Kaupapa Māori theory-based evaluation

In an environment where Māori approaches to evaluation are developing quickly, with ever-widening influence, this article is an attempt to capture the theoretical roots of Kaupapa Māori evaluation approaches. From a range of Kaupapa Māori theorists, six principles are drawn and their relevance to evaluation theory and practice is discussed. These principles are then mapped to major movements in evaluation theory, illustrating how Kaupapa Māori theory-based evaluation, arising as a unique praxis within the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, has strong alignment with international developments.

Introduction

Kaupapa Māori theory (i.e. carrying things out properly from a Māori standpoint) has provided a theoretically sound platform from which unique evaluation theory and practices have been developing in Aotearoa New Zealand. The first part of this article describes the evolution of Kaupapa Māori program evaluation from its roots in Kaupapa Māori theory. Drawing on the work of a range of theorists working in this field, six key principles of Kaupapa Māori theory are outlined and their application to program evaluation are discussed. The second section demonstrates the place of such theory in evaluation generally, by drawing parallels with the development of evaluation internationally.

Theory in evaluation

Theory is integral to evaluation, as it is the point at which evaluation is able to define its purpose, parameters and, to a certain extent, its modus operandi (Alkin 2004; Scriven 1991). All evaluators are concerned with theory even if is it informal and implicit because it is theory that defines what evaluation actually is, who is involved and how it is practised. Fundamentally, it is theory that decides what can legitimately be observed and what can be evaluated (Scriven 1991, 2003).

Furthermore, theory has moved the program evaluation field forward from perceiving its function in terms of assessment to meet management decision-making needs (originating with the early educational evaluation of Ralph Tyler (1942)), towards approaches that seek to affect policy and practice for the betterment of people, that is, through evaluation theorists such as House and Howe (2000) (Alkin 2004; Scriven 2003). It is theory that precipitated the move from the acceptance of an external reality and absolute truth towards belief in multiple socially constructed realities, and all that that entails. It is theory that now takes us deep into the minefield of what development (‘betterment’) is, on what basis, and who decides. It is theory too that is able to help explain and make sense of the complexities involved in embracing a multiplicity of diverse ‘socially constructed’ realities for as Mataira (2003) points out:

Deconstruction of complex constructs requires a theoretical premise. Thus, the layering of theory upon empirical observation allows us to see how these are influenced, and in turn how they influence political social environmental and economic environments.
So, theory serves many and diverse purposes in evaluation. In Kaupapa Māori theory-based program evaluation, one of the key functions of theory is to help make sense of the complex world in which we live. Certainly, by its very name and nature, Kaupapa Māori theory has its own unique characteristics and epistemological understandings for making sense within Māori contexts (Moewaka Barnes 2000; Smith 1997).

Kaupapa Māori theory

The term ‘Kaupapa Māori’ is used to describe all manner of Māori undertakings and Māori-focused endeavours, and should be distinguished from Kaupapa Māori manner of Māori undertakings and Māori-focused theory. The term ‘Kaupapa Māori’ is used to describe all Kaupapa Māori theory

late 1980s and it has links with critical theory within a manner of Māori undertakings and Māori-focused theory. This is also the legal position in this day, with Māori arguing that the Māori version is to the Māori and English translations continues to and into the 1990s. ‘Kaupapa Māori is not new, having its origins ‘in a history that reaches back thousands of years’ (IRI 2000, p. 3). According to Mereana Taki (Taki 1996, p. 17, cited in IRI 2000, p. 3) the concept of kaupapa means ‘ground rules, customs, the right way of doing things’.

