THE CLEARING HOUSE

A GREAT PLACE FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH

Code of Practice

FOR THE TANGATA WHENUA, COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY
SECTOR RESEARCH CENTRE

Version 2.1

2 October 2007

Document Control

Document Reference	
Bibliographic reference	Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector Research Centre (2007) **Code Of Practice for the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector Research Centre,** Version 2.1, Unpublished, Aotearoa
Document title:	
File Name:	COP-v2.1.doc
Date:	2 October 2007
Distribution:	Public

Contents

1 Section one: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to document

This Code Of Practice describes the *optimum practices* in community research as outlined for the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector Research Centre ("the Research Centre"). It is released by the Research Centre's Governance Group. A list of the Governance Group members is in Appendix A: Governance group members.

To date, a range of researchers and others from communities, government and academic sectors have contributed to this document during its consultation round from April 2007.

1.2 Introduction to Code of Practice

The Code of Practice is written for you, the researcher, whether you are with a tertiary, community or Iwi organisation. The purpose of the Code of Practice is to provide a set of benchmark principles and standards by which you can measure your work. It represents what the Research Centre Governance Group and other research and community advocates from a number of organisations consider to be important when "doing research".

The basis for the Code of Practice is that researchers should ensure there is minimal risk and maximum benefit to the people, groups, communities and organisations that are participants in research.

Research participants need the right information and tools to make informed decisions about research and researchers. This Code of Practice will help them to navigate the options and approaches available.

As a researcher, you may agree that you meet the intent of this Code of Practice. If you do not agree, this does not imply that your contributions are not valuable or that they would not be included in the Research Centre's Clearing House project (a website-based store and search tool for research around the country). However, by agreeing with the intent of this Code of Practice, you indicate to others that you value its principles and standards and are open to scrutiny and support from other researchers and communities.

1.3 Perspectives on community research

A significant duty while doing community research is to ensure good relationships. The responsibility for a good relationship rests with all who are involved and good relationships function best when power imbalances are minimal.

Community research includes a practising level of self-determination because the community should be able to make decisions at all levels of the research. Accordingly, there should be meaningful opportunities for community members to make decisions throughout the research process. The research builds capacity in the community and gives it benefits.

"Good" community research can be defined in many ways. For example, some believe that "good" community research requires that researchers are permanently *placed* in the community - they are considered more appropriate to undertake research than those who are temporarily placed. This brings research closer to the need and provision of research. To others, "good" research is not based on the placement of researchers, but on the quality of the relationship between the researcher and the community. In those cases, researchers are temporarily placed from outside the community. The reasons may also include that the funders or clients of the research require formal qualifications or expertise that may not be available from within the community - or that the research is initiated by an institution that needs a research community to play a more passive role so that it can build the capacity of its institutionally-based researchers. In any case, funders and clients of research increasingly require that researchers give evidence that community support and participation has been obtained.

For explanations on the differences between research on the community (the subject of inquiry); research in the community (the location of the research); research for the community (the purpose and who will be the users of research); and research by and/or with the community (participatory approaches and who gets to ask the questions), see, for example, Wadsworth, Yoland. (1997): Do It Yourself Social Research. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

1.4 What we mean when we say 'community'

The *Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector* includes groups such as:

- Urban or rural communities, interest groups and more

- Iwi, Hapu, Whanau

- Groups formed around health, disability, social or special needs and more

- Demographic groups such as children, women, men, elderly, ethnic and more

- Organisations that serve any of the above groups.

The use of the word 'community' in this document refers to these participants in research no matter what form or definition they choose to define themselves. There are various 'stakeholders' in any research and each case takes into account the variety of stakeholders who, even within a single research project, may have different views and values. Research may distinguish primary stakeholders (or community to benefit) from other stakeholders.

2 Section two: Principles and standards

2.1 What the principles are

Principles are value-based approaches that are considered important for the "Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector Research Centre" to ensure that researchers and their research aligns with the expectations of the Centre's research community.

These *enduring principles* will help with decisions about community research including the purpose of the research and your responsibilities as a researcher.

In addition to the list of principles and standards in this section, a further section three lists Tikanga Maori Principles and are offered to researchers, Iwi, Hapu and Whanau to interpret together according to their tikanga.

2.2 What the standards are

A set of standards accompanies every principle. They are the *behaviours* that enable the principles to be measured.

2.3 How the principles and standards are used

The following tables list a set of principles. Each principle is followed by a set of standards.

