), 2. http://www.comet.org.nz/webfiles/CometNZ/webpages/images/43744/Image_A-tapestry-of-understanding-30027.pdf.

the good that comes from it and in time we should also look at those stitches which have been dropped, because they also have a message.'[21]

This thesis applies Tirikātene's image of 'stitches dropped in time' to this study of community archiving in the context of whānau relationships. It positions private family collections as stitches dropped to distinguish them from artefacts and records owned by memory sector institutions such as galleries, libraries, archives and museums. This research argues that whānau archives at home have the potential to do more than merely evoke nostalgic memories of people and past events. These collections contain taonga with an important role to play in the day-to-day lives of whānau; they have the potential to reunite families dispersed through the effects of colonisation and globalisation.[22] The literature review conducted for this thesis suggests that one way this can happen is by placing more digitised material into circulation.[23] This idea is tested against whānau interpretations of access and appropriate use, compared with interpretations identified in other research findings.

---

[21] Tirikātene, cited in *A Tapestry of Understanding*, 2.

[22] Charles Te Ahukaramū Royal. 'Oral History and Hapū Development', in *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, ed. Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005),16.

[23] Hēmi Whaanga et al., 'He Matapihi Mā Mua, Mō Muri: The Ethics, Processes, and Procedures Associated with the Digitization of Indigenous Knowledge—The Pei Jones Collection', *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5–6 (2015): 520–47; Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*; Michaela Anderson, 'An Exploration of the Ethical Implications of the Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori (With Special Reference to the Pei te Hurinui Jones Collection)', MA thesis, University of Waikato, 2012).

Positioning the researcher

This researcher is an insider-outsider, a Pākehā[24] community archivist[25] operating as part of a Māori archiving community of practice in Taranaki. Dwyer and Buckle defined the insider-outsider position not in terms of the dichotomy of its poles, but by 'the space between', which allows researchers to occupy the position of both insider *and* outsider, rather than insider *or* outsider.[26] This view emphasises that the key to representing participant experience is not sitting inside or outside of a research cohort, but an ability to be open, honest, genuinely interested and committed to accurately representing the perspectives of those involved.[27] The in-between space in this study is created by this researcher's position as a non-Māori cultural outsider with whanaungatanga (a sense of family connection) to the interview group through several years of shared archiving experience and a decade of learning te reo Māori together through Taranaki community networks.

This closeness mitigated the distrust and discomfort that Māori feel when approached to participate in tauiwi-led[28] research, a topic that has received considerable scholarly attention.[29] Anne Gilliland addressed this issue in the

---

[24] Non-Māori of European descent: in the case of this researcher, Scottish-Irish descent.

[25] The term 'community archivist' is used here to distinguish this researcher from professional colleagues trained in archival science. The website for the Society of American Archivists defines archival science as 'A systematic body of theory that supports the practice of appraising, acquiring, authenticating, preserving, and providing access to recorded materials'.

[26] Sonya Corbin Dwyer and Jennifer L. Buckle. 'The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 8, no. 1 (2009): 54.

[27] Dwyer and Buckle, 'The Space Between', 59.

[28] Non-Māori, not necessarily of European descent.

[29] Joanna Kidman, 'Comparatively Speaking: Notes on Decolonizing Research', *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives,* 17, no. 4 (2018): 1–10; Alex Hotere-Barnes, 'Generating "Non-stupid Optimism": Addressing Pākehā Paralysis in Māori Educational Research', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 50, no. 1 (2015):

Community Archiving Master Class she ran in Wellington in 2014, with the pertinent question, 'When, if ever, should information, records, memory or cultural professionals intervene on behalf of the preservation of, or access to, materials generated by or held by the community?'[30] There is no single correct answer to this question. In the context of this study, the answer reflects Dwyer and Buckle's theory that intervention is appropriate when the researcher is invited in and is equipped, personally and professionally, to participate with the cultural guidance of kaitiaki (customary guardians) and kaumātua (learned elders) when working with taonga. This thesis examines a unique example of these circumstances aligning. The examples and case studies presented here examine what can happen in the 'space between' when tangata whenua aspirations for their taonga coincide with a willingness to participate and a gap in academic research.

Trust relationships were formed through this researcher's acceptance of Māori protocols and commitment to learning and working in Taranaki reo and tikanga. Soutar has argued that a researcher's competence in te reo determines what access is offered by Māori communities.[31] This was true for this study. Without this researcher's efforts to learn te reo and tikanga as a lynchpin for relationships, the trust required to access and work with this group would not have existed. Adds et al. posited that 'by accepting Māori

39–53; Rachel Selby, 'Partnership and the Protection of Participants: Collecting and Using Māori Oral Histories', in *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, ed. Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005); Nēpia Mahuika, 'New Zealand History Is Maori History: Tikanga as the Ethical Foundation of Historical Scholarship in Aotearoa New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of History* 49, no.1 (2015): 5–30.

30 Anne J. Gilliland, 'Victoria University of Wellington Community-based Archiving Masterclass', unpublished course reference material (2014).

31 Monty Soutar, 'Tribal History in History', in *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, ed. Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005): 8–9.

protocol and abiding by it, white dominance is temporarily subjugated'.[32] This reference relates specifically to the interviews undertaken for this thesis and this researcher's deference to the Māori interviewees' preferred ways of working.[33] This was a means of balancing the dominant role of the interviewer in qualitative inquiry[34] and addressing the 'Pākehā paralysis'[35] that stood to affect the breadth, depth and findings of this cross-cultural research.

Working with traditional knowledge also demands an 'ethics of care' that Boulton and Brannelly[36] argued is integral to participatory methodologies for working with indigenous communities. The concept of 'ethics of care' is based on relational ontology that assumes the researcher and the researched start out as disconnected individuals who go on to form relationships.[37] The duty of care implied here relates to the knowledge being dynamically transmitted and received and the reciprocity that characterises ethical practice in cross-cultural research. University Human Ethics approval for this study was a further safeguard.[38] Collectively, these two standpoints

---

[32] Peter Adds et al., ed., *Reconciliation, Representation and Indigeneity: 'Biculturalism' in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Winter, 2016), 11.

[33] In this case, in person, in te reo Māori and either at home or in marae spaces.

[34] See Selby, 'Partnership and the Protection of Participants'.

[35] Alex Hotere-Barnes, 'Generating "Non-stupid Optimism"', 3. Hotere-Barnes defines 'Pākehā paralysis' as 'the intellectual difficulties that Pākehā can experience when engaging in social, cultural, economic and political relations with Māori'. See also Martin Tolich, 'Pakeha Paralysis: Cultural Safety for Those Researching the General Population of Aotearoa', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (2002):164; Cushla Parekōwhai, 'Kōrero Taku Whāea [sic]: Talk My Aunt: Learning to Listen to Māori Women', in *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, ed. Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005), 40.

[36] Tula Brannelly, Amohia Boulton and Rosalind Edwards, 'The Ethics of Care and Transformational Research Practices in Aotearoa New Zealand', *Qualitative Research* 17, no. 3 (2017): 340–50.

[37] Marian Barnes et al., eds., *Ethics of Care Critical Advances in International Perspective* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2015), 3.

[38] Victoria University of Wellington Human ethics application Approval 0000026116. May 2018.

on positional and methodological ethics combine to safeguard all parties on the research continuum of exchange.[39]

The approach taken for this research draws on Māori-led practices within the public memory sector and a growing acknowledgement within professional practice that records and artefacts need both material and spiritual care, which can be achieved only through active relationships with the communities of origin.[40] Tikao et al.[41] stipulated that kaitiakitanga (duty of care) could come only from those with familial connections to taonga and the mātauranga (knowledge) they embody. Royal described mātauranga as comprising tangible assets (e.g. museum artefacts) and intangible assets (e.g., the Māori language) and distinguished between definitions of mātauranga that are sociological (a body of knowledge) and epistemological (a type or view of knowledge). He argued that confusion between these distinctions arose from differences between philosophy and practice.[42]

This research encompasses both of these definitions of mātauranga. The mātauranga held and shared by interview participants is classed as sociological knowledge, as distinct from the epistemological views expressed in this research in discussions about the practice of community archiving and conclusions drawn through thematic analysis of oral history interviews.

---

[39] See Parekōwhai, 'Kōrero Taku Whaea'; Hotere-Barnes, 'Generating "Non-stupid Optimism"'.

[40] Battley, 'Archives as Places'; Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*; Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum'; Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives'; Heikell, 'Our Future Lies in the Past'; Honiana Love and Claire Hall, 'Ka Puta, Ka Ora: Digital Archiving and the Revitalisation of Taranaki Reo*', Archifacts* (October 2011 to April 2012).

[41] Ariana Tikao, Honiana Love and Claire Hall, '*Whakahoki Ki te Kāinga: The Long (Digital) Road Home for Taranaki's Atkinson Letters*', filmed November 2017 at the National Digital Forum Symposium, Te Papa, Wellington, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kSyU5SXjs0c.

[42] Royal, *Mātauranga Māori,* 50.

Thesis structure

This section locates the researcher as a Pākehā insider-outsider[43] conducting

a qualitative study within a group of Taranaki community archivists united

through a shared interest in caring for their family archives. The researcher

position statement is followed by a review of published scholarly literature on

topics relevant to this research: community archiving, oral history

methodology and record keeping, and archiving for indigenous knowledge

management. This review began broadly, narrowing into Māori scholarship

generally and Taranaki Māori scholarship specifically. The literature surveyed

for this research includes academic journals, books, conference papers,

blogs and reviews within the scholarly fields of oral history, community

archiving, indigenous archiving and records management.

Oral history interview findings are presented thematically, organised by

emergent topics and sub-topics and presented as quotes, to distinguish

between researcher and participant voices. Discussion and analysis is

organised around the three concepts selected for thematic analysis, a

presentation format that is maintained throughout this thesis.

Chapter 2 examines the concept of Māori archiving from the perspective of

the cross-generational interview cohort from Taranaki involved in caring for

their family's archival collections between 2014 and 2017. It argues the case

for whānau archiving as the most appropriate label for the scope and nature

of this work and the relationships the interviewees formed with one another

and their families through this period. Chapter 3 narrows the discussion to

focus on the findings of three case studies of community archiving drawn

---

[43] Dwyer and Buckle, 'The Space Between', 59.

from a selection of the examples introduced in Chapter 2. Chapter 4 concludes the discussion and analysis with this researcher's answers to the main research questions and interviewee conclusions about sharing as a defining concept for Māori archiving, presented through a filter of whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and taonga.

Literature review

The literature surveyed in this research focused on Māori and Māori-led research on oral history, Māori archiving and digital libraries, and studies on traditional knowledge management. While Māori oral history was well represented in this review, there was a limited pool of published, scholarly research on Māori community archiving theory or practice from a whānau perspective, or its significance as a tool in community archiving. Therefore, the literature review was extended to include Aotearoa-based studies with reference to Māori archiving in a community context. This broadened the field to include non-Māori scholars discussing the concept of iwi or community archives as part of mainstream studies,[44] or discussing Māori archives in the context of user engagement and outreach.[45]

A review of the academic literature placed this research in the contexts of indigenous community archiving and indigenous knowledge management. Locally focused scholarship located it within the contexts of the Aotearoa community and the memory sector. This literature review drew on research from practitioners considering the implications of supporting flax-roots efforts to care for whānau archives. While drawing heavily on memory sector

---

[44] Battley, 'Archives as Places'; Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives'; Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives'.

[45] See Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*.

contexts, the issues these studies revealed have been extrapolated for community contexts. The common ground here is a shared standpoint of Māori cultural heritage as taonga and a contemporary reframing of taonga tuku iho (treasures handed down between generations) to encompass digital media. This reflects the current era of prolific digitisation and virtual repatriation of taonga to their communities of origin. Writing about a case study within Te Aitanga a Hauiti's *Te Ataakura* project to revitalise knowledge of iwi taonga, Ngata et al. posited:

Māori have become increasingly aware of the potential of digital technologies not only to record and archive taonga handed down from ancestors, but to serve as elements of, and vehicles for, contemporary cultural expression in their own right … digital technologies provide the media through which a large and increasing proportion of present-day Māori cultural life unfolds.[46]

More research on Māori community archiving is required to identify the ways that whānau – as distinct from iwi – value and manage home-based archives. Tangible cultural artefacts were included in this research by virtue of the fact that they existed in private whānau collections. Particular emphasis was placed on understanding the nature of digital and digitised whānau archival records and the way they represented intangible Māori cultural heritage. This lens was appropriate for this study as it allowed the collective Māori community to be understood within the construct of indigeneity without necessarily meaning a *national* indigenous identity. Hond[47] described whānau

---

[46] Wayne Ngata., Hera Ngata-Gibson and Amiria Salmond, 'Te Ataakura: Digital Taonga and Cultural Innovation', *Journal of Material Culture* 17, no. 3 (2012): 231.

[47] Christen, 'Tribal Archives, Traditional Knowledge', 43.

as a designation that refers to localised identity: in this case, a community of Māori archivists grounded in Taranaki-specific language and knowledge systems.

Issues of particular significance to this investigation of Māori community archiving emerged from the literature review. First, there was no single, definitive interpretation for Māori oral history or Māori community archiving. This research aimed to explain these concepts in the context of this study, an aim that is revisited in Chapter 4. The impacts of 'converging'[48] technologies and memory sector disciplines on oral history methodologies for tangata whenua-led community research were also considered. Oral history interviewing adhered to the code of ethics that some of this study's interview cohort drafted for use within their own families and wider social groups. While there were no scholarly references for this code nor the methodologies it promoted, this researcher judged it appropriate for this research, as it used a capture process for one-on-one interviews with which the participants were familiar and comfortable. The differences between this code and its mainstream equivalent are explained in the next section and source documentation is included in Appendix B.

Oral history

This research refers to oral history in the following three ways: 1) as a methodology for recording qualitative research interviews; 2) as an archival collection item (e.g. a recorded interview with a family member); and 3) as a means of generating contextual information about archival collection items to

---

[48] Anderson, 'Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori', 38. Anderson defined digital convergence as 'the blurring of distinctions between archives, libraries, museums and other memory institutions in the virtual realm … from a user's perspective'.

augment record-keeping metadata. Each aspect is considered in the analysis and discussion, with conclusions about their interconnectedness drawn in Chapter 4.

Semi-structured oral history interviewing was deemed an appropriate qualitative methodology for gathering data for thematic analysis in this study. Oral history was not a novel concept for this group of research participants. All interviewees had some understanding and experience of oral history, either through theoretical training as a part of wānanga for community archiving or as interviewers, interviewees and transcribers of whānau history. It is significant that this cohort was already familiar with oral history theory and methods through personal experience; they had reviewed and amended the *New Zealand National Oral History Association (NOHANZ)* code of technical and ethical practice[49] for recording interviews with whānau subjects. The results of their work were a revised code of ethical and technical practice for Māori oral history and an amended recording agreement form. These documents were the framework for the Māori oral history tikanga (conventions) and tukanga (methods) applied for this research. The key difference between these documents and the NOHANZ code of practice is the use of Māori language and ideologies such as mātauranga, aroha, tika, pono, manaakitanga, whakawhanaungatanga, tino rangatiratanga and mana whenua.[50] This alternative code emphasises the concept of kaitiakitanga and an interviewee's right to maintain ownership of the knowledge they share in interviews.

---

[49] 'Code of Ethical and Technical Practice', National Oral History Association New Zealand (NOHANZ) website, accessed May 18, 2019, http://www.oralhistory.org.nz/index.php/ethics-and-practice.

[50] Definitions for each of these terms are included in the Glossary.

The interviewees' familiarity with this Māori-centred process smoothed the initial approach to participation in this research, as trust in both the proposed methodology and this researcher's competence was already established. The interviewees' previous experiences with oral history methods also created opportunities for focused questioning around the intersection of tribal history and oral history, as well as ways of navigating the contested spaces around future access and use. This space was described by Millar, with reference to indigenous Canadian tribal history, as the 'social life that transcribed texts [of oral narratives] gain in the communities where they originate and continue to be told'.[51] While Millar's description referred specifically to the difference between oral and written accounts, it could equally apply to digital recordings, which have the potential to take on a life of their own because of the ease of copying and sharing. For this research, the interviewees were comfortable with this interviewer quoting their interviews in written form but less comfortable with the idea of their recordings being shared or circulated. All but one asked for a copy of their recordings and transcripts; none wanted their interviews archived for future access.

Two distinct periods of Aotearoa oral history literature were surveyed. The first period peaked in 2005 and was captured in the seminal text *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, edited by Rachel Selby and Alison Laurie.[52] Although some of the articles in this text have been in print for more than two decades, this compilation of Māori rangatira (tribal leaders), wāhine toa (learned women), thought leaders and historians from Aotearoa's bi-culture

---

[51] Bruce Granville Miller, *Oral History on Trial: Recognizing Aboriginal Narratives in the Courts* (Vancouver: UBC, 2011), 67.

[52] Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie, eds., *Māori and Oral History: A Collection* (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005).

of oral history remains relevant in 2019. An update of this volume, in this era of rapid digital convergence, is missing in the academic space. Anderson defined convergence as 'the blurring of distinctions between archives, libraries, museums and other memory institutions in the virtual realm from a user's perspective'.[53]

This gap was filled in part by the 2018 publication, *Te Whare Hangarau: Māori Language, Culture and Technology,* a compendium of examples and case studies from a range of digitisation, repatriation and digital-archiving projects underway in this country within the memory sector and communities.[54] While not specifically about oral history, it tackled some of the complex issues of technological and information convergence across the memory sector, as well as the emerging effects of this on Māori language and culture. Most notably, it did this mainly from the perspective of Māori scholars and sector and community practitioners, many of whom weave oral and tribal history into their essays.

This current research positioned the Selby and Laurie[55] edition in the pre-convergence, pre-digital era of oral history. Its references to analogue capture and overarching (rather than specific) mentions of the internet and information age were notable. While these essays were influential in the design and deployment of this researcher's interviews, a significant difference must be noted: most of Selby and Laurie's contributors presented case studies of oral history done *by* Māori *for* Māori. In contrast, this

---

[53] Anderson, 'Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori', 38.

[54] Hēmi Whaanga, Te Taka Adrian Gregory Keegan, Mark Apperley, and University of Waikato, Issuing Body. et al., eds., *He Whare Hangarau: Māori Language, Culture & Technology* (Hamilton: University of Waikato, 2017).

[55] Selby and Laurie, *Māori and Oral History*.

researcher was a Pākehā recording Māori for academic purposes, a trend that Denzin, Lincoln and Smith (citing the educational research of Russell Bishop) have characterised as 'a tradition of research into Māori people's lives that addresses concerns and interests of the ... non-Māori researchers' own making'.[56]

This was an irresolvable aspect of this research and could be considered a limiting factor in the research findings. This division was arguably mitigated by the trust relationships this researcher had formed with the interview cohort prior to undertaking the oral history interviews, without which this research would not have gone ahead.

A scan of the academic literature related to oral history in Aotearoa revealed a defining issue for working with Māori stories: the intersection between oral history as a qualitative research method and customary and contemporary definitions of tribal history. This refers to Nēpia Mahuika's assertion that New Zealand history *is* Māori history and his argument in favour of challenging Pākehā-centric history through the telling of localised, Māori-led stories.[57] Mahuika argued that Māori history should be more accessible in schools and the public domain, 'closing the gaps' between Māori oral narratives and mainstream historical accounts.[58] Royal pointed out that the idea of an oral culture often competes with the notion of a literate culture when in reality, the two are not mutually exclusive, nor is one inferior to the other:

---

[56] Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds., *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2008), 3.

[57] Nēpia Mahuika, 'New Zealand History Is Māori History: Tikanga as the Ethical Foundation of Historical Scholarship in Aotearoa New Zealand'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 49 (2015): 5–30.

[58] Nēpia Mahuika, 'Closing the Gaps: From Postcolonialism to Kaupapa Maori and Beyond'. *The New Zealand Journal of History* 45 (2011): 15–32.

The problem with this idea is the assumption that memory is only concerned

with storing of quantities of knowledge (particularly of past events) and

that memory can be separated from that part of us that is concerned

with forming understandings, analysing, communicating, and so on.[59]

This thesis hypothesises that both written and oral records are significant memory-makers in Māori community archiving. It responded to the research challenge posed by Mahuika[60] by working with a research cohort that was willing to share their unique local histories through the medium of oral history interviewing.

Community archiving

In 2007, United Kingdom (UK)-based archival studies scholar Andrew Flinn defined community archiving as a movement with origins in 'the grass-roots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, ownership and control of the project is essential'.[61] Dating back to 17th-century antiquarianism, community archiving gained prominence in the UK in the 1970s and 1980s, when the public history movement shifted focus onto 'what is being said rather than the focus on who is saying it'.[62]

---

[59] Charles Te Ahukaramū Royal, 'Some Notes on Oral and Indigenous Thought and Knowledge', in *Māori and Oral History: A Collection,* ed. Rachael Selby and Alison Laurie (Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005), 45.

[60] Mahuika, 'New Zealand History Is Māori History'.

[61] Flinn, 'Community Histories',153.

[62] Flinn, 'Community Histories', 155.

A generation later, US scholar Anne Gilliland[63] noted increasing interest from researchers in the relationships between memory and communities, and records and archives.[64] This reflected a relatively recent shift in focus to the way 'multicultural, pluralistic and increasingly interconnected communities [are] writing their own history and constructing their collective meaning'.[65] Gilliland argued that plurality is a critical variable in archival and record-keeping studies. When situated in research these concepts may better 'explicate and account for … theoretical and applied archival research across the globe'.[66]

In Aotearoa New Zealand, research into this phenomenon has focused on institutional engagement with communities of origin or client consultation in collection management processes. Welland[67] drew on Newman's description for the following working definition for community archives:

Community archives are collections of archival records that originate in a community – that is, a group of people who live in the same location or share other forms of community of interest – and whose collection, maintenance and use involves active participation of that community.[68]

This indicated that definitions for community archiving in this country had not changed in the five years since Newman's work and they still contained no

[63] Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives,* 33. Gilliland made a point of locating herself in a United States archival tradition, stating that her overview for this book 'must inevitably be written from the perspective and with the assumptions of the tradition(s) in which an author is most deeply versed'.

[64] Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives,* 17.

[65] Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives,* 17.

[66] Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives,* 33.

[67] Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives'.

[68] Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives', 8–9.

reference to tangata whenua or notions of indigeneity. In contrast, this thesis focused on whānau experiences of managing their own archives at home and the intersection between tikanga (customary practice) and archival science in caretaking decisions. Rather than growing out of democratising social movements, as in the UK and America, community archiving in New Zealand derives from community relationships with Government and local government records, within a settler-colonial historical context.[69] This current research extended Mahuika's argument that Māori oral history and community archiving can create opportunities for flax-roots communities to 'close the gaps' and alleviate the negative stereotypes of Māori perpetuated by the mainstream historical record.[70]

Māori archiving in digital domains

This section reviews selected literature for evidence of the way 20 years of digitisation in public memory institutions[71] has intersected with the practice of community archiving and whether the impact findings have been consistent or different for institutional and flax-roots efforts. Readings were selected for their relevance to knowledge management in digital domains and concepts of mana raraunga (digital data sovereignty, DDS). This literature review considered the way these fields applied in Māori community contexts.

The review identified gaps in academic research on the digital archiving of whānau records outside of public institutions and social networking sites (SNS). Therefore, this research focused on the way access and use

---

[69] Battley, 'Archives as Places'; Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives'; Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives'.
[70] Mahuika, 'Closing the Gaps', 18.
[71] Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*.

stipulations are applied to whānau archives and whether international models for indigenous knowledge management are relevant in Aotearoa New Zealand contexts. This research alleviated the dearth of literature on Māori community digital-archiving methods by drawing on an international model geared towards indigenous knowledge management. Mukurtu is an open-source content management system that derives its name from the Warumangu Australian Aboriginal word for 'safe keeping place'. It is a grass-roots project developed in conjunction with indigenous communities and it is designed to protect and share traditional knowledge in culturally relevant and ethically minded ways.[72]

In their publication *Te Whare Hangarau: Māori Language, Culture* and *Technology,*[73] Whaanga et al. included case studies on the way this platform has been used for Māori archiving in Taranaki. An analysis of those case studies revealed a proliferation of Māori archival sources being published in the virtual realm. This enthusiasm for digital sharing has been tempered by calls for provisos around access to sensitive cultural material: the study *Kōrero Kitea*[74] is a case in point. In that publication, strong survey responses in support of digitisation for the transfer of Māori language sources were counterbalanced by calls to make users and researchers aware of the difference between access and usage, and rules of engagement stipulated by kaitiaki (customary owners).[75]

---

[72] Claire Hall, 'Mukurtu for Mātauranga Māori: A Case Study in Indigenous Knowledge Archiving for Reo and Tikanga Revitalisation', in Whaanga et al., *He Whare Hangarau*, 186.

[73] Whaanga et al., *He Whare Hangarau.*

[74] Crookston et al.*, Kōrero Kitea*.

[75] Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*, 7.

Digitisation and online sharing can be powerful tools in the preservation and sharing of community archives. There is strong evidence of whānau using no-cost SNS, such as Facebook, as a channel for the distribution of digitised and intangible cultural heritage. Research into this phenomenon by O'Carroll [76] and Reihana [77] found very open attitudes towards the sharing of whakapapa (ancestral links) data within private SNS groups. Crookston et al.'s [78] research into the impacts of digitised Māori language collections on key Government strategies revealed similar attitudes towards digitised Māori material in the public domain. In Crookston et al.'s research, 93 per cent of the respondents thought the digitised medium was appropriate for transferring te reo and mātauranga Māori. The same percentage of respondents agreed that digitisation could help improve engagement with mātauranga Māori in this country, with over 80 per cent of respondents indicating they thought more collections should be fully digitised. The study noted the 'complicated set of obligations and drivers' in non-Western views of appropriate use for cultural heritage, an area they identified as needing wider research. [79]

O'Carroll's [80] research identified the existence of 'virtual marae', while Reihana asserted the existence of 'Ngāti Pukamata' (tribal Facebook). [81] Both of these studies focused on the SNS space and stopped short of asking whether whānau distinguished between organised digital archiving and social

---

[76] Acushla Deanne O'Carroll, 'Māori Identity Construction in SNS'. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* 6, no. 2 (2013): 2–16.

[77] Pikihuia Reihana, '"Ngāti Pukamata" Virtual Iwi: Using Facebook to Manage Whakapapa: A Case Study' (MA Case Study, Victoria University of Wellington, 2014).

[78] Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*.

[79] Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea*, 7.

[80] O'Carroll, 'Māori Identity Construction'.

[81] Pikihuia Reihana, 'Ngāti Pukamata'.

media options, and whether – if available – other digital-archiving options would be used as an alternative to SNS. These studies indicated that the divide between public and private could be diminished more easily in a digital sharing environment.

One notable advantage that was found with regard to the proliferation of choices for digital archiving was that communities had unprecedented access to digitised research collections and opportunities to add their own metadata and access conditions for sharing in private or public domains.

In her thesis discussing the digitisation of the Pei Te Hurinui Jones Collection, Anderson[82] considered the way digitisation affects access to Māori archives. She identified three broad thematic categories relevant to this process: kaitiakitanga, contextualisation of information, and content development with control via layered access. These findings were consistent with international evidence that technology gives indigenous archivists the opportunity to create their own cultural narratives in the digital world. However, as Christen posited, what are the implications if the information does not want to be free? [83] This question directly related to tangata whenua knowledge and the way the digitisation of records related to the authority – or lack of authority – that communities had to dictate conditions for sharing and access. *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei,* the Wai 262 report on New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity, found that claimants objected to their mātauranga in repositories being open to anyone without the requirement of prior kaitiaki consent. It raised particular concerns from source communities about

---

[82] Anderson, 'Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori'.

[83] Kimberly Christen, 'Does Information Really Want to Be Free? Indigenous Knowledge Systems and the Question of Openness', *International Journal of Communication* (2012): 2870.

sensitive material, with some respondents suggesting that Government-held documents containing their mātauranga should be returned to them.[84]

Anderson and Christen[85] argued that open sharing and creative commons licensing that focuses on circulating information in the public domain is at odds with indigenous knowledge management principles. Rather than being solely concerned with the possibility of licensing works, such as through a country's copyright or intellectual property legislation, they argued that traditional knowledge is culturally specific and derives meaning and use applications from the local contexts in which this knowledge is created and sustained. They developed a system of licences and labels delivered through digital platforms and aimed at the complex intellectual property needs of indigenous communities. This system is operational within the memory sector and tribal community archive networks in the US and Australia.[86] It is embedded within the Mukurtu content management system designed for tribal community archives.[87] Its relevance for Māori community archiving contexts was tested in this research.

The locally focused scholarship selected for this literature review located this thesis within community and memory sector contexts, where much scope exists for more research into whānau experiences of community archiving and the adaptation of practice for Māori contexts.

---

[84] New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei,* 527.

[85] Jane Anderson and Kimberly Christen, 'Chuck a Copyright on It: Dilemmas of Digital Return and the Possibilities for Traditional Knowledge Licenses and Labels', *Museum Anthropology Review* 7, no. 1–2 (2013): 105.