Kaupapa Māori existed long before the signing of Aotearoa New Zealand’s founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi. Signed by the British Crown and Māori representatives in 1840, controversy exists over the interpretation of the Treaty, particularly in relation to different versions: a Māori version and an English version. The Treaty is important to Kaupapa Māori theory as the principles contained within the Māori version of the Treaty underpin the argument for the theoretical space occupied by Kaupapa Māori theory, research and evaluation (Pihama 2001; IRI 2000; Walker 1996). Walker (1989) contends that, if mana whenua (customary authority exercised by a tribe or sub-tribe) had been the term used in the Treaty of Waitangi instead of the word kaupapa (a translation of governance), Māori would have had a better idea of the Crown’s intention and would have refused to sign. Contention pertaining to the Māori and English translations continues to this day, with Māori arguing that the Māori version is the legitimate version. This is also the legal position in international treaty law. The Māori version expressly preserves the power and autonomy of the chiefs and it is this commitment by the Crown in 1840 that underpins Kaupapa Māori’s self-determination stance with the government.

The term, ‘Kaupapa Māori theory’ was coined in the late 1980s and it has links with critical theory within a constructivist epistemology (Smith 1997). The linking of ‘Kaupapa Māori with ‘theory’ was an express challenge by Graham Smith, a Māori educationalist at the University of Auckland, to the narrow interpretation of theory as it had been applied in education in Aotearoa New Zealand (Smith 1997). In the process of making this challenge, he opened a space to support Māori academic writing, developing a counter-hegemonic practice that aimed to be transformative for Māori (Smith 1997; IRI 2000). Smith (2003, p. 5) contends that there are at least five elements necessary for theory to be transformative for Māori:

1. It needs to be seen as a potentially useful tool for assisting positive transformation of ... [Māori] conditions.
2. It needs to be seen as a ‘tool’—useful in the right hands and potentially destructive in the wrong hands. Thus the onus is on the person selecting to use the theory (or not to use it), i.e. to assess its relevance and usefulness.
3. It needs to be transformative because the ‘status quo’ for most indigenous contexts is not working well and needs to be improved.
4. It needs to move beyond a homogenizing position of seeing ‘struggle’ as a single issue and therefore needs to be adaptable to develop multiple transforming strategies (some of which might be applied simultaneously).
5. It needs to be accountable to the community; the ideas around praxis and ‘action research methodology’ are useful here.

The importance of defining the terminology is acknowledged but IRI (2000, p. 2) asks the cautioning question: ‘Who controls the definition of Kaupapa Māori principles?’ IRI goes on to caution against strictly bounded definitions that control the way that the term ‘Kaupapa Māori can be used and applied and by whom. They point out that although most of the writing about Kaupapa Māori theory initially originated from a group of academics based at the University of Auckland, Kaupapa Māori can neither be ‘owned by any group nor can it be defined in such ways that deny people access to its articulation’ (IRI 2000, p. 14). It must therefore be flexible enough to be inclusive of the diversity of Māori communities and contexts.

However, Kaupapa Māori theorists have understood the need to articulate key concepts as well as to identify elements (Pihama 2001), practices and procedures (IRI 2000). Most have ordered their articulation of Kaupapa Māori theory in relation to key principles, concepts or elements, thereby avoiding a Kaupapa Māori checklist or recipe that would be antithetical to the fundamentals of Kaupapa Māori theory (IRI 2000). The following section draws together a number of these articulations while identifying considerable commonalities.

Kaupapa Māori principles

To demonstrate congruency among Māori theorists and practitioners, Table 1 provides an analysis of key principles attributed to Kaupapa Māori praxis. Theorists were selected for inclusion in the table because they have been instrumental in the development of Kaupapa Māori theory or they have written about the theory as praxis in research. One evaluation practitioner who has published her concept of Kaupapa Māori evaluation has also been included (Moewaka Barnes 2009). The practice aspects have been considered along with the more purely theoretical,
as Kaupapa Māori theory, from its origin, is a theory of praxis where thinking and practice work together in iterative ways (Smith 1997; Walker 1996).