2.4 List of principles and standards

There are four overarching principles that encompass a number of lower level principles as follows:

1   THE PRINCIPLE OF PARTICIPATION

      1.1 Initiation

      1.2 Indigenous Peoples & Tangata Whenua

      1.3 Post-research responsibilities

2   THE PRINCIPLE OF EMPOWERMENT

      2.1 Governance and Kaitiakitanga

      2.2 Reciprocity and Koha

      2.3 Sustainability

3   THE PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

      3.1 First Beneficiaries

      3.2 Collective and individual privacy

      3.3 Collective and individual ownership

      3.4 Te Tiriti O Waitangi (The Treaty of Waitangi)

4   THE PRINCIPLE OF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

      4.1 Accountability

      4.2 Ethics

      4.3 Values

1. THE PRINCIPLE OF PARTICIPATION

Principle 1.1: Initiation

This principle recognises the initiation process where the researcher and the community have come together to ensure the researcher participation is wanted and is appropriate. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a)	The community is fully informed, and is aware of, the components of the research from conception to completion in a manner that avoids deceit or ambiguity.
b)	The researcher accepts the responsibility to explain the research process to the community, so the community's knowledge base grows
c)	The community is identified by the name, title or label it prefers rather than 'other' imposed names (i.e. the community has the right to define itself)
d)	The community has the right to request references, referees and curriculum vitaes of researchers and information about research institutes before agreeing to the research
e)	The community has the right to request a third party advisor to assist with their inquiries
f)	The community has the right to negotiate aspects of the research
g)	The community has the right to agree or disagree to partnering with researchers or research institutes
h)	The community has the right to have an agreed disputes procedure
i)	The community has the right to ask for the 'rules' of the relationship to be given

	in writing, and signed by leaders or representatives of the research institute and the community
j)	The community has received a commitment from the research institute for a course of action should the researcher not complete the research or should it not be completed to the agreed standard
k)	The community is aware of the decisions required from it and its specific decision-making rights
l)	The community is well-informed with adequate time to consider information and make decisions.

Principle 1.2: Indigenous Peoples & Tangata Whenua

This principle recognises the rights and needs of Indigenous Peoples to continue to hold a unique status in their lands and places that is not compromised within the context of multiculturalism or discrimination. The following standards include actions that support this principle. (Also see Section 3: Tikanga Maori Principles)

a)	Indigenous Peoples are identified in their own right as Indigenous or whatever term they prefer, are invited to participate, and given the opportunity to contribute at al levels of the research from initiation to completion.
b)	Indigenous Peoples are researched in the context of their historical, colonial and contemporary perspectives.
c)	Indigenous Peoples are researched in the context of their cultural values.

Principle 1.3: Post-research

This principle recognises that research does not necessarily have a beginning and end. The community has a stake in the research that potentially spans a timeframe beyond that of the research project. Therefore the relationship with the researcher, the research institute and the research needs to be acknowledged. The following standards include

actions that support this principle.

a) The researcher acknowledges that being given the community's support to work on a research project has created a relationship which may carry with it an ongoing obligation to remain in relationship with that community.

b) The researcher is expected to faithfully analyse and report the data, be up-front about significant limitations, and reveal issues of reliability and validity.

c) The community has the right to participate in the research findings feedback.

d) The community has the right to assist with the analysis and reporting of information.

2. THE PRINCIPLE OF EMPOWERMENT

Principle 2.1: Governance and Kaitiakitanga

This principle recognises the concepts of governance and kaitiakitanga (or guardianship) that is specifically interpreted by the community rather than the researcher. This is the responsibility to protect and use knowledge and research in a manner that is in keeping with the community's perception of care and nurturing. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a) The community agrees the terms of governance or kaitiaki and the form of decision-making that will take place during the research. This could be anything from a reference or steering group of key stakeholders with advisory roles only to a full decision-making group such as a governance group or kaitaiki group.

b) The roles of governance or kaitiaki will be defined at the outset by the community.

c) Points of decision-making are identified and the opportunity is given to the community through its governance or kaitiaki group to consider and make decisions.

d) The definition of kaitiaki may change over time or in different situations. It applies under tikanga which can be defined at the community level rather than at this Code of Practice or its principle level.