[86] New South Wales (NSW) Libraries have collaborated with Mukurtu at Washington State University to establish the NSW Australian Mukurtu Hub for Aboriginal people and communities. See https://mukurtu-australia-nsw.libraries.wsu.edu/who-we-are, accessed May 18, 2019.

[87] Hall, 'Mukurtu for Mātauranga Māori'.

Key concepts

Three guiding concepts created a framework for oral history research and thematic analysis in this research: whanaungatanga (literal translation: relationship, kinship), kaitiakitanga (guardianship, stewardship) and taonga (treasure, socially or culturally valuable object). Their meaning in relation to Māori community archiving is explored in this section through a review of the current literature. The hypothesis that these concepts are relevant to Māori community archiving was tested through semi-structured interviewing, which is discussed more fully later in this document. Similarities and differences between scholarly and community definitions for the concepts are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, with conclusions drawn in Chapter 4.

These concepts were selected for their predominance in academic literature related to caring for tangible (material) and intangible (ephemeral or spiritual) artefacts, and in Māori records. Boulton and Brannelly posited that core Māori values inform an ethic of care that reflects 'deep and abiding' indigenous connection to physical and spiritual realms.[88] This position was echoed by Royal, who posited that the notion of a world fully alive is the most remarkable aspect of an indigenous world view.[89] As well as providing an ao Māori (Māori world view) lens for thematic analysis, these values provided a means of engaging with interviewees on the topic of whānau care ethics without imposing non-Western interpretations over their intended meaning.

---

[88] Boulton et al., 'The Ethics of Care', 4.

[89] Royal, 'Mātauranga Māori', 1.

In defining and discussing these concepts and their relationships to community archiving, O'Carroll[90] observed that definitions related to cultural values appeared to be expanding in their sphere of application to include virtual spaces. Hond similarly noted that the contemporary definition of whānau had expanded to include relationships forged through shared kaupapa (issues, initiatives), whereas previously it implied whakapapa relationships alone.[91] The notion of these values as being dynamic and evolving was carried into the oral history interviewing for this research. The interviewees' perspectives on the way these terms applied to community archiving augmented the following literature review relating to these concepts, creating new definitions and insights into how customary Māori knowledge principles could apply in the context of present-day Māori community archiving.

Kaitiakitanga

To understand the role of the kaitiaki, one has to understand the intricacies of Māori society.[92] In the context of this research, kaitiakitanga refers to inherited or ascribed caring responsibilities for family collections or specific collection items. Kaitiakitanga describes a role that can only be carried out by those with whakapapa relationships to tangible and intangible taonga and mātauranga. The adjacent term kaipupuri (holder or keeper) distinguishes

---

[90] Acushla Dee O'Carroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi – a Thing of the Past? An Examination of Māori Use of Social Networking Sites and the Implications for Māori Culture and Society' (PhD thesis, Massey University, 2013), 23.

[91] Hond, 'Matua Te Reo', 41.

[92] Boulton, 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values', 9.

between those with customary responsibility for taonga and those with rights of possession, such as public memory institutions.[93]

Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: A Report into Claims Concerning New Zealand Law and Policy Affecting Māori Culture and Identity defined kaitiakitanga as focusing on the obligations and relationships that arise from kinship.[94] Boulton and Brannelly[95] noted the grammatical and practical nuance in the term 'kaitiaki': used as a verb, it denotes caring concepts such as guard and protect; as a noun, it refers to a guardian or steward. Royal explained that kaitiakitanga is a waka (vehicle) for understanding 'relationships between different parts of the web … or fabric of life'.[96]

This intersection of meanings is critical within this research. It speaks to kaitiakitanga as being a powerful driver for intergenerational connection and it refers to the complex web of interactions that drive kaitiaki decisions in the virtual realm. This research assumed that whānau kaitiaki of Māori archives are naturally placed to understand the nuances of their own iwi, whānau and hapū situation. This is where kaitiaki decisions stand to clash with, or override, the conventions of archival science and its commitment to rules of practice. Royal's definitions demonstrated that the traditional definitions of kaitiakitanga remain relevant for Māori community archiving because of the traditional notions it maintains at this time of cultural and environmental renewal for iwi.

---

93 Tikao et al., 'Whakahoki Ki te Kāinga'.
94 New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei.*
95 Boulton, 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values', 8.
96 Royal, Mātauranga Māori, 36.

While written more than a decade ago, Royal's observation remains relevant today in the context of caring for whānau archives at home, as well as in the virtual realm. Stephenson and Callaghan's[97] writing on the topic of digitisation and mātauranga Māori in relation to the New Zealand Electronic Text Centre projects sits adjacent to Royal's research on kaitiakitanga. The pair posed questions about whether institutional methods of consultation and access over the digitisation of mātauranga Māori are acting as a barrier to more Māori material being digitised. They offered a useful explanation for the relationship between the concepts of ownership, kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga (sovereignty) and the way these notions reveal the 'non-trivial differences'[98] between Māori and non-Māori attitudes towards the process of digitisation. They defined rangatiratanga as the closest approximation to the Western concept of ownership, albeit distinguished by ideas of shared control and collective sovereignty. This is relevant to notions of kaitiakitanga (meaning guardianship or preservation), as the two are interconnected because:

> In the cultural heritage context there is a sense that although direct ownership of Māori-generated information may have passed from Māori sources to Pākehā collectors, it still belongs to those sources and that the source community collectively retains a responsibility to respect the mana, wairua and tapu of the knowledge and protect it from misuse.[99]

---

[97] Alison Stevens and Samantha Callaghan, 'Digitisation and Mātauranga Maori', 3. Conference details unknown, 2008. Wellington: New Zealand Electronic Text Centre, accessed May 19, 2019, https://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/608/paper.pdf?sequence=1.

[98] Stevenson and Callahan, 'Digitisation and Mātauranga Māori', 3.

[99] Stevenson and Callahan, 'Digitisation and Mātauranga Māori', 3.

This definition is significant for the way it links several key concepts related to kaitiakitanga and the contested notion of ownership in relation to the information in archival records. A number of these concepts arose in the oral history interviews in this research, as well as in relation to digitisation and the archival handling for community archiving contexts.

Whanaungatanga

Taonga conservator Vicki-Anne Heikell[100] argued that whanaungatanga is the most important outcome of efforts to preserve Māori cultural heritage and engage families with it. She noted the sense of collective and shared purpose that comes from caring for taonga, describing it as a marker of the interconnectedness and relationships that exist between taonga and people.

Heikell's view was echoed by the range of Māori scholars reviewed for this research, with regard to describing relationships with taonga and between iwi, hapū, whānau and communities. Boulton and Brannelly[101] posited that the significance of whanaungatanga is best considered in light of the way Māori were able to survive 'when beset by colonisation, war and disease' through an understanding of their own genealogical connections. Hond and O'Carroll[102] provided Taranaki-specific contexts for whanaungatanga from two different perspectives. In his research,[103] Hond placed whanaungatanga as a powerful descriptor for relationships within families and communities, noting that the term now extends beyond whakapapa connections to describe groups joined through shared interests, beliefs and aspirations. He applied

---

[100] Heikell, 'Our Future Lies in the Past', 12.

[101] Boulton, 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values', 2.

[102] O'Carroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi', 13.

[103] Hond, 'Matua te Reo', 42.

this term in the context of language revitalisation, arguing that whanaungatanga exists within communities of practice, contributing to the sharing and construction of knowledge. Whakawhanaungatanga therefore is the 'process of establishing relationships in a Māori context, an important cultural reference point for Māori organisations and community groups'.[104]

This current research extended this argument into the realm of Māori community archiving and examined the way relationships between and within whānau and community archivists are influenced through the construction of archival knowledge. In doing this, it drew on the research of O'Carroll, which shifted the concept of whanaungatanga into the virtual realm and considered the differences between the creation and maintenance in online spaces compared with being kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face on the marae). She argued, 'whanaungatanga appears to be expanding in its sphere of application to include virtual spaces in ways that may influence the dynamics, relevance and impacts of its practice'.[105]

Davidson's[106] definition of taonga in relation to institutional archiving was noteworthy in the context of this research. Drawing from Whatarangi Winiata's work on a 'kaupapa-tikanga' framework for organising Te Wānanga o Raukawa library services, Davidson endeavoured to create a system for reflecting a Māori world view in the way mainstream archives handle and qualify interactions with Māori clients. Whanaungatanga was defined in this

[104] Hond, 'Matua te Reo', 42.
[105] O'Caroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi', 23.
[106] Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum'.

case as an example of tikanga vested in 'maintaining contact with rōpū tuku iho (whānau, hapū and iwi) in the region'.[107]

This current thesis predicted that these definitions from the literature would be relevant in an analysis of the role of whanaungatanga in Māori community archiving in Taranaki. It compared evidence through discussion and analysis and drew conclusions about the outcomes for the families of origin and the taonga archives in their care.

Taonga

This research extended the notions of taonga that have been attributed to Tirikātene[108] and Tapsell to tangible (artefacts) and intangible (data) whānau archives. Tapsell described taonga as any item, object or thing that represents a Māori kin group's ancestral identity with their particular land and resources.[109]

Taonga can be divided into (at least) two distinct, yet interrelated, groups. The first represents those that are tangible, describing (in museum terms) physical or material artefacts. The second category relevant to this research is intangible taonga: those that cannot necessarily be seen or held but represent Māori world views and traditions, such as reo (language) and tikanga (cultural and ritual traditions). These definitions were important in this research as they distinguish between tangible and intangible taonga and simplistic technical categories of hard and soft data.

---

[107] Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum', 23.

[108] Tirikātene, 'A Tapestry of Understanding', 3.

[109] Paul Tapsell, 'The Flight of Parerautututu: An Investigation of Taonga from a Tribal Perspective', *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 106, no. 4 (1997): 339.

Tapsell elaborated on the concepts as follows:

Taonga can be tangible, like a greenstone pendant, a geothermal hot pool, or

a meeting house, or they can be intangible, like the knowledge to

weave, to recite genealogy, or even the briefest of proverbs. As

taonga are passed down through the generations they become more

valuable as the number of descendants increase over time.[110]

This current thesis argues that the whānau archival collections are more than just fragments of memory. They contain taonga artefacts and records that possess qualities related to mana (prestige, authority), tapu (restricted or sensitive material) and kōrero (stories). Tapsell argued that adding context such as tribally ordered narratives to taonga served to make them 'inalienable' and at less risk of being lost or separated from descendants. This security made more taonga available to be part of the lives of whānau, hapū and iwi. This premise underlies this researcher's arguments about the value of Māori community archiving and its links with identity-based community development.

This research extended Tapsell's theories of taonga into the domestic realm and examined them in the context of Māori community archiving. Semi-structured oral history interviewing was used to elicit data on the way archival caretaking, such as story and metadata creation, creates, in Tapsell's analogy of taonga as a soaring comet, a metaphorical 'tail'. According to Tapsell, this represents the tendency of taonga to appear and

---

[110] Tapsell, 'The Flight of Pareraututu', 339.

disappear from view across generations, with new meanings created each time they return to view.

Traced collectively or individually, the image of multiple threads appearing, disappearing and reappearing resonates in the context of Māori community archiving. This thesis explores the domestic realm as a destination for taonga situated within whānau archives. It does not argue for opening these collections up to public scrutiny, nor for testing them against non-whānau definitions of authenticity. Rather, this researcher argues that their value is intrinsic in the fact that they have come to rest under whānau kaitiakitanga. Their authenticity and value as taonga is, therefore, only for whānau to ascribe.

Methodology

This research was located within an oral history paradigm, taking a qualitative approach to interviewing and analysis. It investigated the social phenomena of community archiving from a whānau perspective. It was located within a community of practice coming together to learn and share their experiences and aspirations for their inherited taonga archives. Oral history interviewing allowed for close personal interaction, as expected in relationships established according to the values of kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face communication), manaakitanga (generosity, support) and whanaungatanga (sense of family connection).[111]

According to Denzin, Lincoln and Smith, qualitative research in many, if not all, of its forms is a metaphor for colonial power. 'The metaphor works this

---

[111] O'Carroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi', 81–2.

way: Research, quantitative and qualitative, is scientific. Research provides the foundation for reports about and representations of the other.'[112]

Smith and Jackson[113] noted the inherent difficulty in balancing academic research purposes with the need to engage meaningfully engage with the communities being studied. They described this tension as the dual-centred role of community-focused researchers, a position that brings ethical and methodological considerations to bear on its research impacts. This, along with similar scholarly views, informed the methodological approach adopted for this research and analysis. These views suggested ways to ensure that the research remained 'ethical, performative, healing, transformative, decolonizing, and participatory'.[114]

This thesis presents oral history interviewing and thematic analysis as appropriate methodologies for gathering and examining data from Māori participants. Thematic, semi-structured techniques were used in interviews, with the interviewees asked to recall and reflect on experiences of training and practising as whānau archivists in Taranaki over a three-year period between 2014 and 2017. Bryman[115] posited that this style of social research bears some resemblance to a focused interview, which asks mainly open questions about a situation or event of interest to the interviewees or the researcher. In the context of this research with Māori interviewees, the interviews were as open and flexible as possible while serving the purpose of

---

[112] Denzin et al., *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies,* 12.

[113] Claire Smith and Gary Jackson, 'Decolonizing Indigenous Archaeology: Developments from Down Under'. *American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3/4 (2006): 311.

[114] O'Carroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi', 81–2.

 Denzin et al., *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies,* 5.

[115] Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, 113.

garnering sufficient evidentiary data to answer the research questions outlined earlier in this chapter.

Semi-structured oral history questions were used to elicit detailed and practical examples of archival practice and to generate sufficient data to write case studies detailing the outcomes and impacts of this Taranaki community archiving initiative. This created space for the varied perspectives of the interviewees and the local historical contexts of this research to feature. Bryman wrote that often, what an exemplifying case study has to reveal may only become apparent after the case study has been carried out and 'it may be at a very late stage that the singularity and significance of a case becomes apparent'.[116]

Previously, the community archiving projects that were canvassed for this research have been assessed only to judge the academic outcomes for the students involved and not for their deeper significance and impacts. The interviews were conducted individually and the connections between participants and their collections were made by encouraging interviewees to share stories about their taonga and the memories they conveyed. This created connections to archival taonga within this research and allowed unique and varied perspectives to be revealed in the interviews. Whānau support people were welcome to attend and in many cases, children and other family members came and went throughout the recording sessions. Everyday life carried on around the recordings, which created a sense of ease and familiarity throughout the interviews. Open-ended questions elicited the perspectives, motivations and outcomes for community archiving and

---

[116] Bryman, *Social Research Methods,* 49.

linked motivations with outcomes and plans for future work. Questions around perspectives on sharing and access were designed to elicit generational perspectives on how archival collections should be stored and with whom they should be shared. Three generations were canvassed and a one-on-one interview format was favoured over group sessions, to guard against the tendency this researcher has observed in intergenerational interviews for younger generations to defer to their elders for fear of contradicting them.

The interviews were predominantly thematic, with a life history component included in the form of a pepeha (tribal saying) recorded with each interviewee and each session open and closed with karakia (ritual chant). This reflected oral history interviewing methods already established within the participant group, all of whom had experienced this practice through community wānanga and their own archiving projects. Participants were invited to opt in to this research, with an initial telephone approach followed by a preliminary interview and then a face-to-face recording session.

Citing Cram and Kennedy, Hond's thesis defined a set of values related to whānau research.[117] These values, and this study's responses to them, are detailed in the next sections.

Respect people within the accepted protocol

This research was based on whanaungatanga relationships that this researcher shared with the participant group through relationships forged in common areas of interest, namely community language revitalisation and

---

[117] Hond, 'Matua te Reo', 182.

community archiving. As such, the protocols and ethics for both interviewing and archival practice were an established part of our shared history and experience.

Face-to-face relationships

The relationships were established through face-to-face contact and the interviews were conducted in person. Face-to-face meetings will also be used for the eventual discussion and delivery of the research findings, with a shared meal scheduled to mark the end of this research project.

Emphasis on looking and listening

Semi-structured interviewing emphasises the importance of an interviewer's listening skills. It allows the interviewee to direct the pace, tone and direction of an interview, which necessitates keen listening and dynamic responses on the part of the interviewer to ensure sufficient data are collected to answer the key research questions. The emphasis on looking and listening refers to two aspects of this study's methodology: first, reading the interviewees' body language during the interviews and second, the discussions that took place in relation to whānau archives. Selected taonga were brought to the interviews and looking at them while discussing them allowed the archives to serve as prompts for memory and storytelling within the interviews. As the interviews were audio-only, this interviewer elicited both descriptive and evaluative answers to questions about archival collections and whānau caretaking.

Maintain reciprocity

This researcher took koha (gift or contribution) and kai (food) to each interview. The koha was a token gift and card and the kai was a small snack appropriate for sharing at the end of an interview lasting one to two hours.

Enable whānau participation within the research

Interviewees were given themes and skeleton questions prior to the interview. How these were shared with their families (and adjusted accordingly) was at the discretion of individuals. Whānau support was welcome at individual interviews; however, the one-on-one nature of the data collection for this thesis was stressed. If non-participants in the research had a perspective to share, an opportunity was created at the end of the interview for them to place their thoughts on record. These recordings were not part of the thematic analysis of this research and they will be returned to the interviewees, along with the primary recordings, for addition to family collections.

Do not impose attitudes and beliefs

Trust relationships had been formed with the interviewees through this researcher's acceptance of Māori protocols and commitment to learning and working in Taranaki reo and tikanga. The interviews were conducted primarily in English for academic reasons and the tikanga that was followed was stipulated by each individual being recorded, or by their whānau support people. Preferred protocols were established during a preliminary interview meeting.

Critically reflect on safety and whakamana

Provisions for the appropriate cultural protocols, as outlined above, are an important part of interviewer/interviewee safety in this process. With the relationships already established, neither party entered into an interview as relative strangers. Therefore, both physical and spiritual safety were considered in the methodology design. Contact was made with the interviewees the day following their interview to check on their well-being. In addition, a reflective research journal was maintained by this researcher.

Eleven interviews spanning three generations were conducted. The interviewees received information on the intended purpose and use of their interviews in advance and consent was explained.[118] They were all happy to be identified in this thesis and all asked for a copy of the final report. The recordings were made in the interviewees' homes in Taranaki or in the researcher's home in New Plymouth, with post-interview questions resolved over email. The interviews were transcribed and coded, using keyword searching to identify the common terms, words, topics and sub-topics that were emerging for each research theme. The data were organised into tables under section headings, a step that prepared the relevant sections of transcripts for multiple rounds of thematic analysis. This model was selected as the most efficient way of identifying and analysing patterns in qualitative data.

Psychology scholars Clark and Braun[119] claimed that thematic analysis has 'theoretical flexibility', labelling it an 'analytic method' rather than a

---

[118] See Appendix F.

[119] Victoria Clarke and Virginia Braun, 'Teaching Thematic Analysis: Overcoming Challenges and Developing Strategies for Effective Learning', *The Psychologist,* 26, no. 2 (2013).

methodology, which they said was the form taken by many other qualitative approaches. This flexibility was tested within this research, with the analysis designed to refine the data without obscuring an interviewee's intended meaning, allowing trends to emerge naturally from information shared within this research data set. The analysis followed Clark and Braun's six-step method for rigorous analysis: familiarisation with the data; coding; searching for themes; reviewing themes; defining and naming themes; and writing up.[120]

Conclusion

This chapter has set out this researcher's process for investigating how and why whānau Māori engage with community archiving to care for their memory collections that are held at home. It has established community archiving as an international field of study and compared this with the current trends in this country within the memory sector and private archives. It has identified key issues emerging from a review of the current literature and the way this research fills some of the perceived gaps in academic scholarship.

This researcher has been positioned as an insider-outsider, a Pākehā researcher operating within a Māori archiving community of practice in Taranaki. This place is described by Dwyer and Buckle as 'the space between', which allows researchers to occupy the position of both insider *and* outsider, rather than insider *or* outsider. In the context of this research, the space between reflected this researcher's position as a non-Māori, cultural outsider with whanaungatanga (a sense of family connection) to this group

---

[120] Clarke and Braun, 'Teaching Thematic Analysis', 123.

through several years of shared archiving experience and learning te reo Māori together in Taranaki.

The chapter has introduced a research cohort of Taranaki-based Māori community archivists and discussed the way this research aligned their first-hand interview evidence with contemporary scholarship in the fields of digital archiving for indigenous record keeping. It has established the three key concepts of kaitiakitanga, whanaungatanga and taonga as an ethical and interpretive frame for interviewing and analysis, defining them in the context of this research, which aimed to address the three research questions described earlier and to test their respective hypotheses:

1. In what ways are community archiving and Māori community archiving the same and in what ways are they different?

2. How does community archive training delivered in Taranaki between 2014 and 2017 align with the demands of caring for whānau taonga archives at home?

3. Are there differences between generations in opinions about sharing whānau archives in the digital realm?

Research into these questions focused on these related hypotheses:

1. Māori community archiving is whānau archiving. It is a collective process characterised by the use of tikanga (cultural protocols) and its focus on caring for collections for the benefit of family relationships.

2. Whānau collections were enhanced by the practical archiving skills that kaitiaki gained in digitisation, oral history recording, digital archiving and taonga conservation.

3. Older generations have views about online sharing that are more conservative than those of younger generations.

These questions and assumptions were designed to establish interviewee motivations and methods for working with their 'stitches dropped in time'.[121] The next chapter presents the oral history interview findings thematically, organised by emergent topics and sub-topics and presented as direct quotes. This distinguishes between the researcher and participant voices and provides a springboard for the discussion and analysis that follows in Chapter 3.

---

[121] Tirikātene, 'A Tapestry of Understanding', 3.

Chapter 2: Findings

Introduction

This chapter examines the concept of Māori community archiving through oral history interviews with a cross-generational cohort from Taranaki involved in caring for their family archival collections between 2014 and 2017. The evidence presented in this chapter introduces Māori community archiving as whānau archiving and examines the collections of artefacts passed down from generation to generation and the knowledge that they contain. This chapter introduces the research cohort and establishes why they sought training in community archiving to care for their collections. It frames research data as collective responses and analyses them through the lens of three interpretive concepts related to Māori archiving methods: whanaungatanga (relationships), kaitiakitanga (caring responsibilities) and taonga (valued items).

Introducing the interviewees

The interview group represented three generations of Taranaki Māori archivists who were engaged in community archiving projects between 2014 and 2017. The oral history interviews asked, 'Nō hea koe, ko wai koe?' (Where are you from and who are you?) The answers were relayed through pepeha, tribal sayings that express iwi and hapū affiliations and relationships to maunga (mountain), whenua (land) and awa (rivers). These personal statements are detailed in the interview transcripts, with iwi affiliations noted within this text. Appendix A describes when and where the interviews took place. All the interviewees agreed to their names and stories being presented

in this thesis. All but one interviewee asked for copies of their interviews and related transcripts. They all requested copies of the final research report.

All but one of the interviewees lived in Taranaki.[122] Most shared whakapapa links with one or more of the eight Taranaki iwi. Others related to Taranaki through marriage and whakapapa to iwi from other areas. All were committed to Taranaki through their children and grandchildren and had been involved in efforts to learn the Taranaki dialect of te reo Māori. This group knew one another through family or community relationships before enrolling archiving courses and they held high levels of trust in one another before they started working on archiving projects together. Hinerangi Korewha (Ngāti Apa, H2) explained an important commonality within this group: 'We see [Mount] Taranaki as sacred … in that you draw all of your strength from him, so you adorn him with such thinking'.[123]

The interviewees all took part in a variety of community archiving training sessions between 2014 and 2017. These included kura pō (night classes) and wānanga (educational forums) delivered through Te Pūtē Routiriata o Te Reo o Taranaki, a New Plymouth-based pan-iwi archive. In the first year, these sessions covered oral history interviewing, an introduction to archiving principles and theory, and historical interpretation through arranging and describing whānau archives for cataloguing and databasing. By the third year, the group members were independently coordinating whānau and personal projects at home and in their communities. Their choice to engage with community archiving was motivated by key drivers such as Māori

[122] Ria Waikerepuru (R2) lived in Ōtaki but retained strong ties to Taranaki, visiting regularly to spend time with her family, friends and her marae in the region.

[123] Oral history interview with Hinerangi Korewha (H2), recorded March 24, 2019, 0:06:14.6.

language revitalisation and identity building, whānau influence or pressure, a taonga preservation or conservation need, and for their mokopuna (grandchildren), a sentiment often expressed in interviews and encapsulating this group's desire to pass on family stories and treasured items to the next generations.

The concepts of whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and taonga resonated with this interview group and all interviewees had their own, pre-existing ideas about what these terms meant in relation to their archiving. These concepts are described in detail in the following sections, which discuss the interview findings and draw meaning from a thematic analysis of the oral history evidence.

Whanaungatanga

The concept of whanaungatanga was a core purpose for archiving for the 11 people interviewed for this research. They defined their work for family collections as a caring responsibility handed down within their families from generation to generation. The archival collections they cared for played a pivotal role in uniting their families, a function that was ascribed to their taonga collections because of the large number of whānau who were living away from home. Whether they were striving to revive whanaungatanga, build it anew, or just enjoy the way it made them feel, all of the interviewees cited family relationships and coming together as key outcomes of learning the skills of community archiving.

Whakawhanaungatanga (building relationships) was cited as a prime reason for the interviewees making the effort to bring their families together to help

them care for archival taonga. Three topics related to whanaungatanga emerged in thematic analysis: the importance of pono (trust), whenua (land) and papakāinga or marae (place) and the integral role of kaumātua. These three themes are discussed in the next sections.

Pono (trust)

Strong relationships based on trust and mutual respect developed within the interview cohort while they were students together. This justified the definition for whanaungatanga presented in Chapter 1 as a dynamic concept that relates not only to familial relationships but also can include communities of practice who come together through their shared passion for an issue or a cause.[124] In this context of community archiving in Taranaki, communities of practice refers to a group connected through shared interests, beliefs and aspirations. The sense of whanaungatanga that this group shared was likened to being comfortable enough to open up and share information and stories about the taonga in each other's collections. These descriptions encompassed the values of manaakitanga (caring), reciprocity and tuakana-teina (young and old) working together. Young and old worked side by side in these classes, each finding a place to work according to their own skills, strengths and abilities.

The concept of this archiving group as a situated learning community of practice was based on the interviewees noting that connecting with other like-minded people was a motivation for returning to archiving education year upon year. Hinerangi Korewha (H2) identified her relationships with the other students as the key reason she stayed with the archiving group, a view that

---

[124] Hond, 'Matua Te Reo', 31.

was shared by all the interviewees. Hinerangi described whanaungatanga in archiving as a kaupapa Māori process, which was a model of practice defined by Denzin, Lincoln and Smith as the absence of a need to be in control, being connected as part of a community and being compassionate towards others' moral positions.[125] In relation to Māori community archiving, Hinerangi built on this definition by describing the way the group 'moved together spiritually … without needing to explain it … and working from a foundation of shared respect and values'.[126] Bob Korewha (Ngāpuhi, B2) said the longer the archiving group were together, the deeper the bond between them grew. He rated the closeness he felt with his classmates as the reason he felt comfortable opening up and sharing his knowledge with the group.[127]

Generally, trust relationships are a critical determinant of who Māori community archivists will partner with in caring for their taonga records. Many whānau taonga have been acquired by collectors or placed in public repositories for safekeeping. These dissociative methods have removed taonga from the spiritual care of iwi, hapū and whānau, either partially, through lack of access, or totally, through sale to third parties. In an interview for this research, Kuia Mako Jones (Ngāti Kahungunu, M3) cited her fear of losing access to her taonga as the reason she opted to learn about community archiving through Te Pūtē Routiriata o Taranaki. 'I had been with Te Reo Taranaki for a long time off and on as a student and the trust goes back a long way because there were always the same people working there.'

---

[125] Denzin et al., *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies,* 36

[126] H2, 0:39.30.7.

[127] Oral history interview with Bob Korewha (B2), recorded March 24, 2019, 0:39.30.7.

She described this relationship as 'big time whanaungatanga … we were just like whānau'.[128]

Whenua (land) and papakāinga or marae (place)

The archive became a training centre for wānanga, kura pō (night classes) and drop-in tutorials. This familiarity enabled students to come together in learning, gain confidence and skills from one another, and then return home to share their learning within their families. The focal point of 'home' came through strongly in this research and this term was used interchangeably to refer to the places and spaces in which this group of whānau archivists put their skills into practice. It encompassed domestic and collective spaces such as marae (communal spaces usually including a meeting house), papakāinga (communal home bases), whenua (tribal land) and family museums. This notion of 'home' as a central focus for archiving activities was one of the most prominent themes to emerge related to whanaungatanga, distinguishing Māori community archiving from institutional practice. It linked to a subtheme in this research of whakahoki ki te kāinga (homecoming).