As you would expect from a dynamic but coherent theory, the following analysis reveals many overlaps and similarities. Without trying to control the definition of Kaupapa Māori principles too tightly, key concepts have been compared and contrasted, with commonalities grouped under the following five principles:

A. **Control** principle (Māori control/ownership)

B. **Challenge** principle (analysis and mediation of power relationships)

C. **Culture** principle (Māori as normative including the survival and revival of Māori language and culture)

D. **Connection** principle (relationship-based knowledge sharing and generation whānau/hapū/ iwi etc., plus creation of new knowledge through local and international relationships)

E. **Change** principle (transformative for Māori)

A sixth principle emerged from theorists who focus on principles of practice in research and evaluation. This is the:

- **Credibility** principle (highest quality standards for Māori)

Table 1 shows the concepts articulated by theorists and gives an indication of where the concepts relate to the identified principles of Kaupapa Māori theory (columns on the right). Those concepts linked to the credibility principle are indicated by an asterisk.

### Kaupapa Māori theory in evaluation

The six principles of Kaupapa Māori research as shown in Table 1, apply to evaluation in much the same way as they apply to other forms of social science research. Although distinctions between social science and evaluation are contested, a general distinction is that evaluation is usually designed in order to make decisions while research is designed to add to human knowledge. Evaluation may try to assess the effectiveness of a program and may also aim to help practitioners achieve results or solve problems to become more effective. Casswell (1999, p. 198) also highlights the distinction in that ‘evaluation differs from other research in the degree to which it is utilisation focused’.

In order to achieve a useful comparison between Kaupapa Māori praxis and evaluation, the following section describes more specifically what is meant by the Kaupapa Māori principles and how these might apply to the general context of evaluation. Once the principles are understood we are able to position them in evaluation’s broader theoretical landscape.

### Control principle

The idea of Māori *tino rangatiratanga* (Māori self-determination) is a feature of Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation as all the theorists highlighted. Irwin (1994) and Pihama (1993), Walker (1996) and Smith (1997) all refer to *tino rangatiratanga* as key to Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation activity. For Walker (1996), all Kaupapa Māori understandings adhere to a central notion of *manawhenua*—translated as sovereignty over land. She contends that control over lands is at the heart of the Treaty of Waitangi and, by extension, issues of control and self-determination for Māori. Meanwhile, Smith (1997) aligns self-determination with ‘relative autonomy’ subtly introducing the question of how much control is enough. Although there is some discussion about the level of Māori control required for Kaupapa Māori research, there is consensus that a Kaupapa Māori approach to research must allow for Māori control of knowledge. This includes control over the epistemological understandings as well as what is being researched, by whom and in what manner the research is being conducted.

In evaluation, Māori exercising *tino rangatiratanga* (self-determination) may encompass control over what is evaluated, how and by whom and might include control over evaluation theory, design, process and dissemination (Bishop 1996; Cram 1997). In general evaluative terms this could be seen as the people most involved in the program being evaluated, having control over the evaluation. The extent to which this should happen is a hotly debated issue in the Aotearoa New Zealand evaluation context as well as in the international evaluation arena.

Furthermore, a Kaupapa Māori context means that Māori must have at least a degree of control over the evaluation. How much control is required, by whom, and to what ends, are also contested issues even for Kaupapa Māori theorists. However, most call for a high degree of Māori control in evaluation premised on Māori rights as partners with the Crown under the Treaty of Waitangi (Bishop 1996; Cram 1997; Irwin 1994; Pihama 2001).

Meanwhile, the principle of Māori control or ownership when applied to evaluation, is somewhat complicated by the general context of program evaluation. Program evaluation almost always needs to serve an accountability function to the taxpayers and voters of Aotearoa New Zealand—as most involve public money either in the program being evaluated or in the funding of the evaluation, and frequently both.