Principle 2.2: Reciprocity & Koha

This principle recognises that sharing research is a powerful way to share good fortune. Reciprocity and koha are ways to enact the concept of gifts and reciprocation. Research or selected parts of research (such as the findings or a published report) can be placed in a shared space for the common benefit of other communities while being protected by copyrights and ensuring intellectual property requirements are explicitly stated. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a) The approach and agreement to koha or reciprocation is agreed by the researcher and the community at the outset and is written.

Principle 2.3: Sustainability

This principle recognises that research helps to build the futures of the community. Sustainability allows researchers and communities to explore the long-term growth and survival of communities. Where possible, it includes considering the long term impacts and survival of good ideas (and discarding the negatives and bad ideas), ways to hold onto motivation and ways to generate growth or positive progress. It involves enabling people to enhance their skills and fulfil their goals. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a) The research proposal outlines the approach to ensure sustainability of the benefits is achieved.

b) Sustainability is defined and includes concepts such as capacity-building, empowerment and other productive outcomes.

c) Sustainability is positioned in terms of risk and a risk analysis and management of risks is outlined.

3. THE PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Principle 3.1: First beneficiaries

This principle recognises the basis, motivation and commitment of the researcher to the community being researched. The community should benefit *first and foremost* from the outcomes of research and in constructive ways. It insists that the community should be uppermost when considering benefits. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

    a)   The researcher and community agree on the expected benefits of the research.

    b)   Expected benefits are described in the research proposal as tangible outputs and outcomes.

    c)   Expected and unexpected benefits are identified at the conclusion of the research.

    d)   Benefits that were not met are identified and the reasons given.

Principle 3.2: Collective & individual privacy

This principle recognises privacy that encompasses collectives[1] and individuals. Research should not undermine the privacy except where explicit permission has been granted by those collectives or individuals. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

    a)   The community layers are identified and recognised as individuals and collectives (sometimes layers of collectives such as whanau, hapu and Iwi).

---

[1] Privacy can encompass both the individual and the collective. For example, an individual can have his/her privacy protected via the Privacy Act 1993. Whereas, a group such as a community, organisation, whanau or Iwi feel they have a right to privacy that is not supported by legislation. This does not make it invalid. This document focuses on collective privacy as a means to protect data and information about any group. It is a key issue when data collection occurs on identifiable groups that wish to manage or control data on themselves.

b)	The researcher consults with the appropriate layer to ensure that decisions about privacy and research in general are made by the correct grouping.
c)	The distinctions between privacy, confidentiality and anonymity – all different but important concepts – are properly explained and mechanisms to protect each are outlined.

Principle 3.3: Collective and individual ownership

This principle recognises the layers of ownership. It acknowledges ownership whether or not it is defined within a legal framework. It applies wherever research may impact on the collectives from where the data and information is sourced including in ways which, in the past, have been ignored. This includes minimising the potential for exploitation or misappropriation. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a)	Collective ownership of data and information implies that data, information and knowledge remain with the collective source (such as an organisation, whanau or hapu, or community).
b)	The community and the researcher agrees in writing the terms of ownership (whether individual or collective) and the form of acknowledgement and protection.
c)	Ownership at the source implies that an individual owns his/her data or information first and foremost. At a higher level, a collective (community) such as a group, whanau, a hapu, then an Iwi may own non-personal grouped data.
d)	It is possible that while a researcher has access to data he/she may never be the 'owner' but may act in the role of protector. For example, he/she may act according to the agreed rules of copyright, access and use.

Principle 3.4: Te Tiriti O Waitangi

This principle recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi[2] as the founding document of Aotearoa. Community research will provide opportunities to implement Te Tiriti o Waitangi in practical ways and it is the responsibility of the researcher and research participants to identify these opportunities. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a) The researcher has a well-developed knowledge and analysis of Te Tiriti O Waitangi.

b) The research subject, methods and theory is informed by Te Tiriti O Waitangi.

c) The research supports the implementation of Te Tiriti O Waitangi.

4. THE PRINCIPLE OF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

Principle 4.1: Accountability

This principle recognises the need for accountability between all parties; the researcher, the institution, the funders and the community. The expectation is that all parties are well-informed, that they all commit to their accountabilities, and that a process for resolving difficulties is agreed. It aligns with any possible legal accountability. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a) Accountability that is bound by law is described in a written agreement

b) Accountability that is bound by agreed moral obligations and responsibilities is described in a written agreement.