The whānau archivists wanted to care for their collections at home and they wanted their extended families to come home and help them do this. Taranaki was the region that most interviewees called home through their whakapapa (genealogical connection) to the geographic area defined by north and south and the tupuna maunga (ancestral mountain) that unites the region's eight tribes. Interviewees without whakapapa (ancestral) links to Taranaki were affiliated to the region through family, community, marriage or workplace relationships and they, too, referred to Taranaki as 'home', albeit

---

[128] Oral history interview with Mako Jones (M3), recorded March 29, 2019, 0:45:47.8.

on a different basis from that of those with ancestral connections around the maunga. For this group of interviewees, community archiving was considered another way of linking distant family members back to the sacred ceremonial spaces and sites that held stories of family history. Thus, physically coming home was emphasised as the best way for whānau to work with their taonga archives and learn about them and the family history they embody. It was also the reason that whānau archives were rarely sent way or handed over to outsiders for storage or conservation work. As one interviewee explained 'kaitiakitanga has you not take your eyes off that taonga … skills like digitisation need to be taught in a way that make them relevant to working … in our own homes or in our marae'.[129] She believed that Māori community archiving is about creating the kinds of spaces in which whānau feel comfortable working.[130]

For the older generation of interviewees, home spaces were akin to the way they would have cared for their taonga and shared knowledge from their kaumātua in the old days. Kuia Margie Taylor (Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Mutunga, MT3) shared her experience of learning at the knee of her kuia as an example of how she learned to care for taonga at home.[131] Another interviewee shared stories of her father gaining his exceptional knowledge of te reo Māori in the same way, by growing up alongside his elders in south Taranaki.[132] These examples highlighted the unique role that pāhake-to-mokopuna (grandparent-to-grandchild) relationships play in

---

[129] H2, 0:54:24.5.

[130] H2, 1:22:42.4.

[131] Oral history interview with Margie Taylor (MT3), recorded April 12, 2019, 0:28:00.1.

[132] Oral history interview with Ria Waikerepuru (R2), recorded April 5, 2019, 0:07:21.7.

whanaungatanga and the transfer of family knowledge from generation to generation.

The interviewees agreed that if taonga, whether tangible (artefacts) or intangible (knowledge), is shared with them, it becomes their responsibility to share it with the next generation. While this responsibility is considered in more detail in this chapter's section on the concept of kaitiakitanga, it is touched on here to establish tuakana-teina (elder-junior) relationships as a characteristic of Māori community archiving. One example of tuakana-teina relationships within this cohort was presented by one of the youngest interviewees when she spoke about the influence her koroua (male elder) had with regard to her decision to move her family to Taranaki from the South Island. Taranaki was a home she barely knew because she had only visited the region as child for tangihanga (funerals). Her decision to return was sparked by meeting her kaumātua at a hapū wānanga in Waitōtara[133] and being inspired by his vision for restoring vitality to Ngā Ariki hapū and reconnecting people with their whenua (land) and stories.

> We were on the marae being spoken to by an elder, kanohi ki te kanohi, that was really inspiring. Our kaupapa was all about wānanga [group learning, in this case at the marae], … walking around the whenua. But also acknowledging there's only a few of us here and we're all around the country now.[134]

For many indigenous people, caring for whānau archives on home ground is a strategy for keeping them intact. This is favoured over storage in third-party

---

[133] Waitōtara is a town in South Taranaki, New Zealand. Waverley is 10 km to the north-west and Whanganui is 34 km to the south-east.

[134] Oral history interview with Āria Broughton (A1), recorded March 22, 2019, 0:11:46.5.

archives because it means the taonga remain accessible to family when they want to work with them or use them for special occasions or everyday events. For these interviewees, the whānau archives were a tool of whanaungatanga, with an important role to play in family life. This evidence supported Tapsell's description of the role of taonga as supporting whānau, hapū and iwi to '(re)perform the past … from one generation to the next on appropriate occasions'.[135] Tania Hodges-Paul (Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Tama, T2) described the role that taonga from the McClutchie whānau collection played in the tangihanga of her uncle and family kaumātua when he passed away. She went back to the whānau papakāinga to retrieve a whāriki (ceremonial mat) for her uncle's tūpāpaku (body) to lie on, continuing a family tradition she had learned about from her mother and aunties.[136]

There were other whānau taonga in New Plymouth's Puke Ariki museum that Tania would have liked to take home as well; she referred to the adze Poutama Whiria and the anchor stone Te Punga a Matori. Her grandfather, Te Kapinga McClutchie, had been given shared trusteeship over both artefacts when they were deposited with the Taranaki Museum (now Puke Ariki) in 1927.[137] However, the family had never had these taonga back at home and Tania concluded that the majority of her relatives were unaware of their connections to them.[138] Being able to go home and retrieve the family's

---

[135] Paul Tapsell, 'Aroha Mai: Whose Museum? The Rise of Indigenous Ethics in Museum Contexts: A Māori-led Tribal Perspective', in *New Directions in Museum Ethics*, ed. Janet Marstine, Alexander Bauer and Chelsea Haines (London: Routledge, 2014), 93.

[136] Oral history interview with Tania Hodges-Paul (T2), recorded March 23, 2019, 0:39:10.7.

[137] See the Puke Ariki collection for a photograph of Te Kapinga MClutchie with this taonga, 'The Original Trustees of Punga Tokomaru and Poutama Whiria on the Transferral to Museum Care on 30 Sept 1927', accessed May 12, 2019, https://collection.pukeariki.com/objects/89020.

[138] T2, 0:34:22.8.

own taonga, the whāriki and family photographs, from the whānau collection to draw on for support at her uncle's tangi 'lifted a whole heaviness from me and it felt right'.[139] She explained this feeling in terms of wairua (spirit) and mauri (the material symbol of a life principle), both central facets of Royal's explanation of the role that taonga traditionally played in Māori ceremonial life.[140] Tania concluded that the separation she felt from her whānau taonga in the museum was one of the reasons she did not want to share what her family had left with outsiders.

This perspective was consistent across this group of interviewees; a willingness to share whānau archives outside of kinship groups was expressed by only two people. Many interviewees cited the dearth of very old taonga available to them for ceremonial life, such as that described by Tania, as a prime reason for keeping close what little they had left. This underlined the critical importance of taonga archives being accessible for whānau, with interviewees unanimously agreeing that home was the best place for their taonga archives, even if sometimes storage conditions were not optimal for preservation. The example shared by Tania illustrated the way depositing taonga with a third-party repository could effectively sever the whānau's ties with the iwi (tribal) and whānau history that the taonga embody. It also prevented whānau from using artefacts to draw their people home to learn the waiata (songs) and kōrero (stories) that bind them to their whenua. Bob Korewha (B2) explained the effectiveness of their old family museum in getting people back on the land to visit it, where it sits 'in the middle of an uncle's paddock' in the far north.

---

[139] T2, 0:39:10.7.

[140] Royal, 'Oral History and Hapū Development', 16.

The kōrero is that the bees are the kaitiaki [caretakers] so if you haven't got

the right blood they won't let you in. It's down the road from the marae,

on the whānau whenua [family land]. They've built another whare

[house] over it. I've been in there and there are a lot of old things …

taiaha [long wooden weapon], adzes, greenstone, an anvil. It could

have been my grandfather's stuff; he was a blacksmith.[141]

He said the only way to hear the stories about the whānau taonga in this old
museum was to go home and talk to his cousin, 'the one keeping the home
fires burning, Mr Ahi Kā'.[142] This cousin's role was caretaker of the museum
as well as:

the disseminator of information, the keeper of the whakapapa. It's all in his

mind, even the mapping of the urupā [burial ground] and … the stories

of those families. He says the same thing every year – come back

home, come and do the urupā, come and have a kai and a kōrero.[143]

Āria Broughton (Ngā Rauru Kiitahi, A1) shared this view that whānau taonga
and their stories acted like a magnet, bringing whānau and hapū home more
often. She also felt more comfortable in shared hapū spaces such as marae
and wharenui. She described archiving as a tool of whakawhanaungatanga,
the process of establishing relationships and relating to one another.[144] Thus,
for these interviewees, wānanga learning epitomised this process and was a
mode of sharing knowledge that lent itself to Māori community archiving.

---

[141] B2, 0:57:19.0.

[142] Ahi kā refers to a person who is keeping the home fires burning.

[143] B2, 0:57:19.0.

[144] A1, 0:24:59.2.

Generally, a wānanga is the preferred means of bringing people together at home to care for their archival taonga. In this way, whānau collections can be catalysts for reuniting distant relatives and tightening family ties loosened through national and global dispersion. Wānanga is a reciprocal process that encourages people to share what they know, as well as fill up their kete mātauranga (knowledge basket) from trusted family knowledge holders. For Kuia Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Tama, N3), sharing her whakapapa research during a whānau digitisation wānanga at the whānau papakāinga near Urenui in north Taranaki was a highlight of learning about archiving. It provided her with an opportunity to link her research findings to the photographs that had hung in the parlour of her family homestead for six generations and to pass on her knowledge to others in her whānau who had an interest in family history. Even though the photos that were being digitised had hung in the homestead for as long as she could remember, much of the information about the people and places in them had been lost to living memory. 'I didn't really know who they were, yet I had all the information on them, having done the whakapapa research. I realised I had information and it could be added … to give a fuller story'.[145] Her younger cousin, Tania Hodges-Paul (T2), shared an example of how archiving at home in Taranaki had helped to revive connections between her McClutchie whānau in New Plymouth and the Wharekauri (Chatham Islands) branch of the family that shares their Ngāti Mutunga ancestry. Digitising the family photographs meant they could be selectively shared with other relatives and more information

---

[145] Oral history interview with Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (N3), recorded March 27, 2019, 0:05:15.6.

could be added to the scant fragments her immediate family knew about some of their tupuna (ancestors):

My Wharekauri whānau were able to give me information about one tupuna and her connection to us … Te Kiato, a mokopuna of my great-great-grandmother's sister. We were reconnecting and building relationships with whānau and whanaungatanga was strengthened through that project.[146]

Even though the photographs had been digitised, the sharing that Tania referred to took place face to face when these two branches of the family came together for an archiving wānanga that moved among the community archive in New Plymouth, family homes and significant sites around Taranaki.

Meeting face to face is an aspect of whanaungatanga that is integral to the theme of homecoming, yet it demands closer examination for what it reveals with regard to the spiritual caretaking associated with whānau archives that would otherwise be difficult for this non-Māori researcher to qualify in writing.

Kanohi ki te kanohi – archiving face to face

If the theme of whakahoki ki te kāinga (homecoming) can be understood in terms of pā (touch), or physically connecting on the land, archiving kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) can be expressed in terms of hā, or the exchange of breath. One interviewee combined these terms to define Māori community archiving as aroha (love, compassion, caring) a notion that she said 'people who were not brought up Māori find hard. The Māori way is aroha, that's all

---

[146] T2, 0:25:25.1.

there is'.[147] O'Carroll[148] researched the concept of meeting kanohi ki te kanohi within the context of Taranaki whanaungatanga. She defined this as a way of coming together that could augment relationships forged in a virtual realm. This analogy was fitting for whānau archiving in that it broaches both the physical and digital realms, with the latter positioned as an adjunct to families caring for their taonga face to face and not just getting their information online and out of context.

Coming together in person to celebrate life events was a practice that the interviewees wanted to strengthen through their archival practice. The cohort's youngest whānau archivists upheld face-to-face interaction as a value integral to their relationships with their cousins and agreed with the definition of whakawhanaungatanga being the dynamic process of creating and understanding family connections. They said it was the safest way for sharing whakapapa and family history and they emphasised the principle of reciprocity in knowledge-sharing relationships. When Hokipera Ruakere's (Te Ātiawa, H1) relatives asked her to share the family whakapapa and pepeha (tribal sayings) with them, her response was, 'What *do* you know first?', before explaining that whanaungatanga really means 'te hoki mai' – (coming home) to visit.[149]

They've come and immersed themselves in our world and we've shared with
    them. It's not like I don't want to share. I'm trying to excite them, I'm
    trying to show them that this is a beautiful taonga and that you actually

---

[147] M3,1:06:25.0.

[148] O'Carroll, 'Māori Identity Construction in SNS'.

[149] Oral history interview with Hokipera Ruakere (H1), recorded March 21, 2019, 0:24:15:3.

need to come home and be under your maunga [mountain] for it to be absorbed in a way that will sustain you.[150]

Interviewees from the baby boomer generation revealed an understanding of the potential of digital technologies to bring their extended families home. One couple connected technology's potential in Māori archiving to maintaining the rituals of ceremonial encounter, such as karanga (first call) and kōrero (oratory). They joked together that before long, a hologram would be delivering the traditional welcome to visiting family – for a small fee. This joke masked the more serious issue of visitors turning up in person, expecting manaakitanga (hospitality), when there is nobody left at home to greet family and guests or to carry out the caring responsibilities that are implicit in whanaungatanga.

When they do come home, at the gate there'll be a $2 machine. If you want a karanga, press this one … it will cost you $2. If you want a mihi [welcome speech], press this one, $2. You go [into the wharenui], the door might be open and there will be a screen – a hologram. Then afterwards, we'll just show you a picture of the cup of tea and if you want a cup of tea, that's $3. That door will open, ka-ching! We talk like that when the whānau goes, 'come home'.[151]

The dearth of whānau on home ground with the skills to welcome people in the customary way, with pōwhiri (rituals of encounter), whaikōrero (formal speeches) and manaakitanga (hospitality) was a recurring theme of the interviews, of concern to all generations. Whānau archiving embodied their

---

[150] H1, 0:25:43:6.
[151] B2, 0:01:04.0.

hope for this to change, with a gradual recovery from the impacts of colonisation, which caused language and culture to be interrupted and not handed down.

The difficulty of balancing the whānau demand for face-to-face learning with the practicalities of modern life and families dispersed far from their ancestral lands was a recurring theme. Bob Korewha (B2) accepted this dispersal as a fact of life for his large Ngā Puhi whānau, who were once close but now struggled to stay connected. With 94 first cousins on his father's side and 75 on his mother's, he barely knew the generation below his own. The drive to keep up relationships died with his parents and nobody noticed his family had stopped coming together kanohi ki te kanohi until 10 years after his mother had passed away.[152] The whānau started archiving their history through whakapapa wānanga in 2008 as a way to arrest this decline in whanaungatanga. Community archive training was another way of maintaining whānau relationships and the reason that Bob persevered with his education. He stressed that his role in bringing the family together for wānanga was part of a shared responsibility for keeping family history alive and something he could not achieve alone. 'It's not just my responsibility. In my whānau, they've put me out there in the front, but I thought, I'm not going to do this alone, we've all got to share'.[153] Although they were still relative youngsters in their 50s, Bob's generation was fulfilling the roles that their elders used to fill. He says collectivising responsibility for whakawhanaungatanga is one way of doing this safely in the absence of kaumātua to perform the traditional roles.

---

[152] B2, 0:12:00.0.
[153] B2, 1:08:53.0.

The role of kaumātua (elders)

For the interviewees in this research, kaumātua participation in archiving wānanga was integral to Māori ways of working. The influence of their elders was both motivational and reassuring. They gave the whānau archivists a sense of personal security and spiritual guidance; they were trusted as sources of tribal and whānau knowledge. The urgent need to capture their oral histories was cited as a prime reason for getting this generation involved in community archiving. Young and old alike cited kaumātua participation as a drawcard for joining the community archiving group and a motivation for learning digital capture skills such as audio and video recording. Hokipera Ruakere (H1) said that knowing kaumātua would be present at her archiving night classes would:

call me to class at 7pm at night, because I knew that there was always going to be some kind of taonga … shared with us. I was quite excited about that … that's the benefit of working cross-generationally; that's the only way. That's how we always did it and that's about having a Māori model … right through to the tamariki [children].[154]

Others reflected on the role elders traditionally played in bringing families together and emphasised the safety that having kaumātua present gave whānau working with taonga tuku iho (valued objects that have been handed down from generation to generation). Hinerangi Korewha (H2) felt safer around her elders, who 'may not show that they have the responsibility of looking after us, but they just simply turn up. Their presence and the way that

---

[154] H1, 0:32:50.5.

they talk to us show that they have that mantle'.[155] This presence of elders at archiving wānanga helped the group develop strong relationships based on trust and mutual respect. Kaumātua contributed practically, while also playing a pastoral role in bonding this group together. They filled a gap that some interviewees felt within their own whānau with regard to guidance on approaching sensitive aspects of their archiving projects by advising on tikanga (protocols) for maintaining spiritual safety. For others, kaumātua were more of a drawcard for the students than the lessons on offer. Matiu Paul (Ngāpuhi, M2) said their presence was the main reason he kept turning up for wānanga on Monday nights. 'I don't think we could have done it without them. Those in our group gave us guidance; they were like a stone, a rock'.[156]

The generation of elders that Matiu referred to had learned some traditional archiving methods from their own kaumātua, but they had not intended for them to be continued. Historically, whānau taonga have been buried or withheld for fear of them harming future generations. In a notable shift in tradition, none of the interviewees wanted to continue this practice. Many of them referred to the adverse impacts that not sharing family history had had on their personal identity. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) said she was in her 30s before she understood what it meant to be a strong wahine Māori (Māori woman) and gained the confidence to assume the role of kaikaranga for her iwi. She was sympathetic to the reasons for her elders taking some of her whānau taonga to the grave, a result of them having endured the sharp end of colonisation in Taranaki. Like many in the group, it was only when she

[155] H2, 0:39:30.7.
[156] M2, 0:40:29.7.

started learning te reo Māori that she saw 'the difference in the world'.[157]

Even though her grandfather, Te Kapinga McClutchie, had played a prominent role in local Māori affairs, she had been taught her mother's negative view about what it meant to be tangata whenua (indigenous people) in Aotearoa. Her grandfather had chosen not to share this part of his life with his closest family. Tania harboured a sadness that her male elders had not continued the tradition of taking their children to the marae and had chosen to speak Māori only outside of the immediate family.[158]

Tania said the lack of visibility of te reo and taonga was linked to the mistrust of Māoritanga (the Māori way of life) that lingered within the McClutchie whānau. She and two of her cousins believed that whānau archiving could help to restore their relatives' connections with their Māoritanga and mitigate some of the 'wilful forgetting' Tania attributed to colonisation trauma. Easing her relatives into te reo and tikanga had been most effective when they come together kanohi ki te kanohi with whānau taonga in front of them, a strategy that had caused a perceptible shift in familial connections across all the generations in her family. Digitising the family photos and writing up some of the stories that were shared was a way of getting family history out to a wider audience through a self-published booklet.

The shifts in whanaungatanga that Tania and others described as a result of whānau archiving were evidence of the way taonga could play a strategic role in reuniting families through shared memory making and pride in the collective responsibilities of kaitiakitanga over the archival collections.

---

[157] T2, 0.28:45.0.
[158] T2, 0.30:49.0.

Kaitiakitanga

Kaitiakitanga is presented in this research as a multifaceted concept significant for its ability to link whānau archiving with the notion of inherited guardianship. Only one interviewee, Matiu Paul (M2), said he did not consider himself a kaitiaki of the taonga he had inherited; instead, he ascribed this role to the person who looked after their whānau whakapapa, after learning it 'mouth to ear' from their grandfather. Matiu Paul (M2) preferred the term 'kaimahi' (worker) for his role in whānau archiving for his and his wife's families.[159] All of the other interviewees were comfortable using the term kaitiaki to define their caretaking responsibilities and all considered sharing the taonga with the next generation as a responsibility of their kaitiakitanga. The term kaitiaki was applied interchangeably to describe both the caring responsibilities inherited or ascribed to them by their families and the practical aspects of archiving used in projects.

This reflected Boulton's observation that when it is used as a verb, the term kaitiaki denotes a responsibility to care and protect, while when it is used as a noun, it refers to the guardian or steward enacting caring duties.[160] In oral history research, it is also used as an adjective. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) described her aspiration that the family's digital archive would inspire her mokopuna 'to kaitiaki' the taonga passed down to them by their grandfather Huirangi.[161] These differences are noted here to emphasise the fluidity of this term and to explain why a question was posed as to whether this was a concept with which the interviewees self-identified in relation to their

---

[159] M2, 0:28:53.1.

[160] Boulton, 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values', 9.

[161] R2, 0:14:09.5.

community archiving practice. Presuming a single definition for kaitiakitanga would have limited the way this research could reflect the multiple notions that it actually represents.

Three themes emerged in the interviews around the topic of kaitiakitanga: self-identification and definitions for kaitiakitanga; caring for the language and culture; and aspirations for sharing whānau archives with children and grandchildren. One of Matiu Paul's (M2) archiving projects was recording and writing up a wānanga led by 'the tohunga whakapapa (genealogy expert) up in the far north' for his relatives living in and around Taranaki. These wānanga were designed to give his whānau a chance to ask questions about the information that had also been compiled for virtual sharing. 'We've had it online for many years now … we are administrators and we have checking protocols'.[162] The other male interviewee, Bob Korewha (B2), also hesitated to call himself a kaitiaki at first. 'For me, I know it should be, but I don't. Why is that?' He pondered on his own question for a while, returning to it later in his interview to explain that his hesitancy was based on his belief that kaitiakitanga is a collective responsibility. 'That's where I was going with it … it's not just me, it's all of us. It has to be unanimous, rather than someone having a casting vote'. He said 'sticky things' are referred back to his whānau whakapapa holder: 'And he does what needs to be done. That's kaumātuatanga [an elder's role]'.[163]

The collective nature of whānau archiving is one of the ideological differences that differentiates Māori community archiving from institutional practice. Expertise in whānau practice comes from more than what can be

---

[162] M2, 0:32:33.0.
[163] B2, 1:08:53.0.

taught or learned in training. This lends strength to Boulton and Brannelly's argument that to understand the role of kaitiaki, one first has to understand the intricacies of Māori society.[164] Hinerangi Korewha (H2) stressed that within kaitiakitanga, dangers could arise when a single family member held all the decision-making authority for their extended whānau. 'They all get so used to having a leader, it stops them from stepping up. Kaitiakitanga is a shared leadership kaupapa [issue]'.[165] Hinerangi qualified this by adding that in some cases, certain family members would inherit the responsibility for particular taonga or fragments of family knowledge. In her case, this was the artefacts she inherited from her parents, the whānau urupā (burial ground) and papakāinga, which she cared for collectively with her siblings. 'If I have been bestowed the responsibility of looking after taonga … I will take on that responsibility. We have a shared understanding for all the things Mum and Dad left'.[166] Hinerangi argued that kaitiakitanga involved not sending archives away for digitising, packing or conservation by strangers; she believed this was the reason that a conservation skills wānanga run in Taranaki in 2016 by Te Papa's iwi development outreach agency, National Services Te Paerangi, was attended by about 40 whānau archivists from around the region. Around half a dozen members of the McClutchie whānau brought a range of taonga with them for wrapping, boxing and conservation attention.

Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) readily defined herself as kaitiaki, a role she said was about 'keeping an eye on things'. Within her whānau archiving project, people's kaitiakitanga responsibilities could change according to the

---

[164] Boulton 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values', 9.
[165] H2, 1:08:53.0.
[166] H2, 0:30:32.4.

situation. Three people had been nominated as kaitiaki for whānau archiving by the wider family, with one person from each of the three generations ascribed leadership for different aspects of the project.[167] These kaitiaki have called regular gatherings to report on progress and consult whānau on crucial decisions. These wānanga have given the wider whānau an opportunity to express their own wishes as because 'I don't have the same mana [authority] as others do; my mana looks different and my kaitiakitanga looks different'.[168] Tania's elder cousin, Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (N3), was less certain about describing herself as a kaitiaki, but she conceded that 'in some small way, that's what it is'. Her personal definition was 'a deep desire to ensure that we look after things properly. Nobody taught us to do that in our day, we just grew up wasting things'.[169]

For these interviewees, inherited caretaking responsibilities also applied to the creation of new whānau taonga. Three weavers in the group cited creating new from old, by using the designs and techniques of previous generations for new creations, as an element of their kaitiakitanga. The eldest of the three, Mako Jones (M3), considered herself a kaitiaki because of the specialised knowledge she held which, she argued, came with a responsibility to share it with others 'who are hungry or have a passion in that area … I can pass my kaitiakitanga over to them'. Mako explained that her authority to share this knowledge was passed down from her grandparents, who taught her that if you do not share traditional knowledge, it 'won't grow and it won't stay alive. My grandfather said it is koretake [useless] if you're

---

[167] T2, 0:15:34.9.
[168] T2, 0:48:18.0.
[169] N3, 0:38:49.1.

not going to pass it on. Kaitiakitanga is a lot of things, but you can always pass it on'.[170] Mako's grandparents' attitude did not extend to sharing te reo Māori, a taonga she said they chose not to pass on to her.

The issue of sharing emerged as a significant theme in this research and these findings have been presented to support the research conclusions presented in Chapter 4. One aspect of sharing that is relevant to this discussion of kaitiakitanga was one interviewee's decision to reclaim some of her father's knowledge for the benefit of whānau alone – in spite of wider interest in it from public collecting institutions. Ria Waikerepuru's (R2) kaitiakitanga for her father Huirangi's archives was characterised by a decision not to share them publicly, a position at odds with her elder's view that his collection should be publicly available. At an archiving wānanga in 2017, this researcher asked Huirangi what he thought of the efforts to organise his archives and who he wanted to see them. He responded with enthusiastic approval for the work underway and replied that his collection was for 'everybody'.[171] Ria explained that withholding Huirangi's collection from public view for the foreseeable future was a way of centring his family and restoring their mana (authority) over Huirangi's mātauranga (traditional knowledge and teachings). She said, 'The rest of the world has had him and this time is for his family to have a relationship on this level with his mahi [work], his collection'.[172] A large part of this collection was te reo and documentary evidence of Huirangi's work to change the trajectory of the language that the kaumātua of his generation had been punished for

---

[170] M3, 0:49:54.4.

[171] Personal conversation with Huirangi Waikerepuru, December 3, 2017. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) was present for this conversation, which took place in her home in Ōtaki.

[172] R2, 0:12:30.4.

speaking. Ria attributed her father's uncharacteristic retention of Taranaki reo to his close relationship with his grandmother and his early life on the whānau papakāinga.

Reo (language) and tikanga (protocol)

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the desire to pass te reo Māori on to their children and grandchildren is a driving factor in whānau archiving. For the generations who have been unable to rely solely on the traditional modes of oral transmission that were interrupted by colonisation, community archiving has emerged as a tool for creating a language corpus that will be available to future generations. The interviewees in this research cited the near-loss of te reo as an example of ear-to-ear transmission being insufficient. Stories were spoken about in a similar vein: these archivists were learning the skills to record them so that no more traditional knowledge would be lost.

It is widely known that for many Māori, te reo was deliberately withheld by their family elders in a bid to help their descendants succeed in a changing world. The impacts of these actions on families are less well documented. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) judged the lack of trust in 'things Māori' within her whānau as one of the most significant impacts of colonisation and she positioned whānau archiving as a tool to help her family overcome the inherited fear that persisted in many of her relatives. Tania attributed her grandparents' decision not to teach their children how to speak te reo to a belief that they were better off growing up in te ao Pākehā (the European settler world):

My Mum's generation … all in their 70s … have little understanding of who

they are and what it is to be Māori. They think that our generation are

wasting their time learning the reo and following kaupapa Māori [Māori

ideologies].[173]

While this still upset her, she did not blame her elders for their choices. She

blamed colonisation and the whakamā (shame)[174] it instilled. As Ria

Waikerepuru (R2) explained, this legacy is the reason for language revival

being a key feature of her family's effort to 'claw back that identity stuff' that

her father spearheaded all of his adult life. Ria's whānau archiving was a

continuation of this mahi (work).[175]

Māori community archiving is whānau archiving. In the context of

kaitiakitanga, it is characterised by ensuring that whānau taonga are handed

down from generation to generation. In the context of te reo, this is a

significant challenge. All of the generations interviewed were actively trying to

improve their own abilities to achieve this end. Āria Broughton (A1)

connected being a parent with an acute sense of responsibility 'to do

something'[176] to increase the chances of her descendants knowing te reo

Māori and their origin stories. She had to grow her own knowledge first; for

this, she sought guidance from her kaumātua Potonga Neilson. She

described Neilson's significant role as 'holding that space' for his mokopuna,

just as she was doing for her own children. For Āria, learning te reo was an

aspect of kaitiakitanga for which she took responsibility. 'If I don't do this

---

[173] T2, 0:28:45.0.

[174] N3, 0:45:53.2.

[175] R2, 0:07:21.7.

[176] A1, 0:09:47.3.

mahi, is that going to be an option for them?'[177] She noted the link between te reo and health outcomes and defined her efforts as whakarauora, to save revive or rescue. Matiu Paul (M2) saw te reo as 'the cornerstone of being Māori … even if we get one moko to come back and learn it, that's [enough]'.[178]

These comments were evidence of te reo's primary position within Māori community archiving, highlighting a clear difference between this group's favoured way of working and what they could expect from mainstream libraries, archives and museums. Te Papa Museum's National Services Te Paerangi unit and some National Library services are exceptions to this rule, particularly with their outreach programmes supporting hapū-led kaitiaki and initiatives to digitise and publish te reo Māori archival content such as letters.[179]

Another aspect of Māori archiving that is different from its mainstream counterpart is its spiritual value. This is one of the key ideological differences between community archiving, which has institutional roots and whānau archiving, which is located within families. Bob Korewha (B2) applied the concept of mana (spiritual power) in judging whether using technology for knowledge sharing aligned with his family's tikanga, their Māori world views and values. Bob described kaitiakitanga in archiving as 'how people perceive mana and [issues like] what does technology do with that? Are we giving something mana [through] the archiving process?'[180] He gave the example of

---

[177] A1, 0:37:10.6.