The Kaupapa Māori ideal of Māori control in this context can be seen to introduce a bias to the evaluation and evade necessary accountability. Bias in evaluation is of course possible and some would argue that it is unavoidable (Stake 2003). However, when it is assumed that Māori control means that the evaluation will be unfairly biased and not able to provide accountability, the underlying assumption is that non-Māori control is fairer—somehow inherently less biased. Kaupapa Māori theorists would challenge this assumption as one predicated on western power. In fact, Kaupapa Māori theorists would argue that those who make that assumption are not able to see their own culture (Pihama 1993, 2001). Furthermore, the combination of cultural
### TABLE 1: MAORI THEORISTS AND KEY PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Kaupapa Māori principles/concepts</th>
<th>Kaupapa Māori principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The order in which the Kaupapa Māori concepts are presented is taken from each theorist’s writings. It does not necessarily represent a priority ranking.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Smith</td>
<td><em>Tino Rangatiratanga (Self-determination)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Taonga Tuku Iho (Cultural Aspirations)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ako Māori (Culturally Preferred Pedagogy)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kia Piki ake i nga Rarurū o te Kainga (Socioeconomic Mediation)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Whānau (Extended Family Structure)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kaupapa (Collective Philosophy/Vision)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonie Pihama</td>
<td><em>Te Reo me ona Tikanga (Language and Culture)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Treaty of Waitangi</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tino Rangatiratanga (Self-determination)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Taonga Tuku Iho</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Whākapapa</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Whānau/Whānaungatanga</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ako Māori (Teach and Learn)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Decolonisation</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheilagh Walker</td>
<td><em>Praxis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tino Rangatiratanga (Self-determination)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Resistance</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Living in our own world</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Treaty of Waitangi</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mana Whenua (sovereignty over land)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith 1999 (working principles)</td>
<td><em>Whākapapa (Connection)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Te Reo me ona Tikanga (Language and Culture)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tino Rangatiratanga (Self-determination)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Whānau (Extended Family)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 1: MāORI THEORISTS AND KEY PRINCIPLES (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist (cont.)</th>
<th>Kaupapa Māori research (cont.)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith (1999) Kaupapa Māori ethical code of conduct (See definitions in Smith 2005)</td>
<td>*Aroha ki te tangata (a respect for people) X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kanohi kitea (the seen face; that is, present yourself to people face to face)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Titiro, whakarongo . . . koerā (look, listen . . . speak)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people, be generous)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kia tupato (be cautious)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of the people)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kaua e mahaki (do not flaunt your knowledge)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Irwin (1994)</td>
<td>Culturally safe for Māori</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Māori researchers/mentorship of elders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culturally relevant and appropriate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Rigorous research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whānau (Family)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Māori able to be involved—Treaty Partnership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whānau (Family)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Moewaka Barnes (2000)</td>
<td>Māori control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māori as normative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit of Māori</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheilagh Walker (1996)</td>
<td>Tino Rangatiratanga (ownership)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māori world view</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Reo (Language)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whānau (Family)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Kaupapa Māori evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen Moewaka Barnes (2009)</td>
<td>A 'collective’ journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The goal is negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All parties are united in achieving the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others with the same or complementary goals may join along the way (network building, collaborations and capacity building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The journey itself is important for relationship building and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is by Māori, for Māori, towards Māori development and self-determination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
invisibility and cultural dominance could potentially lead to far greater bias than control of research by a culturally aware minority such as Māori (Pihama 2001).

It can also be argued that Māori are citizens to whom the government must also account for their spending, and that Māori quite rightly want to see taxes being used for their benefit as guaranteed by the Treaty. Under the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori not only have the individual rights of citizens but collective rights as partners with the Crown. This argument is supported by statistics that indicate that government spending is failing to provide equitable outcomes for Māori who fall behind the rest of the population in all the key indices for socioeconomic success.11

**Challenge principle**

Theorists such as Pihama and Walker place a strong emphasis on the analysis of all power relationships in Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation and on resistance against hegemonic dominance in its many guises within the research and evaluation environment. For example, Pihama highlights ‘decolonisation’ and Walker ‘resistance’ as key to Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation. This can be seen as the *challenge principle* whereby Kaupapa Māori research occupies a strategic position that seeks to challenge the dominant constructions of research and ensure that Māori values, priorities and processes are to the fore. Kaupapa Māori theorists argue that the need to challenge power is a product of colonisation (Cram 2004; Pihama 2001; Smith 1999) and assert that, under the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori have a right to challenge the dominant culture and the power of the Crown where it infringes on Māori rights to self-determination.