Principle 4.2: Ethics

This principle recognises different ethical approaches including those of a research

---

[2] In international law under the rule of *contra proferentum*, Te Tiriti O Waitangi, the Maori language text, takes precedence over the English language text.

institute and those of communities. Communities may have a set of ethics, tikanga and kawa or other forms of expected behaviour that should be included during the process of defining and approving ethical approaches to research. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a)	Do no harm

b)	The ethical views are in writing and form part of documents including those that go before research institute ethics committees for approval, and community governance or kaitiaki groups.

c)	Potential differences in ethics are identified and resolved.

Principle 4.3: Values

This principle recognises the diverse values that exist within communities. It aims to ensure that nothing and no-one is exploited or taken for granted, and that the values of the community are understood and nurtured. The following standards include actions that support this principle.

a)	The research proposal outlines the sets of values that the researcher and the community understand to be the basis for working together.

b)	The values are in writing and form part of agreements and research proposals.

c)	Potential differences in values are identified and resolved.

3 Section three: Tikanga Maori principles

The Tikanga Maori Principles are included separately as a reference for researchers who work alongside Tangata Whenua but in contrast to the principles and standards in section two they are not accompanied by a set of standards. We choose to leave them as they are so that researchers, Iwi, Hapu, Whanau, urban Maori, Taurahere (those living outside their rohe/homelands) and pan-tribal groups and others can interpret them together according to their tikanga.

3.1 Manaakitanga

Manaakitanga is behaviour that acknowledges the mana of others as having equal or greater importance that one's own, through the expression of aroha, hospitality, generosity and mutual respect. In doing so, all parties are elevated and our status is enhanced, building unity through humility and the act of giving. We must endeavour to express manaakitanga towards others be they political allies or opponents, Maori and non-Maori organisations, taking care not to trample mana, while clearly defining our own.

3.2 Rangatiratanga

Rangatiratanga is the expression of the attributes of a rangatira (weaving the people together) including humility, leadership by example, generosity, altruism, diplomacy and knowledge of benefit of the people. As an organisation, the importance of walking the talk, following through on commitments made, integrity and honesty is demonstrated. As a people, rangatiratanga is reflected in the promotion of self-determination for Maori, and an expression of the rights defined by Mana Atua, Mana Tupuna and Mana Whenua.

3.3 Whanaungatanga

Whanaungatanga underpins the social organisation of whanau, hapu and iwi and includes rights and reciprocal obligations consistent with being part of a collective. It is the principle which binds individuals to the wider group and affirms the value of the collective. Whanaungatanga is inter-dependence with each other and recognition that the people are our wealth.

3.4 Kotahitanga

Kotahitanga is the principle of unity of purpose and direction. It is demonstrated through the achievement of harmony and moving as one. All are encouraged to make a contribution, to have their say and then together a consensus is reached.

4 Glossary

Hapu   sub-group of related whanau within an Iwi

Iwi   group of affiliated hapu, sub-group within a waka

Kaitiaki / Kaitiakitanga   implies guardianship, stewardship, governance and responsibility roles

Maori   general term for all descendents of indigenous peoples of Aotearoa

Rohe   Tribal geographical areas

Tangata Whenua   Host and/or resident people of the land

Taurahere   Those living outside their tribal geographical areas

Tikanga   Set of protocols and behaviours

Tino Rangatiratanga   implies the ability to make decisions and control one's direction

Whanau   members of same family grouping including extended family members

5 Appendix A: Governance group members

Tangata Whenua

– members who work within organisations at the level of whanau, hapu and iwi:

Pania Coote – CO-CHAIR

Iris Pahau - SECRETARY

Leon Hawea

Atareta Poananga

Jo-Ani Robinson

Tangata Tiriti

– members who work within organisations and who are able to facilitate the voices of the 'Tangata whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector':

Pat Hanley – CO-CHAIR

Peter Glensor

Margy-Jean Malcolm

Garth Nowland-Foreman

Jackie Sanders

6 Appendix B: References

Barlow, C. (1991). Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Maori Culture. Oxford, New York, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Community Sector Taskforce. (2006). A New Way Of Working For The Tangata Whenua, Community And Voluntary Sector (Version 2).

Dorling, Daniel & Simpson, Stephen (eds). (1999). The Arithmetic of Politics. London: Arnold Press.

Fine, Allison, Thayer, Colette & Coglan, Anne. (2000). "Current Evaluation Practice in the Nonprofit Sector", Snapshots No.9 (Feb 2000).

Kamira, R. (1999). Looking Out Of The Window – A Research Strategy for Te Whanau O Waipareira Trust.