[178] M2, 0:46:05.1.

[179] Crookston et al., *Kōrero Kitea.*

[180] B2, 1:22:42.4.

his daughter Arohaina seeking permission from their whānau kaitiaki, Bob's cousin Buck, to share recordings of whānau wānanga on the social media platform, *YouTube*. While she was aware of her uncle's preference for family to come home for wānanga, Arohaina explained to her uncle that it could be difficult for people to make the journey home to their marae in Northland and technology could be a tool for engaging with the younger generations. 'Arohaina knows she needs to look not for permission per se, but she needs to use the right protocols … and you have to go to the older generation to find that out.'[181]

The interviewees for this research did not distinguish between their duties as whānau archivists and advocates for te reo Māori. Hinerangi Korewha (H2) used the analogy of a fish in a fishbowl to describe the way the principles of reo revitalisation aligned with the way she conceptualised whānau archiving: 'The fish can't see the water. It's so natural for me to be a part of this. Te reo is context'.[182]

This section has shown that te reo Māori is a critical criterion of community archiving and therefore, it is inseparable from responsive training practices. It is distinguishing factor between mainstream and Māori methods of caring for whānau collections.

Archiving and future aspirations

The connection between kaitiakitanga and aspirations for future generations is also inseparable. Just as whānau archivists want to care for their taonga at home, they harbour aspirations for younger generations to inherit these

---

[181] B2, 0:26:18.1.
[182] H2, 0:33:23.4.

collections and continue to build on their work. The most common motivation cited by interviewees for wanting to preserve, conserve or hand down whānau archives was 'for the mokopuna'. Whānau archiving was seen as a way of ensuring that when the time comes for their mokopuna to assume this responsibility, they will find their archival inheritance accessible, exciting and in good order. Mako Jones (M3) wanted her mokopuna to inherit her archives, her weaving and notebooks full of stories.[183] Another part of her kaitiakitanga was tending pā harakeke (flax plantations and nurseries) and paru (traditional earth dye) sources around the mountain in Taranaki. Archiving was a way to ensure that her taonga would be left to someone who would understand and benefit from them. This meant placing her knowledge in an archive that would value it in the same way she does; she was not confident about that occurring in a public institution. Mako wanted the stories about the taonga to remain connected with their artefacts. For example, a taonga she created with Parihaka kairaranga (weaver) Kathy Phillips for the opening of Puke Ariki Museum Māori Gallery in 2000, *Te Takapou Whāriki o Taranaki* (the sacred woven mat of Taranaki), had been hung under perspex near the gallery entrance with only a brief label explaining its provenance. Mako said that in spite of her offering a great deal more information, this was the only contextual information available at the museum about the piece:

My workbooks showed the progress of it, every step is documented. I added
kōrero [stories] to it … not knowing at the time the people at the
museum – they don't care about things that are given. I thought there
is another way that this little book will be useful. So even though the

---

[183] M2, 0:10:39.9.

whāriki is … at Puke Ariki, the kōrero sits with Te Reo o Taranaki.

There was no place beside the whāriki for it, so it had to go there.[184]

According to Manheim's description of collective memory-making,[185] interviewees for this research have demonstrated a concerted effort to maintain tangible and intangible taonga for future generations. These current kaitiaki defined their entire archival collections as taonga to be retained and shared for the benefit of their immediate families. Inherent in this aspiration was the hope that subsequent generations will use taonga to make new memories for themselves through the process of personal development.

Taonga

Whānau archives are taonga. For this cohort with links to Taranaki, judging the relative value of one taonga over another was not a value in Māori community archiving. Therefore, the hypothesis proposed by this thesis that whānau taonga are any items, objects or things that represent a Māori kin group's ancestral identity[186] was confirmed. The whānau collections surveyed for this research were diverse and comprised both tangible artefacts and intangible knowledge and data. They contained historic fragments that had survived the ravages of colonisation, theft and private collection, as well as comparatively new taonga, to which the current generations were adding stories by including them in notable whānau events. This fitted with Tapsell's

---

[184] M3, 0:42:05.8.

[185] Karl Manheim, 'The Sociological Problem of Generations', in Daniel Levy, Jeffery K. Olick and Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, eds., *The Collective Memory Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 94.

[186] Tapsell, '*The Flight of Pareraut1utu',* 339.

theory that taonga gain prestige and become inalienable in status when they are imbued with story and meaning.

In this research project, the whānau archival collections included a significant number of items that would normally require specialised conservation handling. In addition, they were dispersed, with multiple families often holding individual but related items. For example, two mats that shared the same provenance or belonged to the same ancestor were being cared for by two different families.[187] Connections were made and maintained through their presence at wānanga and their inclusion in family events such as weddings, reunions and tangihanga (funerals). For these whānau archivists, extending the lifespan of an item by placing it in climate-controlled storage was less important than being able to access it whenever they wanted to use it for ceremonial purposes.

Whānau look to their archives for clues about their past and guidance for their future. All of the interviewees in this research were unequivocal that the items and stories comprising their whānau collections were taonga. Papers, photographs, mementos and artefacts were ascribed the same values and intangible cultural heritage as te reo and whakapapa was revered as much as physical artefacts and conventionally or commercially valuable items. However, few of those were still in whānau collections. The interviewees spoke of iwi and hapū artefacts that had been buried and lost to whānau. Some of these were known to have been retrieved and placed in the hands of museums and private collectors; others remained in their hiding places and existed, for now, only in memory. Hinerangi Korewha (H2) described one

---

[187] MT3, 0:11:30.0.

collection that was similar to a significant number of others surveyed in this research:

> In our whānau, we've got a kahu kiwi [ceremonial kiwi feather cloak], a few patu. We've actually got a few kahu [apparel items] but they get looked after at other whānau homes, … photographs, … carvings, paintings and jewellery that we should be looking after properly but we haven't got there yet. And the longer they are there being not looked after properly … they're exposed to the elements.[188]

The dearth of artefacts left within Taranaki families is a notable result of colonisation. As a result, whānau have placed a greater emphasis on some of the intangible taonga that they had easier access to, such as Taranaki reo and tikanga, the region's distinct brand of language and culture. Hokipera Ruakere (H1) mentioned this dearth of artefacts:

> like patu and stuff … growing up in Taranaki. The taonga that I saw and heard was the language … it's always been about what I've heard in my ears. I didn't touch anything; there was nothing to touch. No pounamu [greenstone], no bone carving, no tā moko [traditional tattooing] … no carvings at the marae.[189]

Hokipera recalled that because of this, whānau had created their own taonga from natural resources such as land and rocks. She had not known why there were so few taonga in Taranaki until she started working as a host at Puke Ariki Museum in her twenties and learned about the Land Wars.[190] Matiu Paul

---

[188] H2, 0:57:19.0.
[189] M2, 0:04:55.0.
[190] H1, 0:53:09.5.

(M2) echoed Hokipera's claim that colonisation, collectors and time had left few taonga tūturu in collective spaces such as wharenui and marae.

> We're Ngāpuhi and a lot of us don't have the carvings, similar to [Ngāti] Mutunga. We never stayed in one place too long. My tupuna Hongi Hika was always on the move, he never had a place to stay. I've never been into a [Ngāpuhi] marae, apart from Waitangi, where there were carvings. All the taonga were kept in homes.[191]

The loss of taonga through colonisation has led to a wider definition of what constitutes a valuable taonga than the definition that would be applied in mainstream museums. In this research group, tangible and intangible taonga were equally revered and anything embodying or containing ao Māori knowledge could be classified as taonga. Both Ria Waikerepuru (R2) and Hokipera Ruakere (H1) traced their impetus to collect and care for family history to the organised retention and transmission of traditional knowledge, notably in the taking of their tūturu (traditional) names in the 1990s. This was a historically significant period for Taranaki Māori and they both recalled the influences of this period as being pivotal. Hokipera was born Jessica in 1997 'and then four years later this taonga, this name Hokipera that was in our whakapapa, was brought back into life and put into me'. She cited the significance of the return of the glottal stop (') to symbolise the aspirated 'h' that is heard in the Taranaki dialect of te reo Māori, changing the written form of 'wh' words to w' (e.g. w'anau instead of whānau). Hokipera said these social changes were another way of archiving Taranaki kōrero hītori (history) that had been lost. 'For a long time that language, those names, those kōrero

---

[191] M2, 0:23:01.0.

karakia [prayers and incantations], they were absent, and then they were brought back. So for me that was the beginning of my archiving'.[192]

Ria (R2) took her Māori name in the same year that Hokipera was born.

> It was 1997 when I changed my name to Ria Waihape Waikerepuru. And that took a bit of thinking about. When my father Huirangi changed his name to the name his kuia gave him, I observed how people responded to that and it created a lot of discussion. It was at a time when not all Māori were ready to start claiming back their identity.[193]

Reversing the legacy of taonga being stolen, buried and placed into public institutions was one of the aspirations that the interviewees linked with their interpretation of community archiving. While this movement had now been in place for decades, both Hokipera and Ria described their use of community archiving techniques as a continuation of the cultural revitalisation efforts of their parents and elders. In Ria's case, this was the Māori language revitalisation work of her father Huirangi Waikerepuru. For Hokipera, these figureheads were recalled as wāhine toa, grandmothers, mothers and aunties whose efforts restored te reo Māori for three generations of Ruakere whānau within a single generation. She recalls this revitalisation being led by her mother Roena, who was part of a collective effort within Taranaki whānui, emphasising language and culture, which gained momentum through the 1990s. 'It was just a normal thing that we all started to just do, without really, pea [perhaps], realising what we were doing.'[194]

---

[192] H2, 0:03:39.7.
[193] R2, 0:07:21.7.
[194] H2, 0:05:18.1.

The dearth of physical artefacts available for whānau archiving had shifted preservation efforts to oral history. Matiu Paul (M3) said the most significant taonga for his iwi now was the kōrero that could be captured from their knowledge holders. He explained that this was now more of a concern for his whānau than caring for physical artefacts:

Kapo kōrero [capturing oral history] is the only way to go. I don't know of any taonga where I come from. Apart from Mataatua waka which we can go and see [at its resting place at Tākou Bay, north of Kerikeri] all the time. Our only taonga are photos in the wharenui and the caves where they keep the bones. And that's tapu [sacred].[195]

Matiu's view on the urgency of recording the knowledge holders was consistent across all of the generations represented in this study. They all emphasised the importance of stories coming from trusted sources within families and that many of those sources were now very old. More than two-thirds of the interviewees reported that learning oral history recording was a primary motivation for their archiving practice. They rated formal interviewing as a method for augmenting kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face) sharing, a mode of communication that is difficult to achieve when families are geographically distant from marae and papakāinga. Āria Broughton (A1) said for this reason, a balance between old and new modes of transmitting knowledge must be struck.[196]

From the outset of her archive skills training in 2014, Hokipera Ruakere (H1) focused her study on oral history practice. She developed a method for

---

[195] M2, 0:23:01.0.
[196] A1, 0:22:51.7.

recording and processing interviews with kaumātua by adapting the rules of recording for archival preservation with methods that she knew would suit her kaumātua. 'Yes, I used the tools of te ao Pākehā to ensure that the recordings were safe, that their kōrero was safe, that it would be looked after'. She concluded that she must have achieved 'a Māori way of working, or this generation wouldn't have agreed to share kōrero'.[197] Hokipera noted that encouraging her interviewees to be honest and open in storytelling was just as important as acting swiftly to record the kaumātua. She emphasised that while the knowledge holders should be mindful of what they are sharing, they should not change their dialogue for the sake of others.

Sharing is about pono, being honest … our whanaunga [relatives] need the ability, the compassion, the hononga [relationships] to be able to do that. Kei te mate haere [death is imminent], the people who have these stories are dying. And that is my sense of urgency, to get out there and kapo kōrero [capture oral history].[198]

Thus, taonga that could not necessarily be seen or held but embodied Māori world views were critical to whānau archiving in Taranaki. The dearth of physical artefacts available in the wake of colonisation had led whānau to redouble their caretaking efforts around their language, stories and the names they gave themselves, their children and their grandchildren. This focus on intangible taonga had created particular training needs for whānau archivists, with digital recording and preservation skills at the top of their list for training priorities.

---

[197] H1, 0:11:16.7.
[198] H1, 0:28:45.0.

Conservation of taonga

Around a third of the interviewees had sought training because they were responsible for an inherited collection or particular taonga. The whānau archivists prioritised tikanga and negotiated decision making more than the technical processes. For example, both the McClutchie and Waikerepuru whānau projects stipulated that taonga should not be shifted away from home for digitisation. This was more important to these families than having optimal lighting or adhering to meticulous standards for archival practice. Mako Jones (M3) said this kind of compromise was critical in whānau archiving, because 'Māori people don't adhere to rules, they adhere to tikanga. You've got to live it before you understand … and it's really hard'.[199]

The interviewees had sought archiving techniques so they could understand the conservation needs of their collections. These included opening boxes, assessing contents, taking photographs and taonga off walls for the first time in many years, and stocktaking the digital files stored in varied places on old devices. Retrieval, back-up and storage of audio and video recordings was identified as a pressing conservation need.

Box-making and storage techniques for taonga were listed among the most useful skills that the interviewees had gained from their archiving courses. Some of them had attended a taonga conservation course in New Plymouth in 2016, delivered in partnership with National Services Te Paerangi, a small team giving practical and strategic help (and limited financial support) to iwi archiving and community museums around the country. They emphasised the value of this session with Māori experts on a local marae, referring to the

---

[199] M3, 0:11:45.4.

tangible outcomes for their taonga and the confidence they had gained with regard to storage methods.

The whānau artefacts that were presented at this course for assessment, conservation and packing were piupiu (waist to knees garment made of flax), a muka (prepared flax fibre) cloak, woven whāriki (mats), a piu hieke (large coarse cloak of rough flax), a rāpaki kilt (traditional garment worn from the waist to the knees), kākahu (apparel), korowai (ornamental or ceremonial cloaks), kete (baskets), taiaha (long wooden weapon) and whakairo (carvings).[200] Te Papa textile conservator and weaver Rangituatahi Te Kanawa led the whānau through packing and conservation techniques for a diverse range of taonga. National Services Te Paerangi supplied the materials and in addition, supported a 2015 wānanga in New Plymouth on the indigenous digital-archiving system, Mukurtu.

Appropriate care and conservation for physical artefacts was a responsibility that sat heavily with the interviewees. Most of the tangible taonga above were being for in family homes and as noted earlier, there was no inclination to keep them in places such as local museums or purpose-built archiving facilities. Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (N3) said she knew of many more 'things shoved in boxes under the bed'.[201] She said she got a thrill from learning how to care for something that had belonged to her grandparents, from knowing how to keep things safe on location in the family homestead. Her cousin Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) supported her elder's view. She has never wished

---

[200] As described by participant whānau on their wānanga registration records: Te Paerangi National Services and Te Reo o Taranaki, 2016.
[201] N3, 0:21:19.9.

for the whānau taonga to be anywhere but at home, ideally in a whare renovated to stop the weather getting in.

I still believe that can happen, but [the] people I need to help aren't ready …
    that would take trust. Our taonga are in the house that our
    great-grandfather built … and the house is getting old. It is about
    money, but it's more about us thinking Māori, thinking as whānau, not
    thinking I, me, him or she, but *us* – all of us. The taonga belong to us
    and we can do this together.[202]

Only one interviewee thought their archival collections would be better off in a third-party repository. Thus, archiving terms such as conservation and preservation had new meanings in the context of Māori community archiving.

Conclusion

This chapter has introduced three generations of Māori archivists from Taranaki who had taken part in community training programmes. It has established their motivations for seeking archiving skills to help them care for whānau collections and the way the training they received had measured up against their expectations. It has discussed interviewee perspectives via the interpretative framework provided by the three key concepts of whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and taonga.

The next chapter provides a more practical archiving perspective by presenting a series of case studies drawn from three whānau archiving projects. The three themes of whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and taonga were a basis for analysing the case study data drawn from the oral history

---

[202] T2, 0:32:02.7.

interviews and considering how they linked back to the three main research

questions for this thesis.

Chapter 3: Case studies

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the findings of three whānau archiving case studies drawn from a selection of the examples introduced in Chapter 2. The chapter begins with a collective overview of the three cases before moving on to examine each one in turn. This is followed by a discussion of the research findings in relation to the key concepts of whanaungatanga (family relationships), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and taonga (treasured items).

The projects profiled here are the Waikerepuru whānau digital archive, the McClutchie whānau digitisation and oral history project and the Ngā Ariki hapū wānanga and taonga repatriation ventures. These three cases were selected for what they revealed about the training and development needs of the whānau archivists who were leading these projects. In addition, they demonstrated three critical points that distinguish whānau archiving from community archiving. First, they embodied the collective nature of kaitiakitanga and decision making that distinguishes Māori methodologies. Second, they were examples of projects that would not have taken place outside a home-based setting. Finally, they all exemplified the important role that taonga archives play in reuniting families who have dispersed around Aotearoa New Zealand and overseas.

All of the interviewees profiled in these cases required some aspect of archival skills development in order to achieve the intended outcomes for their whānau projects. All of these collections contained taonga that had been handed down in trust from generation to generation and in some

instances, artefacts that had been buried, withheld or handed over to museums for safekeeping. This section examines what these whānau archivists understood about these historic decisions, which were at odds with the interviewees' preferred methods for contemporary collection management, and the implications of them for their family's access.

Two of these case studies referred to other taonga, which were related to their families' private collections, being in institutional care. This offered the opportunity to examine the reasons for home-based care being the preferred method when other options for collection care were available to them. One case study highlighted the fact that Government legislation was a barrier to the family's desired outcomes for their taonga: an example of the dichotomy between public rules of practice and traditional kaitiakitanga.

Case studies – an overview

The groups profiled in these case studies were the Waikerepuru whānau, the McClutchie whānau and the Ngā Ariki hapū. Collectively, these case studies represented three generations of women who were intent on keeping alive the knowledge within their whānau archives for future generations, as well as using these taonga to reunite their families. They had all completed a year or more of training through Te Pūtē Routiriata community archive in New Plymouth and all had gained Level 4 to 6 credits for programmes or papers on the New Zealand Qualifications Authority framework before 2017. These case studies were drawn from Taranaki north and south and each family claimed to have a significant proportion of their relatives residing outside the geographic area. All of them had turned to archiving as a solution for overcoming distance and arresting the loss of family connection that

accompanies physical separation. In two of these cases, several members of the same whānau had trained together in order to lead their family's physical and digital collection management.

The kaitiaki from the McClutchie whānau quoted in this chapter are Kuia Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (N3) and her younger cousin Tania Hodges-Paul (T2). These women were two of the three whānau-nominated coordinators of their family history project *He Taura Herenga, He Tāngata Tiaki Taonga*.[203] This digitisation and oral history project was conducted from 2014 to 2016 around a papakāinga (homestead) in north Taranaki. Their archival collection represented six generations of a family from the Ngāti Mutunga and Ngāti Tama tribes.

The people in the other two case studies were from southern Taranaki. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) had links to Ngāti Ruanui iwi and Taiporohēnui marae through her father Huirangi. His archival collection was the basis for her whānau project. The youngest interviewee in these case studies, Āria Broughton (A1), was in her early thirties and affiliated to Waipapa Marae north-west of Whanganui, a stronghold of the Ngā Ariki hapū of Ngā Rauru Kiitahi iwi. Āria was a recent arrival to the Taranaki region. Her involvement in archiving for her hapū was part of her process of settling into her ancestral home and gaining the knowledge she needed to raise her children according to Taranaki reo (language) and tikanga (customs).

All of these women had focused on making their projects multigenerational and involving young and old equally in planning and delivery. Each of them

---

[203] McClutchie Whānau, *He Taura Herenga, He Tāngata Tiaki Taonga*, self-published booklet, 2016. The title translates as *The Ties that Bind These People in Caring for Our Taonga.*

introduced the strengthening of their unique Māori identity as a value, an outcome and an aspiration for their archiving efforts.

Case Study 1 – The Waikerepuru whānau digital archive

The Waikerepuru whānau case illustrated the value of keeping whānau archives accessible on home ground rather than in an institutional collection, at arm's length from the family. Institutional deposit was a viable option for Te Huirangi Waikerepuru's private collection. Spanning more than half a century of teaching, research and te reo Māori activism, the Te Huirangi Eruera Waikerepuru Collection was a mixture of personal and political artefacts and records, documenting Huirangi's life work advocating for te reo Māori, iwi and indigenous causes, and education. Whānau photographs were in boxes along with speeches and word lists; home-made teaching resources sat among official family papers; agendas from iwi, hapū and Government meetings were inked with hand-drawn notes, compositions of waiata and karakia. Ria explained that these notations added new layers of meaning to routine board papers. She said the whānau would not know the true significance of them until they had conducted deeper analysis; meantime, they believed that everything in the Te Huirangi Eruera Waikerepuru Collection was significant. She believed this view was shared by other collectors with an interest in the causes that Huirangi had championed, in particular the topic of language revitalisation. Huirangi had been among those involved in lodging claims with the New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, which led to te reo Māori gaining recognition as an official language, as well as the establishment of Māori broadcasting. He had helped to establish Te Reo o Taranaki, the charitable trust that led to the genesis of the community

archive that was a focus of this research.[204] His archival collection contained many historical fragments documenting this trajectory for te reo Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Huirangi's professional work already features in many mainstream archival collections. For example, the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington holds a set of recordings from Huirangi's work as a broadcaster with Te Ūpoko o Te Ika radio station between 1983 and 1994.[205] The objects, writings, oral history and ephemera in Huirangi's personal files would be sought-after additions to such a public collection. However, institutional deposit was not considered by the family, as they did not want to lose their total control in exchange for help with digitisation and digital archiving. Huirangi's unexplored archives were more important to them as a means of filling gaps in their own knowledge of their father and grandfather's life. In addition, Ria Waikerepuru (R2) was concerned that her family would lose the ability to place their own emphasis on the contents of Huirangi's collection and as a result, the intrinsic meaning to her mokopuna (grandchildren) would be obscured by institutional arrangement and description. Ria cited the example of one item in the whānau collection, a single A4-sized handwritten note from Huirangi to his first mokopuna, detailing this child's ancestral connections to his Taranaki tupuna (ancestors), maunga (mountain), waka (canoe), awa (river) and whenua (land) in the form of a pepeha (family tribal saying). Ria explained

---

[204] 'Five Prominent Māori Leaders Share Lifetime Award', *Māori Television*, July 14, 2018, https://www.maoritelevision.com/news/regional/five-prominent-maori-leaders-share-lifetime-award-commitment-te-reo-and-tikanga.

[205] See the library's collection listings for 'Te Upoko o Te Ika Māori Radio Collection', accessed May 2, 2019, https://natlib.govt.nz/collections/a-z/te-upoko-o-te-ika-maori-radio-collection.

why such a 'humble little card'[206] had been given such prominence in Huirangi's collection:

Ko Aotea[207] is so significant to us, it's our cornerstone, and if our mokopuna

   know no other waiata, *Ko Aotea* is the one that secures us to

   Taiporohēnui [marae], to Hāpotiki [hapū], to Pikiwāhine [hapū original

   home base and the name of a taonga]. It's huge. This humble

   handwritten note is so significant and there is so much more [to it].

   Those fragments are beginning to create the platform, the

   consolidation for ourselves as a whānau.[208]

Being able to express Māori values in classifying archives and setting shared pathways were among the reasons the Waikerepuru whānau opted to use Mukurtu, rather than other digital-archiving software Ria knew of through her professional role as a Māori subject librarian. While it is not Māori in design, Mukurtu is an open-source platform designed with indigenous communities for managing and sharing digital heritage. This platform allows tribal archivists to adopt a bespoke approach to the rules of engagement for individual items and to set access protocols to match them. Ria was intent on only the whānau having the mana (agency) to arrange and describe Huirangi's collection and to add related narratives.

Another reason Ria opted for whānau, rather than institutional, archiving was the volume of intimate family information interspersed within her father's professional archives. She drew on the Mukurtu system's use of 'traditional

---

[206] R2, 0:45:49.4.

[207] Here, Ria abbreviated the first line of the whānau pepeha (tribal saying) *Ko Aotea te waka*, which links them to the ancestral canoe *Aotea* that brought Turi and his people from Hawaiki, eventually arriving in Taranaki. R2, 0:45:49.4.

[208] R2, 0:45:49.4.

knowledge' labels to distinguish this content within the family's digital archive; a label could sit alongside an item's metadata to distinguish archival material with personal or cultural sensitivities. The text accompanying this label instructs users as follows:

Care is to be taken when this material is accessed, used and circulated, especially when materials are first returned or reunited with communities of origin. In some instances, this label will indicate that there are specific permissions for use of this material required directly from the community itself.[209]

The whānau taonga Pikiwāhine was one example of a database entry bearing this traditional knowledge label. Pikiwāhine represented several notable aspects of whānau heritage, both tangible and intangible. It was a 'mere pounamu' (short, flat greenstone weapon) with two incarnations that Ria knew about. The first taonga to bear this name had been buried in a reservoir by her tupuna and never retrieved; the second Pikiwāhine was a replacement purchased around two decades ago. Both of these mere bore the name of the original hapū papakāinga. Today, one of Huirangi's great-great-grandchildren carries the name Pikiwāhine, the first in the family to do so. Pikiwāhine was also the name of a hapū whare wānanga (house of learning), according to a fragment of inherited knowledge that Ria's brother recently added to this taonga's database record. Ria cited this shared piece of knowledge as an example of the way her whānau archiving aspirations were connected to her whānau development aspirations.

---

[209] The online resource developed by Anderson and Christen for traditional knowledge labelling contains the templates that Ria Waikerepuru developed for her whānau archiving project, accessed May 2, 2019, http://localcontexts.org/tk/cs/1.0.

Ria deliberately built the digital archive around the principle of all-of-whānau participation. Rather than prescribing roles, she encouraged each person to assume a responsibility that interested them, or to share some of the knowledge that she knew still existed within living memory.[210] For example, one daughter had been drawn to the family photographs, another to the clothing and jewellery in the collection. Ria's husband helped her to navigate the complex technical information associated with digitisation formats and data uploads, as she admitted she is 'not [the] quickest on the uptake on digital stuff'.[211] She concluded that while she had taken a lead organising role in her whānau archiving project, its successes could be attributed to this collective effort. She cited the whakataukī (proverbial saying), 'ehara tēnei he toa takitahi, he toa takitini' to illustrate the way achieving the milestones for Huirangi's taonga over the last three years of work had been the triumph of many. 'It felt right to acknowledge everybody who helped with all aspects of the mahi [work]'.[212]

In a presentation she gave at a conference for Māori librarians in 2018, Ria coined the concept of 'whānau-led collection management',[213] which encompasses several key aspects of the Māori community archiving characterised in this case study. These include whanaungatanga and the inherited caretaking responsibilities handed down from generation to generation. Within this concept, Ria reclaimed whānau in its truest Māori sense to distinguish her practice from non-Māori family archiving. In this

---

[210] R2, 0:28:28.4.

[211] R2, 0:16:56.4.

[212] R2, 0:48:56.6.

[213] Ria Waikerepuru presenter abstract for Te Rōpū Whakahou Māori Librarians' Conference, 2018, accessed May 19, 2019, https://trw.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/180920-Family-led-Ria.pdf.

context, whānau denotes whakapapa (genealogy) relationships, whereas the related term, whanaungatanga, indicates closeness forged through shared experiences, working together, friendship or reciprocity. In this sense, the term 'whānau-led collection management' describes all of these case studies [214] and implies a requirement for professional or semi-professional training to support archiving initiatives conducted at home. In her interview for this research, Ria said this distinction was critical if taonga were to remain accessible to whānau while they did their own arrangement and description, making their own distinctions between private and public, family and professional work.

One aspect of the Waikerepuru whānau case study that was universal to these three case studies was the connection that they established between archiving 'in a kaupapa Māori way'[215] and language revitalisation. Ria likened working with archival taonga to the strengthened use of te reo Māori, specifically its Taranaki variant. Ria and her fellow community archivists wanted to describe their collections for digital archiving as whānau-led collection management, prioritising cultural narratives over the use of standardised, non-Māori subject headings for metadata.[216] Similarly, she used established Māori methods for developing an approach to digitising Huirangi's collection for import into the family's digital archive. The approaches she drew on were the Pei te Hurinui Jones project, run by

---

[214] Where the term whānau is used in direct quotes, the interview context provides the interviewee's intended meaning.

[215] R2, 0:07:21.7.

[216] The Society of American Archivists' definition for metadata is 'data about data … used to locate or manage information resources by abstracting or classifying those resources or by capturing information not inherent in the resource', https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/m/metadata.

researchers from Te Pua Wānanga (University of Waikato) Library,[217] and the McClutchie whānau digitisation project, which is also part of this research. The common factor between Ria's approach and the McClutchie project is the intention to restrict access to the family's digitised taonga to immediate whānau and to maintain total control over who could amend the information in the digital heritage records. Her motivation was not to exclude anyone. Rather, she wanted to make sure that the information the family has to draw on is correct and can confirm, rather than challenge, their self-identity.

> To give them a connectedness … to Huirangi and where they position themselves in the landscape as his mokopuna, as descendants of Hāpotiki, as descendants of Ngāti Moeahu, Ngāti Haupoto, Ngāti Te Whiti. We have had our struggles as whānau of knowing where we are in the overall scheme of things.[218] … Now that the archive has shape and structure, everyone can feel good and secure … for our own everyday living.[219]

Confirming a family's personal identity in such a way is an unlikely priority for institutional archives with a focus on creating collections for public access. Therefore, Ria was determined that the Waikerepuru collection would remain firmly under her control for now.[220]

---

[217] Whaanga et al., 'He Whare Hangarau'; Anderson, 'Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori'.

[218] R2, 0:04:24.1.

[219] R2, 0:28:28.4.

[220] R2, 0:34:57.1.

Case Study 2 – The McClutchie whānau digitisation project

Titled *He Taura Herenga, He Tāngata Tiaki Taonga*,[221] the McClutchie family

history project placed whānau archival practice firmly on home ground and

illustrated the strong connection between taonga (treasured items), whenua

(land) and papakāinga (original home base). In addition, it exemplified some

of the internal whānau and technical challenges that had to be overcome to

do the type of archiving that Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) wanted for this project.

Like the Waikerepuru project, the McClutchie archiving case study was a

whānau-led collection management approach, characterised by several

generations learning and working together and by efforts to capture

knowledge about taonga from within the family.

Initiated by Tania's drive to keep her historic whānau collection intact, this

project encompassed several strands of archiving expertise, including

digitisation, conservation and oral history recording. To learn these skills,

Tania joined one of the first archiving courses run by Te Reo o Taranaki in

2014. She sought ways to approach caring for a very fragile collection that

was housed in the whānau papakāinga at Mimitanguatua[222] in north Taranaki.

The collection contained artefacts from six generations and comprised

images, manuscripts, weaving, trophies and mementos. It was notable for

around eight dozen photographs, many of which were elaborately mounted

and permanently displayed in one room of the homestead. Tania knew the

identity of the people in the photos because her grandparents, Tiaki and

Esme, had told her stories about them when she was a girl. She had noticed

---

[221] McClutchie Whānau, *He Taura Herenga*.

[222] Used interchangeably in interviews with the abbreviated form, Mimi.

that some of the photographs were losing condition and items had gone missing from the parlour after her grandparents died.

> The whare [house] that my great-grandfather built, Te Kapinga McClutchie …
> is over 130 years old. The photos are in the lounge – my grandfather
> called it the parlour. It has original wallpaper … the room is traditional,
> quite special too. There are large tupuna [ancestor] photographs of my
> grandparents' parents, their children, my grandparents' siblings,
> Mum's siblings and some of their children. The frames are unique.[223]

In spite of the urgent need for special conservation handling of this collection, the McClutchie whānau were unwilling to allow their taonga to leave the premises. Nor were they willing to exchange sole ownership for the specialised digitisation skills they could have sought from their local museum. Tania noted that her first challenge was bringing her family together to seek agreement to organise a digitisation wānanga on site at the whānau papakāinga. There were some difficult conversations. She understood the reasons for the McClutchie whānau being 'understandably precious' about their taonga, but she said in addition, some family members responded negatively to the use of customary practices such as karanga (ceremonial calls), karakia (incantations) and waiata (chants and song) while working with the taonga.

> That was all challenged. When I did the karanga, I was asked why I did a
> karanga to my own tūpuna [ancestors]. Why did I challenge my
> tūpuna? I said 'I didn't, the karanga was an acknowledgement and
> thanks'. Others didn't like Te Amaroa [young cousin] being whaikōrero

---

[223] T2, 0:08:10.0.

[orator], but nobody else could do it. He might be young but he has the skills.[224]

The difficulty that Tania described in talking to her whānau about caring for their collection using customary protocol was a symptom of family ties loosened through geographical dispersion and a loss of traditional knowledge because of colonisation. Gaining the confidence to broach these barriers was one of the skills she gained from her training in community archiving methods. Another was knowing when to step back and create space, rather than pushing against the collective will of her whānau; for example, she tempered her own eagerness to put the digitised photograph collection into an online archive when that action was not supported by the wider family. In spite of the many hours of work she had put into preparing the digitised photograph collection for this step, she was pragmatic about letting the idea rest until everyone was comfortable with it. Tania's decision not to pursue this outcome was shared by her cousin Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu (N3). She noted that while she, too, would have liked the collection to be accessible in a database, she did not want to 'step on any toes' or risk the family judging her as a 'know-all', saying, 'I understand where the decision was coming from.[225] … They are not just an image; these are our people'.[226]

These two kaitiaki were aware that pushing their family into an unfamiliar archiving practice would only serve to reinforce the fears they had harboured about digitisation in the first place: fears of losing control over their remaining tangible links to the ancestors of their whānau. Instead, a shift in focus to

---

[224] T2, 0:53:10.1.

[225] N3, 0:27:15.3.

[226] N3, 0:23:53.2.

linking digitisation and oral history recording was an acceptable means of strengthening the family's collection of tangible artefacts by attaching their stories to them. Just as the archiving project was reuniting the McClutchie whānau on home ground, these previously unshared stories about the family's taonga archives were restoring their descendants to living memory. Until the archiving project occurred, Ngāiwikau was unsure about who was pictured in the family photographs. She wished she had listened more closely to her grandfather when he was telling her stories about them. With him no longer alive, she turned to her elders for that information while they were still able to share it, making the most of the opportunity to 'keep my whānau intact'.

Oral history recording was an ongoing feature of the McClutchie project, with around half a dozen recordings completed at the time of the interviews. In this case study, the significance of prioritising oral history recording alongside the digitisation of physical artefacts illustrated the interconnectedness of tangible (artefacts) and intangible (knowledge) taonga. Tania expressed significant anxiety about the responsibility she felt to 'capture the memories and recollections of my Mum, aunties and uncles before they pass on. I think a lot of my uncles and aunties could but they're at that age where they're forgetting a lot, so they're afraid to share'.[227]

Oral history interview training helped to grow her confidence to the point where she could gather stories from her elders while they were 'still in a good space'.[228] Having printouts of the digitised whānau photograph booklet helped as a prompt for eliciting memories. She likened interviewing her

---

[227] T2, 1:20:14.9.
[228] T2, 1:15:52.0.

kaumātua Davis McClutchie to 'finding a puzzle piece to put in the right place'. She regretted finding time for only a brief group session with him before he died in December 2018. 'He was the only one that could fill those gaps for us. Hopefully, when the time's right, my cousins and I can get together and fill in a few more spaces. He had so much knowledge'.[229]

Generally, strict adherence to standards of archival best practice is at odds with whānau archiving methods. The example above contextualises this argument, highlighting the urgent need to conduct important interviews promptly in the case of recording elders, capturing them when and where the opportunity arises. This may mean capturing an interview with a mobile phone or tablet as a compromise, rather than using professional recording equipment. In one case this researcher is aware of, a van that was used to pick up and drop off kaumātua was fitted with microphones to make the recording process regular and as unobtrusive as possible.[230] The interviewees for this research pointed to the lack of free, or at least affordable, access to equipment such as video cameras, digital recorders and microphones as a barrier to meeting best-practice archival standards such as those set out in the *National Oral History Association Code of Technical and Ethical Practice*.[231] Thus, institutional standards can be an obstacle for Māori archiving. It follows that the outcomes deemed successes in the McClutchie whānau case study could not be measured by the same yardstick used in mainstream community archiving.

---

[229] T2, 1:20:14.9.

[230] Personal communication with Te Poihi Campbell, 2014. The kaumātua were aware they were being recorded and had given their consent for this set-up.

[231] 'Code of Ethical and Technical Practice', NOHANZ, last reviewed 2001, http://oralhistory.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/code.pdf.

The way digitisation was carried out for this case study was another example of the impact of adaptive archiving practice. By institutional standards, much expensive remedial conservation was recommended for their collection. Instead, the McClutchie whānau opted for 'as is, where is' digitisation to mitigate the threat of total loss through deterioration or disaster. In this case, digitisation was both a preservation and a conservation strategy, with digital restoration in Photoshop the only viable option for this large collection with its complex and long-deferred maintenance needs. Mould, insect dirt and borer were noted in many of the photographs and frames. Over the course of a weekend, high-resolution images were taken of more than 80 photographs, with all the work done in situ at the papakāinga. National Services Te Paerangi[232] and Sustainable Heritage Network[233] guides for field digitisation were used as a starting point for planning the field shoot. Lighting and digital camera rigs were adapted for the confined space of the parlour. Oversized frames and curved glass casings created technical challenges that took much of the first day to resolve. Issues arising during the process were referred to whānau for resolution. Tania recalled that rather than sticking to the rulebook, those in charge 'thought about everybody's wants and needs … took it real slow and we were all happy with the outcome'.[234] By conventional standards, the quality of digitisation would not have met preservation criteria. By whānau standards, the project was an unmitigated success and led to the self-publication of a family history booklet.

---

[232] 'Digitising Collections', part of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa 'How To Guides' series, accessed October 25, 2019, https://www.tepapa.govt.nz/learn/for-museums-and-galleries/how-guides/collection-management/digitising-collections.

[233] 'Guide to Digitization Planning', Sustainable Heritage Network, accessed April 24, 2019, https://www.sustainableheritagenetwork.org/digital-heritage/digitization-planning.

[234] T2, 0:15:34.9.

The photographs digitised for the McClutchie whānau project have reunited the family's weavers with the techniques and traditions of their pou kuia (prominent female elder), Te Araroa, by helping them understand how she drew resources from the family farm to create the taonga they were now caring for. Kākahu (clothing items) woven by Te Araroa had been made from flax grown on the property and dyed in a paru (natural mud pigment that stains fibres black) source near the homestead. In 2017, Tania and Ngāiwikau ventured out on the land with textile conservator Rangi Te Kanawa in search of their grandmother's paru source. While their efforts to locate the site were unsuccessful, the women agreed that this exercise got the family learning together and talking with new knowledge about how to care for their taonga.[235] Ngāiwikau concluded that this experience would influence the way she looked after her own raranga (weaving) and kete (woven baskets). 'I want to ensure the weaving is looked after properly … it's too late for some taonga, but we have been shown how so there is no excuse for not trying now'.[236]

Another way of looking after taonga that were deteriorating was by making new from old. Ngāiwikau had started replicating Te Araroa's designs in her own contemporary work and planned to use a poutama pattern (stepped arrangement) from a photograph of Te Kapinga McClutchie that hangs on the wall in the homestead. Being able to create living connections between the past and present was a valuable outcome of the whānau archiving project that was bringing 'deeper meaning'[237] to her craft. Ngāiwikau had not known

---

[235] N3, 1:29:02.0.

[236] N3, 0:57:42.1.

[237] N3, 1:02:10.8.

that her kuia was also a weaver until she helped to digitise the family's photographic collection and found images of Te Araroa weaving harakeke (flax) on the outside deck of the homestead. Another digitised image shows Te Araroa holding her baby daughter Maata, who is wearing an infant's piupiu and shoulder sash woven by her mother. This taonga is still cared for by the whānau, while the baby in the photograph has assumed her mother's place as one of the family's pou kuia.

This case study illustrated the collective nature of whānau archiving and the subtle way the work of archiving could play a role in reuniting families. Physically coming together was critical to overcoming the challenges related to negotiating archiving objectives and the methods to employ to achieve them. This process needed to be led by whānau, away from the glare of camera lights cued ready for digitisation – a process that could be time consuming and expensive if quantified against a per-hour rate for equipment hire or expert technical support.

In spite of the challenges it created for her role as whānau archivist, Tania considered consensus decision making a strength rather than a weakness of the McClutchie model and an important part of determining how Māori care for their taonga. For example, she spoke about the process her family followed to determine sharing protocols for their whānau photograph booklet, *He Taura Herenga, He Tāngata Tiaki Taonga.*[238] Names, dates of birth and death, and stories about friends and relatives in the photographs were collected during the digitisation session. The data were captured in a spreadsheet that was later drawn on for copy for the booklet. Tania described

---

[238] McClutchie Whānau, *He Taura Herenga*.

the resulting self-published first edition as a working draft that family were encouraged to correct, corroborate and add information to. As editor, she would prefer the information to be in a more manageable format than hard copy, as she was finding it difficult to keep up with all the changes she was receiving. In addition, some family members found printing and postage costs prohibitively expensive. One solution Tania proposed was to put the digitised collection into a private database, allowing people to add to their records independently. However, the wider whānau vetoed this suggestion at the third project wānanga, proposing instead that a single copy of the booklet should be printed to stay in the parlour alongside the original photographs. After extensive debate, the whānau ultimately agreed that hard copies could be printed on demand and distributed to immediate family in Aotearoa and overseas. This shift would not have occurred without consensus decision making, which brought the additional benefit of a new closeness between the participants.[239]

Case Study 3 – Ngā Ariki hapū wānanga and taonga repatriation

Reuniting geographically dispersed relatives on their ancestral land by sharing stories was both a strategy and an outcome for the Ngā Ariki hapū archiving project. This project comprised two key strands: a series of wānanga on the hapū whenua in Waitōtara, north-west of Whanganui, and the search for a set of carvings that had been buried in a swamp during the Taranaki Land Wars and were still absent from the restored hapū wharenui (ceremonial house), Ngā Paiaka.[240] In this case, homecoming served as a

---

[239] T2, 0:63:55.0.

[240] Merania Karauria, 'Fight to Keep Marae on Ancestral Lands', *Whanganui Chronicle*, October 24, 2011, accessed April 25, 2019,

catalyst for action for project coordinator Āria Broughton (A1), whose entry into community archiving coincided with her family's decision to shift to Taranaki, the ancestral homeland she barely knew. A visit to her hapū marae, Waipapa, while she was still living in Christchurch, sparked her interest in learning more about her identity and having the right knowledge to share with her two young sons. Āria had arrived at the marae expecting a routine hapū trust meeting; instead, she gained life-changing insights from meeting her kaumātua, Potonga Neilson. These insights prompted her to return to Taranaki with her family and learn about her Taranakitanga,[241] something she was only vaguely aware of before her kaumātua lit a fire in her belly. That fire was for capturing hapū stories to share with her relatives who could not pack up and move home as she had, as well as supporting Neilson's efforts to locate a set of carvings long absent from their rightful place on Ngā Paiaka.

The close relationship that Āria described with her kaumātua confirmed that Māori community archiving was whānau archiving and as such, it was distinguished by inherited caretaking responsibilities that had been handed down from generation to generation. Neilson is a prominent Ngā Rauru Kiitahi kaumātua with a vision for his hapū to return to living on their ancestral land at Waitōtara. In his 80s at the time of writing, he is the namesake and descendant of Potonga Kaiawha, whose wife Tōmairangi was renowned for her discovery of 'the most famous axe in native history',[242] Te Āwhiorangi, which had been found on the sacred hill, Te Tieke, near Waitōtara.

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/wanganui-chronicle/news/article.cfm?c_id=1503426&objectid=10954441.

[241] Taranaki reo and tikanga, denoting whakapapa links. O'Carroll, 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi', 49.

[242] Unknown, 'Two-handed Axe', *Otago Daily Times*, issue 19105, February 26, 1924, accessed May 6, 2019, https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/ODT19240226.2.113.

In 2011, Neilson had championed the shift of Ngā Paiaka out of the Waitōtara River flood zone to higher ground on Papatupu, where it now overlooks the ancient Te Poronui Pā, with views towards Mt Taranaki. In a 2011 newspaper report, Neilson described the site as 'this little piece of land that [Ngā Ariki hapū] still own'.[243] Āria said when she learned of her elder's quest to locate the hapū's missing carvings and return them to their original place on the relocated wharenui, she 'was totally in awe of him. I found him really compelling … he made me think perhaps I could do something'.[244] Āria drew on the professional skills she had gained as a broadcasting student to support Neilson. Community archive training was another means of acquiring the skills and equipment she needed to put their plans to bring people home into action.

She described her role as being the 'hands, feet and mouth' for Neilson's efforts to organise a series of hapū wānanga. After securing some funding from the Ngā Rauru Kiitahi iwi rūnanga (tribal council) to run these sessions in Waitōtara, her next task was motivating whānau to travel home for them.

All I did was create a great pānui [newsletter] and got a buzz going. We had more than 30 people at the first wānanga, important people who came and checked out what was going on. We had an awesome turnout, and before that, no one was doing anything.[245]

This case study exemplified the way stories about taonga could be enough to energise and enthuse whānau into coming home; the responsibility of long-term safekeeping for precious ancestral treasures was not the sole

---

[243] Karauria, 'Fight to Keep Marae on Ancestral Lands'.
[244] A1, 0:06:28.6.
[245] A1, 0:24:59.2.

domain of museums. Ngā Rauru Kiitahi had been the uninterrupted caretakers of the toki (adze), Te Āwhiorangi, since its discovery on their land in 1897. While this taonga has never been even glimpsed by non-Māori, multiple published accounts and tribal histories have corroborated its existence. Writing about the 'illustrious adze'[246] in 1965, Taranaki historian John Houston said, 'Percy Smith[247] surmises that [it] is made from the giant tridacna shell of Polynesia' with 'many references [to it] in waiata'.[248] Āria recalled Potonga sharing one such waiata o mua (traditional chant), *Kii Mai,* with whānau at one of their wānanga on Te Tieke, where Tōmairangi had discovered Te Āwhiorangi some 200 years earlier. Āria described this experience as 'spontaneous and a real buzz. And I captured it all'.[249]

The video recordings she made of her kaumātua sharing his knowledge of Te Āwhiorangi were for the sole benefit of Ngā Ariki hapū. Neilson had decreed that this history could only be shared with whānau who came back to Waitōtara in person for wānanga. Organising the footage she had captured for storage and sharing it through a private database was one of Āria's archiving projects. She concluded that experiences such as hearing first-hand traditional knowledge while standing on sacred sites such as Te Tieke would bring her whānau home more often. Likewise, having recordings of kōrero (stories) and waiata (songs and chants) would help them maintain their connections when they could not physically be on the land.

---

[246] John Houston, *Māori Life in Old Taranaki* (Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2006), 37.

[247] *Journal of the Polynesian Society* editor and anthropologist.

[248] Houston, *Māori Life in Old Taranaki*, 39.

[249] A1, 0:26:56.9.

When you are there, you can feel the wairua [spirit]. [Sharing recordings]

needs to be in balance with coming back to the whenua. We don't just

want people listening to it and then not coming back to share

themselves with us, that's not reciprocal. Everyone has something to

offer.[250]

The conflict between contemporary archiving techniques and the traditional

practices favoured by older generations was a dilemma for the young Māori

archiving practitioners. Āria always opted for tikanga over archival best

practice while working on projects with her kaumātua. She cited an example

of Government legislation intended to protect taonga conflicting with her

elder's status as a traditional knowledge holder; *The Protected Objects*

Amendment Act (2006)[251] directly challenged the hapū's claim of exclusive

traditional ownership over their own taonga. This Act dictates that any

discovery of taonga, such as carvings buried in a swamp, will trigger a

process of determination by the Māori Land Court. This process allows any

interested party to lodge an ownership claim and it would likely involve

institutional intervention in the ongoing care and handling of an artefact. With

the Ngā Ariki carvings yet to be retrieved from where they are buried in a

swamp, this information remains moot. However, this highlighted a tension

Āria often felt in balancing Neilson's vision with the realities of living as Māori

in a colonised society. She concluded that this conflict arose with almost

every aspect of trying to be Māori. 'We're essentially trying to be Māori and

we have to comply with the rules of the kāwanatanga [government]'.[252]

---

[250] A1, 0:26:56.9.

[251] 'Protected Objects Amendment Act 2006', Public Act 2006 no. 37, accessed May 19, 2019, http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2006/0037/latest/whole.html.

[252] A1, 0:19:53.1.

Opting to follow the rule of tikanga over the rule of law and do what she was told by her kaumātua has not yet returned the lost carvings to their hapū. One reason is that the method they followed for surveying the swamp did not progress them very far: Āria was the only person present who was fit enough to get into the mud to dig around. Her kaumātua has conceded that they should try another method; one of his mokopuna has suggested that some kind of ground-penetrating radar might show them the best places to dig.[253]

Āria said she was not invested in the outcome of the search, resolving that she did not mind if the taonga stayed in the ground, as it was the mystery and excitement of the stories that enticed her into whānau archiving. In addition, she noted that if the taonga were to be retrieved in the future, the *Protected Objects Act 2006* would remove hapū autonomy over where, how and by whom their ancestral taonga could be cared for.

Summary of case studies

These three case studies were selected for the range of ways they depicted Māori community archiving as whānau archiving. They demonstrated issues and outcomes for taonga that have been handed down from generation to generation, as well as the ways the whānau archivists interpreted the historical contexts and fragmented stories that embody their families' connections to these personal collections. The evidence presented in these cases showed that balancing the inherited responsibilities of kaitiakitanga with the tools and techniques of community archiving was a critical skill in whānau toolkits. In fact, this was arguably more useful to the whānau archivists than having a nuanced understanding of contemporary tools of the

---

[253] A1, 0:50:20.4.

trade related to digitisation and specialised conservation techniques. While they all bore evidence of the divide between whānau aspirations for their taonga and institutional rules and regulations, the Ngā Ariki hapū case in particular illustrated the way Government legislation relating to the care of discovered taonga creates an irreconcilable situation for those wishing to prioritise tikanga over public rules of practice.

Analysis and discussion

This section reviews the case study evidence in relation to the key concepts of whanaungatanga (family relationships), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and taonga (treasured items). These case studies revealed three critical points that distinguish whānau archiving from community archiving. First, they embodied the collective nature of decision making related to caretaking. Second, none of these projects would have been authorised outside a home-based setting. Third, they all illustrated the important role that taonga archives have in reuniting family who are dispersed around Aotearoa and overseas. The following sections break down the component parts of these case studies for a thematic analysis of the roles the three cornerstone concepts above played in the whānau archiving actions related to the Waikerepuru whānau digital archive, the McClutchie whānau digitisation project and the Ngā Ariki hapū wānanga and taonga repatriation ventures.

Whanaungatanga

Whanaungatanga emerged as the strongest theme within the three case studies, corroborating the evidence presented in Chapter 2 that Māori community archiving is whānau archiving, with family relationships both

motivating and shaping project strategy, design and delivery. Implicit in this finding was the condition that archiving took place on home ground, not for convenience but as a means of enlivening the spiritual connection that all interviewees mentioned in relation to their taonga collections. This section interrogates the nuanced definitions of 'home' in relation to whanaungatanga in archiving, arguing that the critical significance of this concept relates to more than just relationships between family members.

Whatarangi Winiata's[254] definition of this whanaungatanga in relation to library services is relevant here for the way it centres this concept in relation to the geographic area to which a person is connected.[255] Winiata posited that whanaungatanga is an example of tikanga vested in the way rōpū tuku iho (whānau, hapū and iwi) maintain contact with records in their region. Although this definition focuses on whānau engagement with institutional archives, it encapsulates the way these cases studies seamlessly merged stories about their relationships with taonga into their memories of land and place, as well as the spiritual connections that were evoked through the process of remembering. In this research, the geographic focus for taonga within whānau archives lay in the Taranaki region. It is noteworthy that oral history evidence related to these collections ranged much further afield, a reflection of the historic journeys made outside the region by the ancestors still evoked in living memory. For example, Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) frequently referred to her grandfather's connections to the Chatham Islands and the way her archiving project had revived connections with her relatives

---

254 Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum', 23.
255 Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum', 23.

there.[256] This example illustrated the way home-based caring for taonga could enliven kinship links even outside the geographic area in which a project was taking place.

Both the McClutchie and the Ngā Ariki projects emphasised the significance that being under their ancestral mountain had to their archiving practice. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) and Āria Broughton (A1) concluded that inhabiting the places and spaces in which their tupuna had lived was critical. Tania surmised that her project would not have gone ahead if the McClutchie photographs had to be shifted out of the whānau papakāinga to be digitised. Both Āria and Tania described their wairua (spirit residing in the heart and mind) being enlivened by working on their collections in the places and spaces that had once been inhabited by their tupuna. Tania's husband Matiu Paul (M2) was involved with McClutchie whānau archiving through the whanaunga connections he had with Taranaki through marriage, his children and his grandchildren. Matiu likened the feelings he had when helping to digitise the photographs in the McClutchie collection to the sensation of arriving home to his Ngāpuhi family land in the far north after a long absence. 'If you had been away for years and come home … you get this overwhelming feeling, a good feeling. That's what that taonga does. Like as soon as I hit Kerikeri … te hokinga mahara [the memories come back]'.[257]

The strong memory prompts that come from working with tangible and intangible taonga were the reason these interviewees were putting their efforts into organising and archiving them. Tania and Āria's evidence pointed

---

[256] T2, 0:21:59.2.
[257] M2, 0:09:27.0.

to memory, and its role in creating new meaning, being further enhanced when taonga, whenua and whānau came together in home-based archiving.

In contrast to the two Taranaki-based cases, home for the entire Waikerepuru whānau project was a domestic setting outside of Taranaki, 250km south in Ōtaki. In spite of this geographic distance from the family's whenua, this family's enduring connection to their ancestral land was ever-present in the stories and memories evoked by the handling of taonga. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) spoke about how sharing family history in archiving wānanga created common ground between relatives. She explained that family photographs were also vehicles for family knowledge, but over time, with people spreading out and fewer gatherings being held, that knowledge was diminishing. Tania emphasised the critical role her kaumātua played as repositories of family history, as well as the gaps that emerged with their passing.

In these case studies, the multidimensional influence of kaumātua, past and present, was a key characteristic of whanaungatanga-led archiving. Whether living or dead, these generations were kaitiaki, storytellers, advisors and knowledge holders. They enthused and protected the community archivists as trusted sources of customary knowledge in contemporary archiving contexts. Tania expressed a desire for more kaumātua guidance in her role as kaitiaki for the McClutchie whānau taonga archives. Decision making in this project was regularly referred to elders and their traditional knowledge was given more weight than the knowledge gleaned by students through their formalised archive training. This was exemplified when questions related to digitisation and conservation were negotiated with kaumātua in spite of their lack of understanding of the technical aspects of this process. Similarly, their

intrinsic knowledge guided how, and from whom, metadata and oral histories could be gathered. The significance of mahitahi (working together as one) trumped expert knowledge in whānau archiving.

The significance of whanaungatanga in dealing with archival taonga placed the collections in each of these three case studies beyond the caretaking ability of outsiders. The investment of time required to work face to face at a pace set by kaumātua would be uneconomic in an institutional archiving model facing financial constraints and quantifiable outputs. While the McClutchie whānau digitisation wānanga was completed over one weekend, around two years of training, planning, coordination and consulting had been invested in this outcome.

Fear about the misappropriation or theft of taonga archives was another reason that access for caretaking was restricted to immediate family members. In the McClutchie case, the community archive in New Plymouth was approved to perform digital back-ups and provide archival storage for certain collection items. This agreement positioned the community archive as kaipupuri (caretakers) and the whānau as kaitiaki (owners) of their collection items, with the items sitting as silent files in a protected archiving space accessible only to two staff members. The connection that made this arrangement permissible to the whānau was the trust established by Te Reo o Taranaki's role in training the McClutchie whānau project kaitiaki, another example of the role that whanaungatanga plays in Māori community archiving.

Mahitahi (collaboration) and tuakana-teina (elder-junior) relationships in whānau archiving were dual strategies in continuing the tradition of

intergenerational succession to family collections. Both of these elements were at play in the McClutchie and Waikerepuru whānau projects as values demonstrated in wānanga learning situations. These ideals were significant for the way they elevated shared experience over quantifiable outcomes such as the number of photographs digitised in a day, or the time spent gathering stories or metadata about them. While these were hailed as accomplishments in both cases, equal value was placed on the number of whānau attending wānanga and the new knowledge that was generated by spending time talking about an object.

Whānau archiving is a methodology that places a secondary value on conservation and preservation as defined for institutional contexts. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) believed that the way whānau-led practice drew out people's unique talents was a more valuable measure of achievement. She concluded that her two daughters and her husband would not have volunteered to take part in archive training if it had not been delivered at home. 'Through this medium [archiving] they will be exposed to that kaupapa mahi [Māori work] in … a way that they haven't been before and they will be able to filter that knowledge through [to subsequent generations]'.[258]

These case studies supported National Preservation Office conservator Vicki-Anne Heikell's proposition that whanaungatanga is the most important outcome of efforts to preserve and engage families with their Māori cultural heritage.[259] The findings presented here have reinforced Heikell's hypothesis

[258] R2, 0:07:21.7.