Kamira, R. Combined report: (1999). The kidZnet Project: Guiding Cultural & Ethical Issues for Iwi and (2000) Report for Iwi Cultural and Ethical Issues in KidZnet.

Kamira, R. (2000). Information & Privacy Framework: HepB Screening & Surveillance Programme Steering Committee.

Kamira, R. (2000). Since We Became the Masters. Global CN 2000, Barcelona, Spain (Also, presented to the Flaxroots Conference, Wellington, April 2000).

Kamira, R. (2002). Indigenous peoples inclusion in the World Summit for the Information Society, Submitted to 1st PREPCOM (Preparatory Committees of the World Summit) Geneva 1 - 5 July 2002.

Kamira, R. (2002). Te Mata o te Tai – The Edge of the Tide: Rising capacity in information technology of Maori in Aotearoa, Conference presentation for Information Technology in Regional Areas, Rockhampton 27 - 29 August 2002.

Kamira, R. (2004). Research of issues for Maori relating to the Online Authentication Project for State Services Commission, 29 March 2004.

Kamira, R. (2001). "Indigenous Internet." EarthWatch Institute 20(2): 8-9.

Kamira, R. (2001). I Sneeze - Therefore I Live! Presented to the INET Conference 2001 Stockholm, Sweden and printed in "EarthWatch" 2001.

Kamira, R. (2007). Kaitiakitanga and Health Informatics: Introducing Useful Indigenous Concepts of Governance in the Health Sector, chapter in "Information Technology and Indigenous People", Eds, Laurel Evelyn Dyson, Max Hendriks, Stephen Grant; University of Technology, Sydney, Information Science Publishing, Sydney.

Lunt, Neil, Davidson, Carl & McKegg, Kate (eds). (2003). Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Practice. Auckland: Pearson Educational.

Mander, J. (1991). "In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology & the Survival of the Indian Nations", Sierra Club Books, San Francisco.

Mead, A.T.P. (1997). Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific. In Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights: Economic, Politics & Colonisation, 2, 22-30. Moko Productions / IRI.

Ministry of Social Development. (2002). He Waka Kotuia: Joining together on a shared journey.

Ministry of Social Policy. (2001). Communities and Government: Potential for Partnership

Orange, C. (1987). "The Treaty of Waitangi", Allen & Unwin, Port Nicholson Press, Wellington.

Pere, R.T. (1991). "Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom", Ao Ako Global Learning New Zealand Limited, Gisborne.

Smith, L.T. (1999). "Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People", Zed Books, London, New York, Dunedin.

Te Puni Kokiri/Ministry of Maori Development. (1999). Evaluation for Maori: Guidelines for Government Agencies. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.

Te Puni Kokiri. (2001). He Tirohanga o Kawa ki Te Tiriti O Waitangi: A Guide to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as expressed by the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal. Wellington, NZ.

Ivan Snook "The Ethics and Politics of Social Research" in Davidson, Carl & Tolich, Martin (eds). (2003). Social Science Research in New Zealand: Many Paths of Understanding. Auckland: Pearson Education.

Wadsworth, Yoland. (1991). Everyday Evaluation on the Run. Melbourne: Action Research Issues Association.

Wadsworth, Yoland. (1997). Do It Yourself Social Research. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

7 Appendix C: Relevant legislation

Aside from institutional ethics committees (where they exist for a research project), compliance to the legislation must also be included within the set of criteria for community research. In particular, the Privacy Act 1993 and Official Information Act 1982 are relevant. The following are brief overviews.

PRIVACY ACT 1993

The Privacy Act aims to protect personal and identifiable information about individuals. Under this Act, individuals can exercise some control over the management of personal information by researchers. Researchers and their institutes or organisation and funders involved in direct collection must adhere to the Privacy Act.

OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

A request for information about identifiable individuals by a third party is dealt with under the Official Information Act. The Act applies to public sector agencies, for example, Ministries and their agencies. In this case, the agency may be the researcher organisation or the funding organisation.

Underlying the OIA is the principle of availability of official information to enable participation by the people of New Zealand in the making and administration of laws and policies and to promote the accountability of Ministers of the Crown and officials.

Once a public sector agency has established grounds for withholding information under Section 9, it must then balance those against other considerations that may render it desirable in the public interest to make the information available. Each request must be assessed on its own merits and privacy interests would need to be protected. However, occasionally the request may be such that there is a public interest in some information being made available to a third party.