[259] Heikell, 'Our Future Lies in the Past', 13.

that the sense of shared purpose that taonga evoke provides critical evidence of their importance in whānau relationships.

Kaitiakitanga

This subsection focuses on the training that the interviewees had found useful and the way they had put their archiving skills into practice in their roles as kaitiaki of their whānau collections. It considers the way their training augmented the knowledge gleaned from lived experience that they also drew on as project coordinators. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) emphasised the significance of inherited knowledge to kaitiakitanga in whānau archiving and stressed that training alone could not prepare someone to assume this responsibility. Ria encouraged each family member involved in the archiving wānanga she organised to choose the job that most interested them, a role that often changed within and between wānanga sessions. In the case of her husband, this meant helping the team navigate complex technical information associated with issues such as digitisation formats and data uploads.[260] On other occasions, he helped to unpack and repack boxes and focused on organising all the books in her father's collection. Ria explained that kaitiakitanga was a responsibility held at different levels within a whānau and that even children could have a place within this. 'Their kaitiakitanga can come through their feedback about particular items, their relationship … to that taonga, and that secures it. Ko tērā te kaitiakitanga [that is kaitiakitanga]'.[261]

---

[260] R2, 0:16:56.4.
[261] R2, 0:26:45.9.

As with whanaungatanga, this description proved the collective, intergenerational emphasis that is placed on kaitiakitanga in whānau archiving. Mentoring was a critical aspect to Ria being able to fulfil her own responsibilities as kaitiaki and she attributed her family's archiving successes to the cumulative knowledge she could draw on from within the wider student group. Ria cited the whakataukī (proverb), 'ehara tēnei he toa takitahi, he toa takitini', which speaks of accomplishment being the triumph of many. She said that kaitiakitanga was about giving credit where credit was due and acknowledging everybody who helped with the work.[262]

Others similarly emphasised collective effort over individual accomplishments as being a characteristic of kaitiakitanga. Āria Broughton (A1) saw securing a great turnout at a Waipapa Marae wānanga, by enthusing whānau into 'doing something',[263] as a qualitative measure of success. She considered this job a responsibility of her kaitiakitanga because the knowledge her relatives from out of town would glean from these sessions would bring them home to their papakāinga more often. Recording these sessions was a back-up plan to ensure that the knowledge would still be there for her children in the future. She doubted this would be an option for her boys if her kaitiakitanga had not been invested in driving her hapū's archiving efforts.[264]

Guiding the technical processes of archiving was another aspect of kaitiakitanga identified through these case studies. However, following exact technical process was a secondary consideration in the Māori way of working described by interviewees. While their kaitiaki roles demanded a degree of

---

[262] R2, 0:48:56.6.
[263] A1, 0:09:47.3.
[264] A1, 0:37:10.6.

logistical coordination and decision making, in practice their caretaking was not characterised by an adherence to strict archival standards. Getting tikanga (protocol) right through the appropriate use of customary practice was more important in each of these cases than following the theoretical rules. However, the whānau archivists concurred that the professional guidelines they had learned about in training had been a good starting point for discussing archiving options with their families.

Āria Broughton was open to the idea of using both contemporary archiving processes and tikanga in unison to achieve her project goals. Reflecting on what her tupuna would have done in her situation, she concluded that they would have drawn on the best of their Māori world knowledge as well as what Pākehā were offering at the time.[265] This perspective gave her the confidence to use digital tools for capturing and sharing hapū history, even though she was aware that previous generations had been afraid these new technologies would steal their mana (authority). 'Why can't we do both; have our wānanga kanohi ki te kanohi [face to face], waha ki te taringa [mouth to ear] and also … send it out to our uri [descendants] that don't necessarily live in Waitōtara?'[266]

To enact their duties as kaitiaki, the whānau needed access to their taonga. Making more taonga more available in day-to-day life was a driver for archiving, with evidence of this peppered throughout the case studies. Kaitiakitanga sometimes meant deciding which taonga could appropriately support the ceremonial and public life of the whānau, a role described by both Ria Waikerepuru (R2) and Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) in their discussions

---

[265] A1, 0:21:33.1.
[266] A1, 0:22:51.7.

of kaitiakitanga. Tania gave the example of seeking permission from her wider family to retrieve a whāriki (ceremonial mat) and tupuna photographs for the tangihanga (funeral) of a family elder. She was initially advised that the original photographs could not leave the homestead, so she set about having prints made from digitised copies. That decision was later revoked and she gained permission to place the original items alongside her uncle while he was lying in state at home.

> That was really special … really meaningful. That [permission] lifted a whole heaviness from me and it felt right. I was uncertain which mat was the right one to take, so I opened them, laid them out, did a karakia, and one felt right.[267]

Kaitiakitanga was tethered to a desire to have whānau taonga at family events, such as wānanga, reunions and tangihanga. The Waikerepuru whānau archiving project took this a step further by adding stories and photographs to the family's digital archive about how the taonga had been used. Ria cited the example of the kahu kiwikiwi (kiwi feather cloak) Te Ōhaki being used to honour her husband's mother, Oma, when she died; it was laid over Oma's coffin by Ria's father and sister to signify the relationship between the families. She said a photograph of this event would be added to Te Ōhaki's entry in the database:

> as a contribution from the Rodeka whānau … Te Ōhaki is a living taonga whānau … and with this taonga comes whakapapa, our land interests whānau … all that stuff secures us as a whānau. …

---

[267] T2, 0:39:10.7.

That's our kōrero, that's our whānau kōrero and that's what the mokopuna

need to be exposed to whānau … and then when they go to Te

Wānanga o Raukawa and do their iwi [tribal] and hapū [sub-tribal]

studies, there is information for them to draw from. It is so important to

secure ourselves.[268]

Halting the decline of language after it had been withheld by previous generations was a form of kaitiakitanga expressed in all of these case studies. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) signalled exposure to te reo Māori as a precursor to future language acquisition, a view endorsed by the wider interview cohort as a key outcome for their archiving efforts. As well as creating new sources of language for future generations to draw on, all these women prioritised involving their children and grandchildren in the archiving efforts. They presented the involvement of younger generations while they were still in their infancy as a strategy for engendering their connection with whānau taonga in the widest sense. Tania recalled bringing her mokopuna Miriama with her to archiving sessions at the whānau homestead, in the hope that this experience would stay with her and contribute to her personal identity.[269]

The creation of new Māori language vocabularies and compositions through archiving was reuniting whānau with their lost taonga and reviving the language spoken by the tupuna shown in the whānau photographs. While they were sympathetic to and understood the reasons for their grandparents' choices not to pass on te reo, none of the interviewees approved of these past decisions, nor of the practice of burying of taonga because of fear or

[268] R2, 0:22:33.3.
[269] T2, 0:50.53:1.

superstition. Tania said her grandparents had raised their children to be 'fearful of everything. The urupā [family cemetery], the dead'.[270] She contrasted this with her own attitude towards kaitiakitanga and saw sharing as a necessary part of ensuring that her grandchildren will grow up to be 'proud, confident, competent Māori'.[271] Āria Broughton (A1) echoed Tania's way of thinking, stating that sharing the taonga with their descendants was what afforded them their special status: 'it comes from us'.[272] Tania (T2) credited her whānau archiving project with recovering stories and information about taonga that would otherwise have been lost. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) described her archiving practice as:

walking with the whānau towards the headlights. All generations can learn these skills. This might help the mokopuna find mahi [work] … they will learn good, practical skills that can help them look after their own things and take responsibility to kaitiaki the collection.[273]

These case studies identified that a plan for shoring up succession in terms of kaitiakitanga was an important role for whānau archiving. Ria Waikerepuru (R2) harboured aspirations for her brothers, sisters, children and grandchildren to assume more responsibility for the family's collection in the future. Adding sufficient information to the digital archive for sharing with mokopuna living overseas would bind distant whānau through knowledge that would otherwise be inaccessible to them.[274]

---

[270] T2, 0:45:39.2.

[271] T2, 0:50:53.01.

[272] A1, 1:10:03.2.

[273] R2, 0:14:09.5.

[274] R2, 0:26:45.9.

Taonga

The whānau archives were all taonga. None of the whānau archivists cited in these case studies ascribed variable weightings to the items in their collections. They agreed unanimously that *all* of their archival collections were fragments of history worth keeping and caring for. In terms of a collection policy, this approach would be simple: keep everything. Tania Hodges-Paul (T2) brooked no dissent in describing the McClutchie family collection as being 'everything to me because they once sat … in the house with the grandparents, they were touched by them … blessed by them. That's why it's important to renovate or rebuild the whare [house] that the taonga are kept in'.[275]

Being able to hand these taonga on to future generations was a cornerstone of whānau archiving. Sharing them with their immediate family was a preferred strategy, with whakapapa links (genealogical connections) the only condition of access. All the interviewees described a sense of relief at achieving milestones in their family archiving projects. The fear of losing family knowledge and the voices of Māori language speakers was acute and it drove the types of archiving activities that the whānau prioritised.

One example of this was Tania Hodges-Paul's (T2) perceived race against time to record oral history with whānau elders, feeling more secure now that she had started recording her elders. In a Māori archiving context, Tania valued oral history from this group as a trusted source of whānau knowledge and she sought their verification of information about taonga and other aspects of family history. Tania was acting swiftly to conduct these interviews

---

[275] T2, 1:20:14.9.

while her subjects were still capable. However, after successfully completing several sessions, she encountered some unanticipated challenges about sharing these interviews within her family. She described interviewing a 90-year-old aunty who was too self-conscious to share her interview in case she 'said things she shouldn't have'.[276] Although Tania then edited the interview to remove the sections her aunty did not like, her elder still refused to listen to her interview because she did not 'like the sound of her own voice'. Tania was concerned that delays in sharing this taonga kōrero with her cousins would block them from asking questions of their mother while she was still alive.[277]

Historically, as noted earlier, many whānau taonga have been deliberately not passed on by previous generations. Some were buried or withheld and others were placed in public repositories for safekeeping. Neither of these methods of caring for taonga was supported by the current generations as viable methods for whānau archiving. All the family collections profiled in these case studies contained taonga that had been buried to save them from theft or destruction, such as during the Taranaki Land Wars. For the Waikerepuru whānau, their taonga was the patu pounamu (greenstone hand weapon) Pikiwāhine, which had been buried and never retrieved, and has now been replicated. In the McClutchie whānau, the taonga was the toki (adze) Poutama Whiria, which had been discovered in 1923 buried at Pukearuhe, on land adjoining the McClutchie family farm, by a Pākehā farmer identified as Mr Black.[278] Te Rangi Hiroa (Ngāti Mutunga, also known

---

[276] T2, 1:20:14.9.

[277] T2, 1:20:14.9.

[278] Unknown, 'A Famous Axe', *Evening Post*, Volume CV, Issue 67, March 20, 1923, accessed May 6, 2019,

as Sir Peter Buck) wrote of the adze's 'magic power' in his book *The Coming of the Māori* and recalled being shown it by Te Kapinga McClutchie. He gave the following account of the taonga being found and of McClutchie's role in its repatriation:

> One night a young girl of the Ngāti Tama dreamt that Poutama Whiria had been found [and] was so insistent that her father, Te Kapinga, visited Mr Black's home, where, to his intense surprise, Mrs Black produced a large stone adze which her husband had found recently. It was of polished black basalt, the right length, and it had a chip off one corner of the cutting edge. Mr Black arrived and, after hearing the story, very generously gave it to Te Kapinga as the representative of the rightful heirs.[279]

Tania's grandfather Te Kapinga McClutchie was one of three Māori trustees originally appointed as kaitiaki for Poutama Whiria, a responsibility that had now passed through four generations of his male descendants.

The Ngā Ariki hapū story of buried taonga related to a set of carvings from their wharenui, Ngā Paiaka, which had been hidden in a swamp and were still missing. These artefacts were the focus of Potonga Neilson's excavation efforts that in turn, motivated his mokopuna (descendant) Āria Broughton (A1) to seek training to help him find them. The carvings were missing pieces of hapū heritage that Neilson wanted to see reunited with the other parts of their wharenui retrieved from swampland over a century ago. These

---

https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/EP19230320.2.8?query=Poutamawhiria&snippet=true.

[279] Te Rangi Hiroa, *The Coming of the Maori.* (Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1950), 378.

examples of burying taonga as a means of preservation were a fundamental difference between Māori community archiving and its mainstream counterpart. The trainers and facilitators needed to understand the historical context and underlying values in a way not required by mainstream archivists.

In Aotearoa, the shift in attitudes towards keeping all taonga above ground and all stories in circulation has occurred within the last three generations. The current kaitiaki deem their entire archival collections, tangible and intangible, as valued taonga for sharing with their immediate family. This was a significant reason for none of the taonga in these case studies being intended for institutional deposit or public sharing. Explaining why her whānau taonga were of such importance to her, Āria Broughton (A1) said they were fragments of the past that would 'always be looked back upon as something to gain insight and knowledge from'.[280] Aria's perspective was that whānau archives were a means to a more significant end – the revitalisation of her hapū; 'to wake people up and excite them and get them interested in who they are'.[281] She believed it was the people who made things taonga[282] and upheld the keepers of knowledge, like her kaumātua Potonga, as hapū treasures themselves.

Conclusion

This chapter has narrowed the focus to concentrate on the findings of the three whānau archiving case studies drawn from a selection of the examples introduced in Chapter 2. The projects profiled have been the Waikerepuru

---

[280] A1, 0:48:34.3.

[281] A1, 1:13:01.2.

[282] A1, 1:10:03.2.

whānau digital archive, the McClutchie whānau digitisation project and the Ngā Ariki hapū wānanga and taonga repatriation ventures. This chapter began with a collective overview of the three cases before moving on to examine each one in turn. This was followed by a discussion of the research findings in relation to the key concepts of whanaungatanga (family relationships), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and taonga (treasured items).

These three cases were selected for what they revealed about the training and development needs of the whānau archivists leading these projects. In addition, they illustrated three critical points that distinguished whānau archiving from community archiving: the collective nature of kaitiakitanga and decision making; being projects that would not have happened outside of a home-based setting; and the way taonga archives play an important role in reuniting family dispersed around Aotearoa New Zealand and overseas.

All the interviewees profiled in these cases required some aspect of archival skills development to achieve their intended outcomes. All these collections contained taonga that had been handed down in trust from generation to generation and all had instances of artefacts being buried, withheld or handed over to museums for safekeeping. These historic decisions were at odds with the interviewees' preferred methods for contemporary collection management; what these whānau archivists understood about them and their implications for their family's access has been examined.

Two of these three case studies referred to taonga that had a relationship to their families' private collections being in institutional care. This external archiving was a key to examining why home-based care was the preferred alternative when other options for collection care were available to these

whānau archivists. One case study highlighted the way Government legislation was a barrier to the family's desired outcomes for their taonga, an example of tension between public rules of practice and their preferred outcomes for taonga.

In these case studies, three generations of women were working to keep alive the knowledge within their whānau archives for future generations and using these taonga to reunite their families. The projects were located in north and south Taranaki and community archiving was seen as a solution for overcoming distance and arresting the loss of family connection that accompanies physical separation. In two of these cases, several members of the same whānau had trained together to lead their family's physical and digital collection management. All of these interviewees focused on involving young and old equally in the planning and delivery of their projects, as a way of strengthening their unique whānau and hapū identity. Each of the case studies provided evidence of the evolution of a uniquely Māori, whānau-centred and whānau-driven approach to archiving projects in the Taranaki region.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter concludes this oral history study of Māori community archiving conducted with a group of 11 students linked to New Plymouth's pan-tribal archive, Te Pūtē Routiriata o Taranaki, between 2014 and 2017. After discussing the findings of this research in relation to the three research questions and their associated hypotheses, an overview of the research findings is provided, followed by a summary of the relevance of this research for Māori community archiving, whānau archiving and the public memory sector, as well as opportunities arising from this study for future research.

Research Question 1

1. In what ways are community archiving and Māori community archiving the same and in what ways are they different?

Hypothesis: Māori community archiving is whānau archiving. It is a collective process characterised by the use of tikanga (cultural protocols) and its focus on caring for collections for the benefit of family relationships.

Two definitions of community archiving are presented here to judge the validity of this hypothesis. The first definition establishes this concept as a post-custodial model characterised by a shift away from archives holding physical records and owners maintaining the physical custody of their

knowledge.[283] The second definition is one interviewee's perspective on Māori community archiving.

Defining Māori community archiving was a goal of this research but lucid descriptions were elusive, with few clear interpretations of this concept emerging from the interviews. Responses ranged from non-answers, to disdain ('Good luck with that!'[284]) and likening this practice to wairua (spirit).[285] One of the youngest interviewees contextualised the question in terms of process and the effectiveness of their training:

I think that you can define it as kaupapa Māori because the students were

Māori. And that as Māori … working with our own people, we knew

that we had the whakaaro [perspective], we could apply it … I carried

it out in a very Māori way; it was definitely an aronga Māori [Māori

focus]. We used the tools of te ao Pākehā, te ao tauiwi [the non-Māori

world] to ensure that the [archives] were safe and would be looked

after.[286]

The concept of archiving was linked to factors such as naming children, learning songs, holding wānanga and reciting whakapapa. Tasks more commonly associated with archiving were included, but with the exception of oral history and digital archiving, these did not warrant the attention or excitement that the interviewees' more abstract definitions for Māori community archiving did. In conclusion, while the oral history evidence

---

[283] Society of American Archivists, 'A Glossary'.
[284] B2, 1:22:42.4.
[285] M2, 0:12:43.2.
[286] H1, 0:11.16.7.

supported this hypothesis, the interviewees' own definitions were much broader in scope than the assumption set out by this researcher.

The tools of classical archiving were a means to an end for these whānau archivists. They did not worry about definitions or classifications for what they were doing but they did agree that the most important aspects of their archiving work were whānau, working collectively, operating under tikanga and maintaining face-to-face relationships. These four aspects were covered in the analysis related to the theme of whanaungatanga. This was the first of three concepts selected for organising the oral history data and it emerged as both a driver and an aspiration for archiving. Each of these dimensions are now reviewed in turn against the relevant literature from Chapter 1.

The hypothesis that Māori community archiving is whānau archiving reflected Heikell's view that caring for taonga created whanaungatanga, a strengthening of relationships between those who care for items or collections.[287] The sense of shared control that comes from whānau archiving has the power to ameliorate the negative impacts of disconnection and dispersal that stem from colonisation and globalisation by filling gaps in the collective memory. By comparison, the quantifiable measures for whanaungatanga in institutional archiving, devised by Davidson[288] for Archives New Zealand, do not resonate with the values of whānau archiving. This system evaluates whanaungatanga based on the number of visits made to an archive, a measure that discounts the intangible spiritual connection that whānau maintain with their taonga even when they are geographically distant from them. The interview evidence demonstrated that mythology and

[287] Heikell. 'Our Future Lies in the Past', 12.
[288] Davidson, 'The Colonial Continuum'.

memory alone were sufficient to evoke whanaungatanga and that the presence of physical objects was not a prerequisite for relationship building through whānau archiving.

Each of the case studies in Chapter 3 exemplified this difference between home-based and custodial archiving models. The Ngā Ariki hapū case contained two examples of taonga that had had a demonstrable influence on whanaungatanga in spite of their physical absence: some carvings buried in swamp and the famous adze Te Āwhiorangi. None of these taonga had been seen in centuries yet their spiritual presence evoked a sense of mystery and excitement that inspired whānau from around the country to return home and learn about them.[289]

This research showed that whānau archiving is a collective experience characterised by all generations coming together to care for collections, with tasks given to young and old alike. In spite of their training in archiving techniques, the interviewees considered their own experience was on the same level as others in their family, to ensure that everyone with a will to participate could do so. Hinerangi Korewha (H2) described this as whānau 'moving together spiritually … without needing to explain it' and working from a foundation of shared respect and values.[290]

This argument regarding the significance of shared identity in Māori community archiving did not imply uniformity across the research cohort and the families they represented. These research findings were at odds with the notion that a one-size-fits-all definition for Māori archiving could be applied,

---

[289] A1, 1:13:01.2.
[290] H2, 0:39:30.7.

even within a context of communal organising. Even with their shared reverence for Taranaki maunga (mountain), reo and tikanga (protocols), every whānau profiled in this research was distinctive in its motivations and aspirations for community archiving. Understanding the nuances of these ambitions was critical to allowing the extended families to discuss care strategies for the taonga archives and to negotiate decision making.

Tikanga played an important role in these discussions and guided practical decision making with regard to how taonga should be handled and shared. Working under tikanga mitigated the risk of the interviewees perceiving archiving as an imposition of settler-colonial principles over their indigenous archiving paradigm. It created a 'space between'[291] the binary positions of archival science and whānau kaitiakitanga in which interviewees were comfortable. The oral history evidence in Chapters 2 and 3 filled a gap in research about the kind of help whānau need to care for their taonga at home and revealed that this group of Māori practitioners now had the confidence and knowledge to seek help with their collections on their own terms.

In this research, a readiness to debate what was right and wrong about the archiving practices set this whānau archiving outside the realm of archival science, which is notable for its regularity and certainty; this family-centred practice involving multiple generations was fertile ground for discussion and debate. Just as there was a place for traditional and contemporary practices, there was a place for all generations. Matiu Paul's (M2) encouragement for younger generations to be involved in discussions about caring for and sharing taonga was universally agreed on, with all interviewees

---

[291] Dwyer and Buckle, 'The Space Between', 59.

acknowledging the expertise that teina (juniors) offered as digital natives. 'It's not just about all the old people having all the answers … they need to see all points … you can always debate it.'[292] Neither of the two younger interviewees claimed to be digital natives – they looked to their children to fulfil this role. However, both of them supported their elders' views that debate is an important part of whānau archiving. Āria Broughton (A1) summed up the view that the 'whole point of [having such debates] ... is about whakarauora [to save or rescue]';[293] she considered knowledge sharing through vigorous discussion a part of that revitalisation. Hokipera Ruakere (H1) concurred that there was no place in whānau archiving for the view that ao Māori knowledge should be withheld from whānau.

> Hē katoa, kua hē te aronga [that perspective is all wrong]. That hasn't helped us. Withholding information and not sharing taonga like language, like karakia, like waiata, like places, like whānau names … it's not okay. For a long time we were mamae, we were hurt, we were afraid, we were told that our stories weren't important. That they weren't going to help us to get anywhere.[294]

This section has addressed the main research question for this thesis, which sought to identify how community archiving and Māori community archiving were the same and in what ways they were different. It has drawn the conclusion that Māori community archiving is whānau archiving and it has many more differences from, than similarities to, the most 'radical' post-custodial model of community archiving that has emerged in

---

[292] M2, 0:42:41.8.
[293] A1, 0:42:33.4.
[294] H1, 0:22:25.3.

international practice, such as that described by Darms.[295] This research has confirmed the hypothesis that Māori community archiving is whānau archiving. It is a collective process, characterised by the use of tikanga (cultural protocols) that prioritise modes of collection care, strengthening family relationships and shared identity. And the best place for this to happen is at home.

Research Question 2

2. How does community archive training delivered in Taranaki between 2014 and 2017 align with the demands of caring for whānau taonga archives at home?

Hypothesis: Whānau collections were enhanced by the practical archiving skills kaitiaki gained in digitisation, oral history recording, digital archiving and taonga conservation.

The aim of this research question and hypothesis was to fill a gap in academic research with regard to the needs of Māori community archivists caring for their taonga archives at home. The oral history evidence presented in this thesis confirmed this hypothesis and usefully elucidated the interviewees' concepts of the terms 'home' and 'better off' in the context of whānau archiving.

In this thesis, the term 'home' has been used to refer to the spaces, outside of collecting institutions, where the taonga were housed, looked after or linked to whānau through historical events. All of the interviewees had engaged with the Māori community archive in New Plymouth to gain

---

[295] Darms, 'Radical Archives (Introduction)'.

collection management skills such as digitisation, cataloguing, oral history interviewing and storage techniques. The archive had been a central point for coming together to train. These skill sets were subsequently dispersed out into communities, with the vast majority of project work taking place away from the confines of the archive. The two spaces worked in tandem, confirming Wenger's theory of 'communities of practice' – groups of situated learners who share a common passion for what they do and who grow in knowledge and responsibility the more they do it.[296] Moving outside the community archive and into their home spaces contributed to the skills developed and confidence gained across this group of whānau archivists.

Hond extended Wenger's theories to apply to 'communities of language practice', arguing that the strength of defining communities in terms of engagement acknowledges the importance to group cohesiveness of shared spaces and regular communication.[297] This concept could be applied to the archiving community of practice that grew around the Taranaki Māori archive, a group that shifted fluidly between their domestic spheres and the bricks and mortar of the community archive. This group was dynamic and adjusted their archiving practices to suit the places and spaces in which their taonga were housed. These included family homes, papakāinga (communal home bases), marae (communal spaces usually encompassing a meeting house) and iwi museums. The places where collections naturally resided were whānau archivists' favoured environments for working with their taonga – regardless of how well (or otherwise) this environment suited archival practice.

---

[296] Etienne Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[297] Hond, 'Matua te Reo'.

The McClutchie family digitisation project demonstrated the type of technical challenges that had to be overcome to enable whānau to care for their taonga at home. The family's collection of old, fragile photos and artefacts could not be shifted, making it impossible to achieve the standards set out in the digitisation guides from which the family were working. The imaging of their taonga for preservation purposes, in any form, was more important to the family than meeting the standards of archival best practice. The best that could be achieved in variable circumstances was deemed good enough. In spite of these compromises, the family concluded that the collection was now better off than it had been pre-digitisation, for two reasons. First, if tragedy struck, all of their tupuna photographs could be replicated. Second, the process of digitisation unlocked sharing among family members and lubricated the flow of information about the people, places and events depicted in the photographs. Digitisation had brought back into view a collection of taonga that had been hidden in plain sight for generations and new meaning was made from the memories they were eliciting. These 'stitches dropped' were doing more than just evoking memories of the past; archiving had made them an enduring part of day-to-day life and they had become tools in reuniting a family dispersed through the effects of colonisation and globalisation.

These Māori community archivists wanted to care for their family collections at home and use them to draw their families together. Their Māori community archiving was whānau archiving. Bricks and mortar with climate-controlled storage were not required to care for the whānau archives in the community. However, a space for centralising training and access to equipment had created archiving communities of practice, augmenting the skills and

confidence of whānau archivists to return home and share their knowledge with family on home ground. This finding reiterated the conclusion drawn for the first research question: that there are more differences than similarities between community archiving and Māori community archiving. Here again, for contrast, is the working definition for community archiving proffered by Newman[298] and Welland:

Community archives are collections of archival records that originate in a community – that is, a group of people who live in the same location or share other forms of community of interest – and whose collection, maintenance and use involves active participation of that community.[299]

These whānau archives did more than 'originate in community'; they resided there permanently. Alongside whanaungatanga, the taonga archives themselves bound their caretakers and motivated participation in archiving activities. The interviewees' argument that their taonga were better off if they eschewed physical conservation (e.g. putting their original photographs into climate-controlled archives to arrest their physical deterioration) in favour of leaving a collection intact and in situ was at odds with archival best practice. However, their conclusion that their taonga archives were now better off than they had been before their projects started was one of the strongest arguments to emerge from this set of interviews. Only one participant out of 11 preferred their archives to be stored in the Taranaki community archive and made available for public research. Home was deemed the best place for all of the other whānau collections, with access reserved for immediate

---

[298] Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives', 8.
[299] Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives', 9.

family alone. A desire to manage sharing closely was linked to this cohort's preference for home-based care. This was the focus of the final research question, which examined the influence of age on these community archivists' attitudes towards sharing their whānau archives.

Research Question 3

3. Are there differences between generations in opinions about sharing whānau archives in the digital realm?

Hypothesis: Older generations have views about online sharing that are more conservative than those of younger generations.

In some of the whānau, their taonga had been deliberately not passed on by previous generations; some had been buried or withheld and others had been placed in public repositories for safekeeping. These methods of kaitiakitanga were not supported by the current generations as the best way to care for whānau archives. This raised the questions of what constituted acceptable sharing and how the interviewees had used their training and experience to shape outcomes for their families.

In this research, the hypothesis that the older generations were less open to the virtual sharing of whānau archives than their juniors, which could block access to the information that could be used for whānau development, was not supported in the interviews. All the interviewees agreed that online sharing was acceptable, with three provisos. First, sharing was an obligation of kaitiakitanga but should be restricted to immediate family. Second, online sharing should be mediated and whakapapa (genealogy) should not be published on social media sites. Third, online sharing should be in balance

with kanohi ki te kanohi, the sharing of knowledge face to face on home ground. These three aspects of sharing are considered next and conclusions drawn about how the tools of community archiving could serve whānau aspirations to share or restrict their taonga.

Restricted sharing

For the interviewees, keeping whānau archives for the benefit of whānau alone was a way of reclaiming some of the ancestral treasures and kinship ties that had been lost through colonisation and relatives shifting away from Taranaki for a more viable future. Restoring whanaungatanga was central to interviewee attitudes towards sharing. Opening collections up for access outside the immediate family was not a priority because these whānau archivists wanted to use their archives to put things in order at home first. In 2007, Arapata Hakiwai noted that taonga could play a role in whakawhanaungatanga, helping whānau and hapū to see their history as an expression of living culture.[300] This view was echoed in the interviewees' motivations for keeping their taonga close to them.

The interviewees unanimously concluded that although sharing was a duty associated with kaitiakitanga, how and where that happened should be decided case by case:

It should always be asked of the people what they think, and every hapū is

different. What [Ngā Ariki hapū] decided was to make it available to

the people who came home to the wānanga. I have heard other

---

[300] Dean Scully, 'The Protection of Taonga Māori Heritage in Aotearoa', in *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Māori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2010).

kōrero; older pāhake (older people, seniors) think it's not right to share

kōrero or images and I agree that their mana is captured when

capturing images or audio. I can understand that as well.[301] … It's all

about holding that space for my mokopuna … making it available. If I

don't do this mahi, is [access] going to be an option for them?[302]

One of the youngest and one of the oldest interviewees shared common

ground in their attitudes towards access from outside their immediate

families. Hokipera Ruakere introduced the concept of 'kua rangona',[303]

people sharing what they have been told by trusted sources:

Rangona is a really important word that keeps people safe, because it's

something that they've heard. It's not something that they know, it's

not real tūturu (sacred knowledge). This is something that I've heard

… and it's a thing to share.[304]

All of the interviewees referred to applying tikanga (customary practice) to

mediating the process of sharing the decision making. This research has

argued that the intersection between traditional practice and te ao hurihuri

(the changing world) was fertile ground for whānau archiving. Āria Broughton

(A1) concluded:

archiving now isn't the way our tūpuna did it, but if my tūpuna could hear me

speaking reo today, would they understand what I was saying? We're

---

[301] A1, 0:41:15.5.

[302] A1, 0:37:10.6.

[303] The passive form of rongo, to hear.

[304] H1, 22:25:3.0.

evolving … . Our tūpuna were open to the tools people were bringing, but they did it in a Māori way.[305]

The interviewees feared that taonga containing whakapapa would lose integrity if they were shared outside their families. Matiu Paul (M2) said that only close family should view their whānau archives online because 'if it becomes public, it loses its integrity. I don't have a problem with going online as long as it's restricted'.[306] That did not include Facebook because he could not control third-party sharing. His whānau used the native Alaskan-designed Tribal Platform system.[307]. Matiu noted that there were no fixed rules for applying tikanga to sharing decisions, as unlike kawa (ceremonial protocols), the rules of tikanga could be adapted.[308]

Six interviewees from the youngest and middle generations had tried the Mukurtu software for managing their whānau archives. They believed it was a viable solution for reflecting tikanga in the sharing and access protocols they were setting or managing as kaitiaki. They liked this digital-archiving system's features of allowing whānau and hapū to maintain control over who could view different elements of the collection data and who could add information about the taonga. Ease of use was another benefit. None of these interviewees was interested in understanding it at a technical level. Rather, they wanted authoritative, trusted advice on how the system could assure data integrity for their whānau archives. Te Mana Raraunga, the Māori Data Sovereignty Network, defines this as 'perceiving data as subject to the laws

---

[305] A1, 0:22:51.7.
[306] M2, 0:32:50.0.
[307] See https://arcticit.com/2015/05/welcome-to-tribal-platforms-by-arctic-it.
[308] M2, 0:37:53.0.

of the nation from which this is collected, subject to Māori governance, supporting tribal sovereignty and the realisation of iwi aspirations'.[309] This definition was in keeping with the interviewees' own non-expert interpretations of this concept.

Rather than dwelling on whether her interpretation of tikanga was right or wrong, Āria Broughton (A1) strove to find balance with regard to what she shared as a kaitiaki for Ngā Ariki hapū knowledge.[310] She said that traditional knowledge in electronic formats 'is still taonga tuku iho [treasures handed down between generations]. Being captured digitally doesn't take away from that … it still needs to be taken care of responsibly.'[311] Hokipera Ruakere (H1) described a similar approach to dealing with requests from cousins for taonga such as pepeha (tribal sayings), whakapapa (genealogy), kōrero (stories) and karakia (incantations):

Me hoki mai koutou ki te kāinga [you need to come home to get that knowledge]. I'm not just going to dish stuff out like that over [Facebook] Messenger … because I understand that there are some tikanga and that actually if they want to know that, there's a responsibility that comes with this knowledge.[312]

Interviewees from all generations wanted to share their archival collections online with their immediate families. They considered this an obligation of kaitiakitanga and they were exploring solutions outside of social media to do

---

309 Te Mana Raraunga Māori Data Sovereignty Network portal, accessed May 10, 2019, https://www.temanararaunga.maori.nz.

310 A1, 0:42:33.4.

311 A1, 1:07:00.3.

312 H1, 0:24:15:3.

this safely. All the interviewees who had trialled the indigenous knowledge management platform Mukurtu said they would use this option if it were available to them. One whānau archivist had created a digital archive for collection management and was using this to mediate access to their family's collection. The younger generations stressed that online sharing had to be balanced with face-to-face interaction and they were using online sharing as a way to entice whānau members home and to keep them connected when they could not come back.

Initially, the research question on sharing was expected to be a subsidiary research question about intergenerational attitudes towards the idea of publishing whānau archives in virtual spaces. However, the range and depth of discussion on this topic gave it equal status with the other two research questions. This helped the researcher draw conclusions about who the whānau prioritised for access to online archives and how these decisions could be mediated technically by non-expert users. The findings of this research supported O'Carroll's conclusion that online tools could augment face-to-face communication rather than replacing it.[313] There was clearly a place for both in within these Taranaki families.

Conclusions drawn from the research findings

This purpose of this research was to compare community archiving as an international field of study with equivalent Māori-led initiatives that are emerging in Aotearoa New Zealand. One example of this, the Taranaki community archive, was selected as the focus of this study because of this researcher's connection, as a kaimahi (worker), to the Te Pūtē Routiriata

---

[313] O'Carroll, 'Virtual Whanaungatanga'.

archive in New Plymouth and to the people who studied there. The following conclusions were drawn from a thematic analysis of the evidence presented in Chapters 2 and 3 in relation to the research goals and literature review set out in Chapter 1.

1. **Collections at the centre of this research could be defined as 'stitches dropped in time', an analogy coined to distinguish private whānau collections from artefacts and records controlled by memory sector institutions.**

This comparison was a starting point for investigating how whānau-led archiving compared with institutional modes of practice centred on public collection building and what these two methods could learn from one another.

2. **Contemporary community archiving was relevant to this research for its association with a post-custodial model that promotes the idea that archivists no longer hold all the power over the acquisition, description and maintenance of records.[314]**

In theory, this model shifts the role of archivist from that of manager to facilitator, leaving the decision-making power in the hands of the communities of origin[315] that own the records and the knowledge they contain.[316] There are notable examples of this model's influence in Aotearoa New Zealand, both in the mainstream community archiving sector and in the way public memory institutions are considering how this trend affects professional practice.[317]

---

[314] Darms, 'Radical Archives (Introduction)'.

[315] Horwood et al., 'Worlds Apart', 2.

[316] Battley, 'Archives as Places'.

[317] Battley, 'Archives as Places'; Welland, 'The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives'; Newman, 'Sustaining Community Archives'.

This research argues that any discussions of this shift's significance for Māori communities should led by iwi, hapū and whānau. Devolved community archive training has been shown to be one way of equipping these groups with the knowledge and vocabularies required to engage with collecting institutions over issues of access and ownership.

3. **The whānau archivists interviewed for this research had no inclination to share their collections beyond their immediate families. Neither were they willing to accept a conditional 'quid pro quo' of access in return for help in caring for the archival taonga.**

In some cases, people were willing to deposit their material in the Taranaki Māori archive for back-up and safe storage on condition of no external sharing. In one case, negotiable access for public outreach and education was permitted. In all cases, retaining ownership over collection items was a bottom line.

The nuanced and varied conditions of sharing agreements was one component of this Māori community archiving, differentiating it from mainstream methods, a key finding of this research. The interviewees' attitudes with regard to public access to their collections deterred them from engaging with public memory institutions because of two key concerns: the theft or distortion of knowledge[318] and the difficulty of forming long-term, trust-based relationships with anonymous archivists.

---

[318] Jared Davidson, 'Out of Sight, out of Mind? Non-user Understandings of Archives in Aotearoa New Zealand' (report towards Master of Information Studies, School of Information Management, Victoria University, Wellington (2014), 16.

4. Very few institutions undertake outreach and training work unconditionally.

The interviewees noted one exception to this conclusion: National Services Te Paerangi,[319] Te Papa Museum's six-strong outreach team that supports regional archives and museums around the country, as well as iwi, whānau and hapū who want to work on home ground.

When asked which of the training initiatives they had found most useful, the interviewees unanimously named two community wānanga run by National Services Te Paerangi in Taranaki. The first was a two-day session on digital archiving using Mukurtu indigenous knowledge management software; the second was a hands-on box-making and taonga conservation skills workshop held at Ōwae Marae in north Taranaki.[320] Other useful skills gained in that workshop and via coursework were digitisation and digital capture skills, interviewing, archival research techniques, mentoring and confidence building.

5. Whānau archives play an important role in bringing families together.

A shared interest in caring for their 'memory prompts' was a magnet for bringing families together on home ground to take part in the performative act of caring. The interviewees described this as an enactment of kaitiakitanga and stressed that this role could be fulfilled both with and without formalised

---

[319] Mission and Purpose of National Services Te Paerangi, accessed May 17, 2019, https://www.tepapa.govt.nz/learn/for-museums-and-galleries/national-services-te-paerangi.

[320] Claire Hall, blog post on how National Services Te Paerangi workshops in Taranaki held in 2015 influenced community archiving networks in the region, accessed May 18, 2019, https://blog.nzmuseums.co.nz/i-te-putake-building-maori-archiving-cultural-heritage-networks -for-aotearoa.

training in archiving techniques. The case studies introduced in Chapter 3 all emphasised the importance of intergenerational participation, with young and old alike having a role to play in making new meaning from the fragments and artefacts that made up their whānau collections. This was encapsulated in the concept of tuakana-teina relationships, a term describing the interaction between juniors and elders as well as with those holding unique skills or qualifications in certain areas. This concept related to more than chronological age; it was integral to the notion of intergenerational transmission in Taranaki Māori contexts.[321]

6. **These whānau archivists wanted to care for their taonga at home and were unwilling to let them go for the purposes of digitisation or conservation.**

This created difficulties in evaluating archival outcomes by the prescribed standards of best practice. The way these families measured the success of their community archiving endeavours were qualitative and incorporated factors such as the number of whānau who turned up to help, the stories told about an item and the quality of the hākari (feast) that customarily followed the work of caring for taonga archives at home. This feature of whānau archiving embodied critical aspects of tikanga (cultural protocol) as an expression of manaakitanga (hospitality) and whakanoa (the process of grounding oneself after inhabiting the sacred spaces created for taonga archives and tribal histories).

---

[321] Hond, 'Matua te Reo'.

7. **Te reo Māori is both a tool of whānau archiving and a taonga in its own right, which all interviewees sought to enhance.**

Hinerangi Korewha (H2) captured the view of all of the interviewees when he said that like a fish not being able to 'see' the water in which it swims, it was very natural for him to be part of the archiving and language revitalisation process.

Te reo was a critical context for this whānau archiving. In addition, it was a prerequisite for the interviews for this study, with two-thirds of interviewees being fluent in te reo and using it interchangeably with English in recording sessions. Had time constraints not been a factor, all of these interviewees would have used te reo throughout. All of the interviews began with pepeha (tribal sayings) to locate the interviewee and opened and closed with karakia (incantations).

The permission that was granted to conduct these interviews confirmed two views introduced in Chapter 1. First, it proved the standpoint of Adds et al. that 'by accepting Māori protocol and abiding by it white dominance is temporarily subjugated'. Second, an understanding of te reo was integral to this researcher managing her fear of unintentionally offending or trampling on tikanga (cultural protocol), which Hotere-Barnes has termed 'Pākehā paralysis'.[322]

8. **Te reo was frequently referred to in these interviews in the context of taonga lost or diminished because of the impacts of colonisation.**

---

[322] Hotere-Barnes, 'Generating "Non-stupid Optimism"'.

Language was a cornerstone of Māoridom on which the interviewees relied for reviving the mana (authority) and well-being of their whānau. The revival of te reo was an aspiration shared by all interviewees, with an emphasis on passing the Taranaki dialect on to their children and grandchildren. This was also noted as a challenge for some, with older members of the group expressing the whakamā (shame) they felt for their lack of fluency in the language of their forebears. Many shared stories of hearing their grandparents' generation speaking te reo among themselves but not to the generations below them and cited this break in language transmission as something they were trying to address through their archiving practice.

9. **Some taonga tūturu have been buried for safekeeping or because of superstitious fear that they would hurt someone if left above ground.**

Some of these taonga had been retrieved by whānau but the majority had not. While the thinking behind these practices was understood, this was not a tradition of caring for taonga that any of these whānau archivists wanted to continue. They all considered preserving and sharing taonga with their descendants an obligation of their duties as kaitiaki.

This set of conclusions has been based on the most common responses to the semi-structured questions posed in interviews with this group of whānau archivists. They represent the views and opinions shared across the group and they characterise the intentions, motivations and aspirations that the interviewees linked to the community archiving activities in which they were involved between 2014 and 2017. These conclusions provide the background for the final section of this thesis on the implications of this research and its

relevance for further research into Māori community archiving and its related fields.

Relevance and future research

Collecting institutions are full of archives and artefacts that once belonged to tangata whenua. Colonisation, collecting and misappropriation have distanced Māori from their taonga, leaving private archival collections with a special role to play in the lives of whānau. This research has positioned Māori community archiving and whānau-led collection management as strategies for restoring mana to whānau archives and empowering the kaitiaki that care for them. The benefits of these two activities are not isolated to the physical enhancement of whānau archives in private care. This research has demonstrated a strong connection between tangible and intangible cultural heritage and relationships between family members. As such, taonga archives are uniquely positioned to mitigate some of the negative impacts linked to historical experiences of colonisation and to restore vitality to kinship, language and culture within Māori communities.

The findings of this research will be relevant to iwi, hapū and whānau seeking strategies for approaching community archiving, as well as to researchers and professionals working with tangata whenua in the fields of record keeping and taonga collection management. In particular, it will resonate with outreach agencies of public sector institutions that seek a foothold in Māori communities as allies in the protection of this country's cultural heritage. The post-custodial model that defines community archiving is a middle ground in which collecting institutions can meet flax-root archivists to develop new strategies for engaging iwi, hapū and whānau on their own terms. The mutual

benefits that can derive from this 'space between' will be more contextual information and stories flowing into institutions about the objects they hold in exchange for the expertise and skills that can be devolved into Māori communities in return.

The outreach capacity of agencies such as National Services Te Paerangi is severely limited by its need to compete with all other aspects of museum operation for funding and resources. This research has highlighted the impact of National Services Te Paerangi engagement in Taranaki and it has given more weight to arguments for more dedicated funding to support Māori archiving taking place in communities, as well as placing more value on the non-quantifiable outcomes of engagement, such as strengthened relationships based on trust and mutual understanding.

It can be argued that the care and maintenance of private collections is the responsibility of its owners. However, the findings of Wai 262 and evidence of formative change that has come from the last three decades of progressive practice have proved that Aotearoa New Zealand is a leader in alternative modes of museological practice and the benefits that come from this. With this history to build on, lending weight to emergent trends in Māori community archiving is a logical next step for this country's cultural heritage sector. A small investment in this area could reap significant returns. It would help to shift the inertia that predominates over calls for a unified response to issues raised in the findings of the Wai 262 report,[323] which pointed to the need for greater recognition of tangata whenua rights around the control of their own traditional knowledge and customs. For this to occur, greater recognition is

---

[323] New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*, 527.

needed for the facts that collecting institutions are not the only places holding valuable tangible and intangible taonga and spiritual kaitiakitanga can only be delivered by the source communities. Community archiving is a field of practice in which kaitiaki can gain the skills and language they need to dictate the terms and conditions of care for their taonga within their own whānau, third parties and external agencies.

Several paths of future research could continue the line of investigation initiated by this thesis. This study's geographic focus on Taranaki means that its findings are relevant to Taranaki alone and cannot be extrapolated into other regions with different histories and tribal and social structures. However, the methodological framework and demonstrated effectiveness of qualitative oral history methods used in this research are replicable in other areas. This would provide a useful comparison with the findings of this research and broaden the range of definitions for Māori community archiving in the public domain. A similar study into the impacts and outcomes for the Ngāi Tahu[324] archive is recommended. Together, these two studies would provide examples for archiving at two ends of the Māori-led continuum; the new research would focus on a structured post-settlement model serving a single iwi, counterbalancing the focus of this research into a pan-tribal Taranaki archive[325] that arose from community language revitalisation efforts. It is predicated that within these two poles of Māori archiving practice, other iwi, hapū and whānau would find something of relevance to their own development strategies.

---

[324] https://ngaitahu.iwi.nz/tag/ngai-tahu-archives, accessed May 19, 2019.

[325] https://tereootaranaki.org/te-pute-routiriata, accessed May 19, 2019.

Another area identified for future research is the potential for adapting the international success of the Mukurtu open-source knowledge management platform for Māori community archiving in Aotearoa New Zealand. While this model is theoretically already available to Māori communities, research into the viability of three key changes could enhance its applicability to local community archiving scenarios. The first step would be research into options for a collectivised data storage and server option on local ground. Second, research into ways to take the existing framework and make it Māori would alleviate the duplication that currently occurs in tailoring this software for local contexts. This research has revealed the system's basic compatibility with Māori ways of working. The third step in this process would be examining the indigenous network models that have emerged in the US and Australia for application to tangata whenua needs in this country.

In conclusion, this small, focused study into the outcome of an adapted community archiving framework for Māori archiving has relevance for to iwi, hapū and whānau seeking strategies for approaching community archiving, and for researchers and sector professionals working with tangata whenua in the fields of record keeping and taonga collection management. It contains qualitative data that will resonate with the outreach agencies of public sector institutions seeking a foothold in Māori communities as allies in the protection of this country's unique cultural heritage. In addition, this research provides a platform for further research into several specific aspects of Māori community archiving, particularly the way different models for archiving can be scaled up (or down) to respond to the needs of iwi, hapū and whānau within their own distinct geographic and tribal areas. Finally, it points to the opportunity for future research into a viable alternative for a collectivised, Aotearoa-based

digital-archiving model that has been demonstrated as being effective internationally, as well as in the evolution of a uniquely Māori, whānau-centred and whānau-driven approach to archiving projects in the Taranaki region.

Glossary of Māori terms

ahi kā	to keep the home fires burning
ao Māori	Māori world view
aroha	love, compassion, empathy
aronga Māori	Māori focus
awa	river
hā	breath
hākari	feast
hapū	sub-tribal; sub-tribes
harakeke	flax
hītori	history
hononga	relationships
iwi	tribe, tribes, tribal
iwi rūnanga	tribal council
kahu	apparel items
kahu kiwi	ceremonial kiwi feather cloak
kahu kiwikiwi	kiwi feather cloak
kai	food
kaikaranga	women caller or callers to marae visitors
kaimahi	worker
kaipupuri	caretakers; holder or keeper
kairaranga	weaver
kaitiaki	caretaker; customary guardians; customary owners; owners
kaitiakitanga	duties of care; guardianship
kākahu	apparel, clothing items
kanohi ki te kanohi	face to face
kapo kōrero	capturing oral history
karakia	incantation, ritual chant
karanga	ceremonial call, first call
kaumātua	elder
kaumātuatanga	an elder's role
kaupapa	issues, initiatives
kaupapa Māori	Māori ideologies and causes
kawa	ceremonial protocols
kāwanatanga	government

kei te mate haere	death is imminent
kete	basket, woven basket or baskets
kia rangona	so it can be heard
ko wai koe?	who are you?
koha	gift or contribution
kōrero	oratory, stories
kōrero karakia	prayers and incantations that are recited
koretake	useless
koro	grandfather
koroua	male elder
korowai	ornamental or ceremonial cloak
kua hē te aronga	that perspective is all wrong
kua rangona	heard, in relation to information from trusted sources
kuia	female elder
kura pō	night classes
mahi	work
mahitahi	collaboration, working together as one
mamae	hurt
mana	prestige, authority, spiritual power
mana raraunga	digital data sovereignty
mana whenua	sovereignty over tribal lands
manaaki	caring
manaakitanga	generosity, support, hospitality
Māoritanga	Māori practices and beliefs, the Māori way of life
marae	communal spaces usually encompassing a meeting house
māramatanga	understanding
mātauranga	knowledge, traditional knowledge teachings
maunga	mountain
mauri	material symbol of a life principle
me hoki mai koutou ki te kāinga	you need to come home
mere pounamu	short, flat greenstone weapon
mihi	welcome speech
moko	grandchild, descendant, grandchildren
mokopuna	grandchild, descendant, grandchildren
muka	prepared flax fibre
Ngāti Pukamata	tribal Facebook

pā	to touch, physical connection
pā harakeke	flax plantations and nurseries
pāhake	older person, senior
pānui	newsletter
papakāinga	communal home bases, homestead, family home
paru	natural mud pigment, traditional earth dye
patu pounamu	greenstone hand weapon
pea	perhaps
pepeha	tribal saying
piu heke	large coarse cloak of rough flax
piupiu	waist to knees garment made of flax
pono	trust
pou kuia	prominent female elder
pou tupuna	prominent ancestor
pounamu	greenstone
poutama pattern	stepped arrangement used in tukutuku and woven mats
pōwhiri	ceremonial encounter, welcome
rangatira	tribal leaders
rangatiratanga	sovereignty
rangona	to be heard
rāpaki	traditional kilt worn from waist to knee
raranga	weaving
reo	language
rōpū tuku iho	whānau, hapū and iwi
tā moko	traditional tattooing
taiaha	long, wooden weapon
tamariki	children
tangata whenua	indigenous people
tangi	funeral
tangihanga	funeral, funerals
taonga	treasured items
taonga tuku iho	treasures handed down between generations
taonga tūturu	original, authentic treasure
tapu	restricted or sensitive material, sacred
Taranakitanga	Taranaki reo and tikanga, denotes whakapapa links
tauiwi	non-Māori, not necessarily of European descent

te ao hurihuri	the changing world
te ao Pākehā	the European settler world
te hokinga mahara	the memories come back
tika	correct
tikanga	cultural and ritual traditions, protocols, customary practice
tino rangatiratanga	autonomy, self determination
tohunga whakapapa	genealogy expert
toki	adze
tuakana-teina	elder-junior
tukanga	methods
tūpāpaku	body
tupuna	ancestor
tūpuna	ancestors
tūturu	sacred knowledge; traditional
uri	descendants
urupā	burial ground, whānau cemetery
waha ki te taringa	mouth to ear
wahine Māori	a Māori woman
wāhine toa	learned women
waiata	songs and chants
waiata o mua	traditional chant
wairua	spirit
waka	canoe; vehicle
wānanga	educational forums
whaikōrero	formal speeches; orator
whakahoki ki te kāinga	homecoming
whakairo	carvings
whakamā	shame
whakamana	to uphold, give authority to
whakanoa	process of removing tapu
whakapapa	ancestral links; genealogy, lineage, descent
whakapapa ā toto	blood relationships
whakarauora	to save, revive or rescue
whakaaro	perspective
whakatauākī	a proverb with a known provenance/source
whakataukī	proverbial saying
whakawhanaungatanga	the process of establishing relationships
whānau	Māori family and community

whānau whānui	extended family
whānau whenua	family land
whanaunga	relatives
whanaungatanga	family relationships, sense of family connection
whare	house
whare wānanga	house of learning
Wharekauri	Chatham Islands
wharenui	ceremonial house
whāriki	ceremonial mat, woven mat
whenua	land

Bibliography

Books and e-books

Adds, Peter, Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich, Richard S. Hill, and Graeme Whimp. *Reconciliation, Representation and Indigeneity: 'Biculturalism' in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Winter, 2016.

Anderson, Atholl, Judith Binney, and Aroha Harris. *Tangata Whenua: A History*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2015.

Attwood, Bain and Fiona Magowan. *Telling Stories: Indigenous History and Memory in Australia and New Zealand*. United States: Allen & Unwin, 2002.

Barnes, Marian, Tula Brannelly, Lizzie Ward, and Nicki Ward. *Ethics of Care: Critical Advances in International Perspective*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.

Berryman, Mere, Suzanne SooHoo, and Ann Nevin. *Culturally Responsive Methodologies*. Bingley: Emerald, 2013.

Boyd, Douglas A. and Mary Larson. *Oral History and Digital Humanities Voice, Access, and Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Clayworth, Peter. *Recording Tangata Whenua Oral Histories and Traditions: Techniques and Lessons from the Ruapekapeka Pā Oral History Project*. Wellington: Department of Conservation, 2010.

Donahue, Jay, Lyla June Johnston, Miho Kim, Jay Macedo, Mara
Ortenburger, and Alison Whitemore. *Our Voice, Our Land: A Guide to Community-based Strategies for Mapping Indigenous Stories.* California: Data Centre for Research and Justice, 2015. A2014.

Gardner, James and Paula Hamilton. *The Oxford Handbook of Public History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Gilliland, Anne J. *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives.* Chicago: ALA Editions, 2014.

Gilliland, Anne, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew Lau. *Research in the Archival Multiverse*. Victoria: Monash University Press, 2016.

Green, Anna and Megan Hutching. *Remembering: Writing Oral History.* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2004.

Higgins, Rawinia, Poia Rewi, and Vincent Olsen-Reeder. *The Value of the Maori Language: Te Hua O Te Reo Maori*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2014.

Hiroa, T. R. *The Coming of the Maori.* Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs,1950.

Houston, John. *Māori Life in Old Taranaki*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2006.

Janesick, Valerie J. *Oral History for the Qualitative Researcher: Choreographing the Story.* New York: Guilford, 2010.

Knell, Simon J. *Museums and the Future of Collecting.* London: Routledge, 2016.

La Follette, Laetitia. *Negotiating Culture: Heritage, Ownership, and Intellectual Property*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2013.

Leavy, Patricia. *Oral History: Understanding Qualitative Research*. Cary: Oxford University Press. 2011.

Levy, Daniel, Jeffery Olick, and Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi. *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

McCarthy, Conal. *Exhibiting Maori: A History of Colonial Cultures of Display.* New York: Oxford, 2007.

McCarthy, Conal. *Museums and Māori: Heritage Professionals, Indigenous Collections, Current Practice.* Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2011.

McRae, Jane. *Māori Oral Tradition: He Kōrero Nō te Ao Tawhito*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2017.

Miller, Bruce Granville. *Oral History on Trial: Recognizing Aboriginal Narratives in the Courts.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2011.

Millar, Laura. *Archives: Principles and Practices.* London: Facet, 2010.

New Zealand Geographic Board. *He Kōrero Pūrākau Mo Ngā Taunahanahatanga a Ngā Tūpuna = Place Names of the Ancestors, a Māori Oral History Atlas.* Wellington: New Zealand Geographic Board, 1990.

Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith. *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2008.

Orange, C. *An Illustrated History of the Treaty of Waitangi.* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd, 2004.

Peers, Laura, and Alison K. Brown. *Museums and Source Communities*.
London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Perks, Robert, and Alistair Thomson. *The Oral History Reader.* London:
Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2016.

Ritchie, Donald A. *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History.* Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2012.

Roy, Loriene, Anjali Bhasin, and Sarah K. Arriaga. *Tribal Libraries, Archives,
and Museums: Preserving Our Language, Memory, and Lifeways*.
Lanham: Scarecrow, 2011.

Royal, Charles Te Ahukaramū. *Te Haurapa. An Introduction to Researching
Tribal Histories and Traditions*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books and
Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs, 1992.

Selby, Rachael, Alison J. Laurie, and National Oral History Association of
New Zealand (NOHANZ). *Māori and Oral History: A Collection.*
Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous
Peoples*. Moorpark, CA: Cram101 Inc., 2013.

Society of American Archivists. *A Glossary of Archival and Records
Terminology*. Online publication, 2005, accessed March 4, 2019,
https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/p/postcustodial-theory-of-ar
chives.

Sully, Dean. *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses
Outside New Zealand.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast, 2007.

Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Whaanga, Hēmi, Te Taka Adrian Gregory Keegan, and Mark Apperley. *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, Culture & Technology.* Hamilton: University of Waikato Press, 2017.

Wilson, Shawn. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods.* Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publications, 2008.

Book chapters

Boulton, Amohia. 'Care Ethics and Indigenous Values: Political, Tribal and Personal'. In *Ethics of Care: Critical Advances in International Perspective*, edited by Tula Brannelly, Marian Barnes, Lizzie Ward and Nicki Ward, 69–82. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.

Hall, C. 'Mukurtu for Mātauranga Māori: A Case Study in Indigenous Archiving for Reo and Tikanga Revitalisation'*. In *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, Culture & Technology,* edited by Hēmi Whaanga, Te Taka Keegan and Mark Apperley, 189–199. Hamilton: University of Waikato Press, 2017.

Manheim, Karl. 'The Sociological Problem of Generations', in Daniel Levy, Jeffery K. Olick and Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, eds., *The Collective Memory Reader,* 91-98. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Parekōwhai, Cushla. 'Kōrero Taku Whāea: Talk My Aunt: Learning to Listen to Māori Women'. In *Māori and Oral History: A Collection, edited by* Rachael Selby and Alison J. Laurie, 38-42. Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005.

Royal, Charles Te Ahukaramū. 'Oral History and Hapū Development'. In

    Māori and Oral History: A Collection, edited by Rachael Selby and

    Alison J. Laurie, 16-18. Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005.

Royal, Charles Te Ahukaramū. 'Some Notes on Oral and Indigenous Thought

    and Knowledge'. In *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*, edited by

    Rachael Selby and Alison J. Laurie, 45-49. Wellington: NOHANZ,

    2005.

Selby, Rachel. 'Partnership and the Protection of Participants: Collecting and

    Using Māori Oral Histories'. In *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*,

    edited by Rachael Selby and Alison J. Laurie, 70-73. Wellington:

    NOHANZ, 2005.

Soutar, Monty. 'Tribal History in History'. In *Māori and Oral History: A*

    Collection, edited by Rachael Selby and Alison J. Laurie, 4-5.

    Wellington: NOHANZ, 2005.

Tapsell, Paul. 'Aroha Mai: Whose Museum? The Rise of Indigenous Ethics

    in Museum Contexts: A Māori-led Tribal Perspective'. In *New*

    Directions in Museum Ethics, ed. Janet Marstine, Alexander Bauer

    and Chelsea Haines. London: Routledge, 2014.

Journal articles

Anderson, Jane and Kimberley Christen. 'Traditional Knowledge Licences

    and Labels'. *Art Law* 4 (2012): 42–44.

Anderson, Jane and Kimberly Christen. 'Chuck a Copyright on It: Dilemmas of Digital Return and the Possibilities for Traditional Knowledge Licenses and Labels'. Museum Anthropology Review 7 (2013): 105-126.

Battley, Belinda. 'Archives as Places, Places as Archives: Doors to Privilege, Places of Connection or Haunted Sarcophagi of Crumbling Skeletons?' *Archival Science* 1 (2019): 1–26.

Bell, Avril. 'Decolonizing Conviviality and "Becoming Ordinary": Cross-cultural Face-to-face Encounters in Aotearoa New Zealand'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 7 (2016): 1170–1186.

Binney, Judith. 'Maori Oral Narratives, Pakeha Written Texts: Two Forms of Telling History'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 38, no. 2 (2004): 203–214.

Blacklock, Fabri. 'The Diversity of Indigenous Oral History'. *Oral History Association of Australia Journal* 32 (2010): 20–23.

Brannelly, Tula, Amohia Boulton, and Rosalind Edwards. 'The Ethics of Care and Transformational Research Practices in Aotearoa New Zealand'. *Qualitative Research* 17, no. 3 (2017): 340–350.

Buchanan, Rachel. 'Decolonizing the Archives: The Work of New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal'. *Public History Review* 14 (2007): 44–63.

Christen, Kimberly. 'Tribal Archives, Traditional Knowledge, and Local Contexts: Why the "s" Matters'. *Journal of Western Archives* 6, no. 1 (2015): Article 3.

Christen, Kimberly. 'Does Information Really Want to Be Free? Indigenous

Knowledge Systems and the Question of Openness', *International

Journal of Communication* (2012): 2870.

Clarke, Victoria and Virginia Braun. 'Teaching Thematic Analysis:

Overcoming Challenges and Developing Strategies for Effective

Learning'. *The Psychologist* 26, no. 2 (2013): 120–123.

Cook, Terry. 'Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting

Archival Paradigms'. *Archival Science* 13, no. 2 (2013): 95–120.

Darms, Lisa. 'Radical Archives (Introduction)'. Archives Journal Special Issue

(November 2015): online publication accessed May 18, 2019,

https://www.archivejournal.net/essays/radical-archives/.

Davidson, Jared. 'The Colonial Continuum: Archives, Access, and Power'.

Archifacts (April 2015): 17–24.

De Caro, Frank. 'Stories and "Oral History" Interviews: A Thematic Analysis

of "Embedded" Narratives'. *Western Folklore* 71, no. 3–4 (2012):

257–77.

Durie, Mason H. 'The Health of Indigenous Peoples'. *BMJ (Clinical Research

Edition)* (2003): 510–511.

Dwyer, Sonya Corbin and Jennifer L. Buckle. 'The Space Between: On Being

an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research'. *International Journal of

Qualitative Methods* 8, no. 1 (2009): 54–63.

Eketone, A. 'Theoretical Underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori Directed Practice'.

MAI Review 1 (2008): 1–11.

Evans, Joanne, Sue McKemmish, Elizabeth E. Daniels, and Gavan McCarthy. 'Self-determination and Archival Autonomy: Advocating Activism'. *Archival Science* 15, no. 4 (2015): 337–368.

Eyssartier, Cecilia, Ana H. Ladio, and Mariana Lozada. 'Cultural Transmission of Traditional Knowledge in Two Populations of North-western Patagonia'. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 4, no. 1 (2008): 25.

Flinn, Andrew. 'Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges'. *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 28, no. 2 (2007): 151-167.

Gilliland, Anne J. and Hariz Halilovich. 'Migrating Memories: Transdisciplinary Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching About Diasporic Memory, Identity and Human Rights in Archival Studies'. *Archival Science* 17, no. 1 (2017): 79–96.

Green, Anna. 'Individual Remembering and "Collective Memory": Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates'. *Oral History* 32, no. 2 (2004): 35–44.

Green, A. 'Intergenerational Family Stories'. *Journal of Family History* 38, no. 4 (2013): 387–402.

Green, Anna. 'Returning History to the Community: Oral History in a Museum Setting'. *Oral History Review: Journal of the Oral History Association* 24, no. 2 (1997): 53–72.

Green, S. and G. Winter. 'Looking Out and Keeping the Gate Open: Wairarapa Archive, New Zealand's Greatest Little Archive'. *Australasian Public Libraries and Information Services* 25, no. 1 (2012): 23–31.

Hall, Claire. *Ka Puta, Ka Ora: Digital archiving and the revitalisation of Taranaki reo.* Archifacts. (October 2011 to April 2012).

Heikell, Vicki-Anne. 'Our Future Lies in the Past: Me Hoki Whakamuri, Kia Ahu Whakamua, Ka Neke'. *International Preservation News* 61 (2013): 12–14.

Hotere-Barnes, Alex. 'Generating "Non-stupid Optimism": Addressing Pākehā Paralysis in Māori Educational Research'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 50 (2015): 39–53.

Hunt, Dallas. 'Nikîkîwân: Contesting Settler-Colonial Archives Through Indigenous Oral History'. *Canadian Literature* 230–231 (2016): 25–42.

Hunter, J. 'The Role of Information Technologies in Indigenous Knowledge Management'. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 36, no. 2 (2013): 109–124.

Jones, Alison. 'Dangerous Liaisons: Pākehā, Kaupapa Māori, and Educational Research'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 47, no. 2 (2012): 100–12.

Kidman, Joanna. 'Comparatively Speaking: Notes on Decolonizing Research'. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 17, no. 4 (2018): 1–10.

Liebert, Rachel Jane, Ruthellen Josselson, Cristian Tileagă, and Jovan Byford. 'Radical Archiving as Social Psychology from the Future'. *Qualitative Psychology* 4, no. 1 (2017): 90–100.

Love, Honiana and Claire Hall. 'Ka Puta, Ka Ora: Digital Archiving and the Revitalisation of Taranaki Reo'. *Archifacts* (October 11–April 2012): 25–34.

Mahuika, Nēpia. '"Closing the Gaps": From Postcolonialism to Kaupapa Maori and Beyond'. *The New Zealand Journal of History* 45 (2011): 15–32.

Mahuika, Nēpia. 'New Zealand History Is Māori History: Tikanga as the Ethical Foundation of Historical Scholarship in Aotearoa New Zealand'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 49 (2015): 5–30.

Mahuika, Nēpia. 'An Outsider's Guide to Public Oral History in New Zealand'. *New Zealand Journal of Public History* 27 (2017): 3–18.

Mahuika, Rangimarie. 'Kaupapa Māori Theory is Critical and Anti-colonial'. *MAI Review* 3 (2008): Article 4.

Mangan, Hinureina. 'Nga Puna Maumahara: Marae-based Repositories: A Research Project in Process'. *Archifacts* (April 2005): 89–101.

Millar, Laura. 'Touchstones: Considering the Relationship Between Memory and Archives'. *Archivaria* 61 (2006): 105–26.

Moodie, Jane. '"Surprised by Joy": A Case History Exploring the Expression of Spiritual Joy in Oral History'. *Oral History* 38, no. 2 (2010): 75–84.

Ngata, Wayne, Hera Ngata-Gibson, and Amiria Salmond. 'Te Ataakura: Digital Taonga and Cultural Innovation'. *Journal of Material Culture* 17, no. 3 (2012): 229–244.

O'Carroll, Acushla Deanne. 'Virtual Whanaungatanga: Māori Utilizing Social Networking Sites to Attain and Maintain Relationships'. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 9, no. 3 (2013): 230–45.

O'Carroll, Acushla Deanne. 'Māori Identity Construction in SNS'. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* 6, no. 2 (2013): 2–16.

Pihama, Leonie, Paul Reynolds, Cherryl Smith, John Reid, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, and Te Rihi Nana. 'Positioning Historical Trauma Theory within Aotearoa New Zealand'. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 10, no. 3 (2014): 248–62.

Rabbitt, Elaine. 'Indigenous Australian Oral Stories Contribute to the Australian Reconciliation Process'. *Oral History Association of Australia Journal* 35 (2013): 23–29.

Roberts, Mere, Waerete Norman, Nganeko Minhinnick, Del Wihongi, and Carmen Kirkwood. 'Kaitiakitanga: Maori Perspectives on Conservation'. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 2, no. 1 (1995): 7–20.

Roy, Loriene and Daniel L. Alonzo. 'Perspectives on Tribal Archives'. *The Electronic Library* 21, no. 5 (2003): 422–27.

Russell, L. 'Indigenous Knowledge and Archives: Accessing Hidden History and Understandings'. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 36, no. 2 (2005):161–171.

Shnukal, Anna. '"It's All about Respect": The Etiquette of Recording Indigenous Oral History'. *Oral History Association of Australia Journal* (1998): 13–18.

Smith, Claire and Gary Jackson, 'Decolonizing Indigenous Archaeology: Developments from Down Under'. *American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3/4 (2006): 311-349.

Smith, Linda, Te Kahautu Maxwell, Haupai Puke, and Pou Temara. 'Indigenous Knowledge, Methodology and Mayhem: What is the Role of Methodology in Producing Indigenous Insights? A Discussion from Mātauranga Maori'. *Knowledge Cultures* 4, no. 3 (2016): 131–156.

Tapsell, Paul. 'The Flight of Pareraututu: An Investigation of Taonga from a Tribal Perspective'. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 106, no. 4 (1997): 323–374.

Thomson, Alistair. 'To Live Is to Remember: Making Sense of the Past'. *Oral History* 25, no. 2 (1997): 23–26.

Tolich, Martin. 'Pakeha Paralysis: Cultural Safety for Those Researching the General Population of Aotearoa'. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 19 (2002)164–178.

Whaanga, Hēmi, David Bainbridge, Michela Anderson, Korii Scrivener, Papitha Cader, Tom Roa, and Te Taka Keegan. 'He Matapihi Mā Mua, Mō Muri: The Ethics, Processes, and Procedures Associated with the Digitization of Indigenous Knowledge –The Pei Jones Collection'. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5–6 (2015): 520–547.

Winiata, Whatarangi. 'Survival of Maori as a People and Maori Archives'.
Archifacts (April 2005): 9–19.

Thesis

Anderson, Michaela. 'An Exploration of the Ethical Implications of the
Digitisation and Dissemination of Mātauranga Māori (with Special
Reference to the Pei te Hurinui Jones Collection)'. MA thesis,
University of Waikato, 2012.

Hakiwai, Arapata Tamati. 'He Mana Taonga, He Mana Tangata: Māori Taonga
and the Politics of Māori Tribal Identity and Development'. PhD thesis,
Victoria University of Wellington, 2014.

Hond, Ruakere. 'Matua Te Reo, Matua Te Tangata: Speaker Community:
Visions, Approaches, Outcomes'. PhD thesis, Massey University,
2013.

Horwood, Michelle. 'Worlds Apart: Indigenous Re-engagement with
Museum-held Heritage: A New Zealand–United Kingdom Case Study'.
PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2015.

Mahuika, Nēpia. '"Kōrero Tuku Iho": Reconfiguring Oral History and Oral
Tradition'. PhD thesis, University of Waikato, 2012.

Newman, Joanna M. A. 'Sustaining Community Archives'. MA thesis, Victoria
University of Wellington, 2010.

Ngāwhare-Pounamu, Dennis. 'Living Memory and the Travelling Mountain
Narrative of Taranaki'. PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington,
2014.

O'Carroll, Acushla Deanne. 'Kanohi Ki te Kanohi – A Thing of the Past? An Examination of Māori Using Social Networking Sites and the Implications for Māori Culture and Society'. PhD thesis, Massey University, 2011.

Sciascia, Ana. 'Iwi Exhibitions at Te Papa: A Ngāi Tahu Perspective'. MA thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2012.

Academic case studies and other research reports

Crookston, Mark, Gillian Oliver, Ariana Tikao, Paul Diamond, Chern Li Liew, and Sarsha-Leigh Douglas. *Kōrero Kitea: Ngā Hua o te Whakamamatitanga: The Impacts of Digitised Te Reo and Archival Collections.* Wellington: InterPARES Trust, 2016.

Davidson, Jared. 'Out of Sight, Out of Mind? Non-user Understandings of Archives in Aotearoa New Zealand'. Report towards Master of Information Studies, School of Information Management, Victoria University of Wellington, 2014.

Hall, Claire. *I Te Pūtake: Building Māori Archiving and Cultural Heritage Networks for Aotearoa*. New Zealand Museums Blog, March 2016.

Harris, Aroha. *Crown Acquisition of Confiscated and Maori Land in Taranaki, 1872–1881.* Wellington: New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, 1993.

McClutchie Whānau, *He Taura Herenga, He Tāngata Tiaki Taonga*, self-published booklet, 2016.

New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal. *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: A Report into Claims Concerning New Zealand Law and Policy Affecting Māori Culture and Identity*. Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2011.

Parliamentary Counsel Office. New Zealand Protected Objects Amendment
   Act 2006. Wellington, online edition, 2006.

Reihana, Pikihuia. '"Ngāti Pukamata" Virtual Iwi: Using Facebook to Manage
   Whakapapa: A Case Study'. MA case study, Victoria University of
   Wellington, 2014.

Royal, Charles Te Ahukaramū. *Mātauranga Māori and Museum Practice. A
   Discussion.* Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa,
   2007.

Tirikātene, Kukupa. Cited in *A Tapestry of Understanding: Intergenerational
   Family Learning*. City of Manukau Education Trust (COMET)
   Discussion Paper, Auckland: COMET, 2006.

Welland, Sarah. *The Role, Impact and Development of Community Archives
   in New Zealand: A Research Paper.* Wellington: The Open
   Polytechnic, 2015.

Conference papers and presentations

Bonisch-Brednich, Brigitte and Richard Hill. 'Problematics of Applying
   Indigenous Oral History to Politico-Racial Reconciliation in
   Aotearoa/New Zealand'. Proceedings of the International Oral History
   Association Conference, 2004.
   https://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10063/708/a
   rticle.pdf?sequence=8.

Gilliland, Anne. 'Community-based Archiving'. Unpublished course reference
   material at Victoria University Community-based Archiving
   Masterclass, 2014.

Stevenson, Alison and Samantha Callaghan. 'Digitisation and Matauranga Maori'. Conference details unknown, 2008. Wellington: New Zealand Electronic Text Centre, accessed May 19, 2019, https://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/608/paper.pdf?sequence=1.

Te Mana Raraunga. 'Summary Report of the Indigenous Data Sovereignty Summit, 14 November 2016'. Te Mana Raraunga, 2016, accessed May 19, 2019, https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58e9b10f9de4bb8d1fb5ebbc/t/5913038ed482e9800e82a10b/1494418322395/IDSov+Nov+2016+Summit+Report+-+Final.pdf.

Tikao, A., Honiana Love, and Claire Hall. 'Whakahoki Ki te Kāinga: The Long (Digital) Road Home for Taranaki's Atkinson Letters'. Keynote presentation filmed November 2017 at the National Digital Forum Symposium, Te Papa, Wellington, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kSyU5SXjs0c.

Tinirau, R. 'He Ara Whanaungatanga: A Pathway Towards Sustainable, Intergenerational, Research Relationships. The Experience of Ngāti Ruaka/Ngāti Hine'. In *Proceedings of the Traditional Knowledge Conference 2008 Te Tatau Pounamu: The Greenstone Door. Traditional Knowledge and Gateways to Balanced Relationships*, Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, 2008.

Oral history interviews

Broughton, Āria. Recorded 22 March 2019.

Hogdes Paul, Tania. Recorded 23 March 2019.

Jones, Mako. Recorded 29 March 2019.

Korewha, Bob. Recorded 24 March 2019.

Korewha, Hinerangi. Recorded 24 March 2019.

Paul, Matiu. Recorded 23 March 2019.

Phillips, Sue. Recorded 12 April 2019.

Ruakere, Hokipera. Recorded 21 March 2019.

Taylor, Margie. Recorded 12 April 2019.

Taylor Manu, Ngāiwikau. Recorded 27 March 2019.

Waikerepuru, Ria. Recorded 5 April 2019.

Websites

archivists.org

archivejournal.net/essays/radical-archivescomet.org.nz

maoridictionary.co.nz

maoritelevision.com

mukurtu.org

mukurtu-australia-nsw.libraries.wsu.edu

natlib.govt.nz

nzetc.victoria.ac.nz

nzherald.co.nz

oralhistory.org.nz

paperspast.natlib.govt.nz

pressreader.com

pukeariki.com

stuff.co.nz

sustainableheritagenetwork.org

tepapa.govt.nz

waitangitribunal.govt.nz

www.legislation.govt.nz

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Interviewee list

Appendix B: Oral history Code of Ethics

Appendix C: Human ethics approval

Appendix D: Transcriber confidentiality agreement form

Appendix E: Participant information sheet

Appendix F: Consent to interview form

Appendix G: Transcribing confidentiality agreement

Appendix A: Interviewee list

All interviews were recorded on a Zoom H4N recorder, using AKG or Countryman lapel microphones. The raw (.wav) recording rate was 44.1 KHz. All interviewees signed research consent forms allowing their names and interviews to be cited for this research and agreed to an external transcriber working with their interviews. Only one interviewee did not want a copy of their recording or associated interview transcript. All requested a copy of the final report.

	Interviewee name	Unique identifier in text	Date/s	Recorded at
1	Āria Broughton	A1	22/03/19	Interviewee's home, Ōkato
2	Bob Korewha	B2	24/03/19	Interviewee's home, New Plymouth
3	Hinerangi Korewha	H2	24/03/19	Interviewee's home, New Plymouth
4	Hokipera Ruakere	H1	21/03/19	Interviewer's home, New Plymouth
5	Mako Jones	M3	29/03/19	Interviewer's home, New Plymouth
6	Matiu Paul	M2	23/03/19	Interviewee's home, Waitara
7	Margie Taylor	MT3	12/04/19	Interviewee's home, New Plymouth
8	Ngāiwikau Taylor Manu	N3	27/03/19	Interviewee's home, New Plymouth
9	Ria Waikerepuru	R2	05/04/19	Interviewer's home, New Plymouth
10	Sue Phillips	S3	12/04/19	Interviewer's home, New Plymouth
11	Tania Hodges-Paul	T2	23/03/19	Interviewee's home, Waitara

Appendix B: Oral history Code of Ethics

Working draft

Code of ethical and technical practice for kaupapa Māori oral history capture

The organiser of this oral history project accepts the following responsibilities:

- To foster oral history and archiving practice that allows interviewees to maintain mana motuhake over their own mātauranga.

- To respect the values and ethics associated with creating oral history records for this project: aroha, tika, pono, manaakitanga, whakawhanaungatanga, tino rangatiratanga and mana whenua.

- To support and train interviewers to gain competence and interviewing skill; to match appropriate interviewers to interviewees.

- To determine appropriate kaitiaki processes for the safekeeping of oral history records.

- To train interviewers in oral history indexing and cataloguing techniques.

- To advise on the skills and equipment required for achieving archival quality recording for preservation opportunities and accompanying material at the highest possible standard.

- To ensure that placement arrangements promote interviewees' mana over access to recordings and accompanying material.

- To ensure that placement and access complies with a signed or recorded agreement with the person interviewed.

- To ensure that people interviewed are informed of issues such as copyright, ownership, privacy legislation and how the interview and accompanying material may be used.

- To create relationships with other council-managed project data and research, as appropriate or authorised.

- To guard against possible social injury to, or exploitation of, people interviewed.

Interviewers have the following responsibilities:

- To inform the person interviewed of the kaupapa and tikanga of oral history and its value in the context of this project, as well as the anticipated storage destination and its accessibility.

- To inform the person interviewed of issues such as copyright, ownership, privacy legislation and how the interview and accompanying material may be used.

- To develop sufficient skills and knowledge in interviewing and equipment operation (e.g. through reading and training) to ensure the results are of the highest possible standard.

- To use equipment that will produce recordings of the highest possible standard.

- To encourage informative dialogue based on thorough research.

- To conduct interviews with tika, pono and aroha.

- To treat every interview as confidential, with the contents of it available only as determined by written or recorded agreement with the interviewee.

- To archive recordings and all accompanying material subject to any conditions placed on it by the interviewee.

- To inform the interviewee of where the material will be held.

- To abide by all agreements made by the person interviewed.

Appendix C: Human ethics approval

From: researchmaster-help@vuw.ac.nz
Subject: Human ethics application approval 0000026116. Automated Email, Do Not Reply
Date: June 12, 2018 at 1:17 PM
To: hall.claire@gmail.com
Cc: isobel.cairns@vuw.ac.nz, ethicsadmin@vuw.ac.nz

Dear Claire,

Thank you for your application for ethical approval (Working title: Ngā raranga i makere // Stitches dropped in time: An oral history study of
intergenerational family memory within whānau archival collections of Taranaki whānui., reference 0000026116), which has now been considered by the Standing Committee of the Human Ethics Committee.

Your application is approved as of today. Your approval applies for three years from the date of this email.

If you would like to receive a formal letter please contact the HEC Administrator (ethicsadmin@vuw.ac.nz).

Best wishes with the research.

Judith Loveridge, Convenor
Human Ethics Committee

*****This is an automated email. Do not reply to this email address*******

Queries for the central Human Ethics Committee can be sent to ethicsadmin@vuw.ac.nz

Appendix D: Transcriber confidentiality

agreement form

TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI
VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Transcribing Confidentiality Agreement

Project Title: Ngā Raranga i Makere – Stitches dropped in time

Principal Investigator: Claire Hall

I , _____ agree to ensure that the audio files I transcribe will

remain confidential to Claire Hall and myself.

I agree to take the following precautions:

1. I will ensure that no person, other than Claire Hall, hears the recording.

2. I will ensure that no other person has access to my computer/device.

3. I will delete the files from my computer/device once the transcription has been completed.

4. I will not discuss any aspect of the recording with anyone except Claire Hall.

Signature:

Date:

Appendix E: Participant information sheet

TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Title (working): Ngā raranga i makere // Stitches dropped in time: An oral history study of intergenerational family memory within two archival collections of Taranaki whānui.

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

You are invited to take part in this research. Please read this information before deciding whether or not to take part. If you decide to participate, thank you. If you decide not to participate, thank you for considering this request.

Who am I?

My name is Claire Hall and I am a Masters student in New Zealand Studies at Victoria University of Wellington. This research project is work towards my thesis.

What is the aim of the project?

This project examining intergenerational family memory handed down within archival collections of two Taranaki whānau Māori. It investigates the concept and shape of private whānau archives within the frame of tukuihotanga - fragments of inherited family history, connecting past and present.

This research has been approved by the Victoria University of Wellington Human Ethics Committee [tbc]

How can you help?

You have been invited to participate because you have been nominated by your whānau as a family member involved in your whānau archiving project, and able to answer questions about your whānau archival collection, its contents, and significance to your whānau. If you agree to take part I will interview you at your home, or your whānau papakāinga. I will ask you questions about your whānau archival collection, and your family's efforts to care for it for future generations. The interview will take a few hours. I will audio record the interview with your permission and write it up later. You can choose to not answer any question or stop the interview at any time, without giving a reason. You can withdraw from the study by contacting me at any time before 31 October 2018. If you withdraw, the information you provided will be destroyed or returned to you.

What will happen to the information you give?

Any information you provide will first be accessible to Claire Hall as researcher, and her university supervisors. Only the sections of oral history research related to pre-agreed themes and agreed by you will be considered for analysis in my final write up.

The way your identity will be presented and/or revealed in final publication will be discussed with you as part of the interview planning process. Anonymity will be an option, as will being named in the final report. However, you should be aware that in small projects your identity might be obvious to others in your community.

Choices available to you regarding identification in my final write up:

I understand that identification of me in relation to any information I provide for this research will be entirely at my discretion. I also understand that withholding may name from publication may not assure my anonymity in such a confined study based around a shared whanau kaupapa.

[OR]

I consent to information or opinions which I have given being attributed to me in any reports on this research.

Only my supervisors and myself will read the notes or transcripts of your interview. The interview transcripts, summaries and any recordings will be kept securely for evidential purposes only and destroyed by the University after five years. The master interview files will be returned to you for archiving at your discretion.

What will the project produce?

The information from my research will be used, with your permission, in Masters thesis, and/or academic publications and conferences related to my research.

If you accept this invitation, what are your rights as a research participant?

You do not have to accept this invitation if you don't want to. If you do decide to participate, you have the right to:

- choose not to answer any question;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview
- withdraw from the study at any time
- ask any questions about the study at any time
- receive a copy of your interview recording
- receive a copy of your interview index
- read over and comment on a written summary of your interview
- be able to read any reports of this research by emailing the researcher to request a copy.

If you have any questions or problems, who can you contact?

If you have any questions, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either me or my supervisor:

Student:

Name: Claire Hall

University email address:
claire.hall@vuw.ac.nz

Application ID: 0000026116

Supervisor #1:

Name: Associate Professor Anna Green

Role: Primary supervisor

School: Stout Centre

anna.green@vuw.ac.nz

Supervisor #2:

Name: Annie Te One

Role: Second supervisor

School: Department of Māori Studies

annie.teone@vuw.ac.nz

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convenor: Dr Judith Loveridge. Email hec@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 6028.

Appendix F: Consent to interview form

TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Title (working): Ngā raranga i makere // Stitches dropped in time: An oral history study of intergenerational family memory within two archival collections of Taranaki whānui.

CONSENT TO INTERVIEW

This consent form will be held for [5] years.

Researcher: Claire Hall, Stout Centre for New Zealand Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

- I have read the Information Sheet and the project has been explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can ask further questions at any time.

- I agree to take part in an audio recorded interview.

I understand that:

- I may withdraw from this study at any point before 31 October 2018 and any information that I have provided will be returned to me or destroyed.

- The identifiable information I have provided to the University will be destroyed on 19 February 2024.

- Any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and my supervisors.

- I understand that the results will be used for a Masters thesis, and/or academic publications and/or presented to conferences.

- [EITHER] My name will not be used in reports, nor will any information that would identify me.

- *[OR]* I consent to information or opinions which I have given being attributed to me in any reports on this research. Yes ☐ No ☐

- I would like a copy of the recording of my interview: Yes ☐ No ☐

- I would like a copy of the index of my interview: Yes ☐ No ☐

- I would like a summary of my interview: Yes ☐ No ☐

- I would like to receive a copy of the final report and have added my email Yes ☐ No ☐
  address below.

Signature of participant: _____

Name of participant: _____

Date: _____

Contact details: _____

Appendix G: Transcribing confidentiality agreement

TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Transcribing Confidentiality Agreement

Project Title: Ngā Raranga i Makere – Stitches dropped in time

Principal
Investigator: Claire Hall

I , Carol Dawber, agree to ensure that the audio files I transcribe will remain confidential to Claire Hall and myself.

I agree to take the following precautions:

1. I will ensure that no person, other than Claire Hall, hears the recording.

2. I will ensure that no other person has access to my computer/device.

3. I will delete the files from my computer/device once the transcription has been completed.

4. I will not discuss any aspect of the recording with anyone except Claire Hall.

Signature:

Date: 13 May 2019