The challenge principle is inseparable from issues of control and manifests in evaluation through an emphasis on examining who controls the evaluation, not only in terms of the underlying evaluation theory but also the processes for contracting and conducting evaluations and the dissemination and utilisation of findings. There is also a commitment to research and evaluation seeking to mitigate, if not eliminate, power differentials that disadvantage Māori and advantage non-Māori.

**Culture principle**

For a colonised people, the Māori challenge to the dominant research paradigms and control over research are foundational to the *culture principle* of Kaupapa Māori research. It follows that Māori control over the research/evaluation agenda ensures that Māori cultural norms will be embedded in the research as the legitimate modus operandi. The culture principle whereby Māori values and systems are given full recognition in the research is found in the writing of all featured theorists. Smith (1997) refers to this as ‘Taonga Tuku Iho’ or ‘cultural aspirations principle’. Walker refers to it as ‘living in our own world’, while Irwin refers to Kaupapa Māori research as needing to be ‘culturally relevant and appropriate’. Moewaka Barnes simply states that one of the key principles for Kaupapa Māori research is ‘Māori as normative’. Issues of Māori identity are also embedded in the culture principle with theorists widely acknowledging the link between cultural identity and Māori socioeconomic and spiritual wellbeing.

In reference specifically to language maintenance, theorists argue that the demise of Māori language and culture in everyday Māori life is a product of the colonising agenda. When Māori language and culture are regarded as legitimate, then Māori will, once again, be able to be ‘normal’ (IRI 2000). For some theorists, the work towards this revival of language and culture is central to the Kaupapa Māori theoretical agenda and research enterprise.

The culture principle translated into a Kaupapa Māori evaluation context would ensure that evaluations are specific to the Māori context. This means that Māori concepts, practices, protocols, language and cultural practices become normalised in the design and implementation of any evaluations. In this way, Māori cultural norms are viewed as ‘ordinary’ (Moewaka Barnes 2000) in Māori evaluation because Māori have a right under the Treaty of Waitangi to govern their own affairs and maintain traditions and resources. Again, the *culture principle* cannot be divorced from the previous principles of *control* and *challenge* to the dominant paradigm in evaluations. In a Kaupapa Māori evaluation context, Māori ways of knowing and doing are integral and can never be mere add-ons to facilitate evaluation buy-in, even though Kaupapa Māori approaches to evaluation may be very useful in producing this (IRI 2000).

**Connection principle**

Māori cultural underpinnings of Māori (genealogy) and concepts of collective responsibility, generally along traditional Māori lines or community structures, are important when addressing Māori socioeconomic disadvantage (Smith 1997). The connection principle of whakauhangaingatanga (establishing relationships) is also important in the generation and sharing of knowledge. The Kaupapa Māori research theorists refer to the critical importance of the relationship of whānau (extended family) in particular as integral to Māori cultural survival and Māori wellbeing. Smith (1997) refers to the connection principle as ‘Kaupapa’, identifying the need to be unified in regard to collective responsibility and a shared vision. Irwin (1994) contends that it is appropriate for Māori researchers to be under the mentorship of elders. For all theorists, the closely aligned practice of collective responsibility is a central tenet of Kaupapa Māori theory.

The connection principle includes Māori ways of establishing and maintaining relationships. Smith (1999) has articulated some of the protocols governing relationships in research and evaluation. These include: respect, listening, being hospitable, being cautious and remaining humble. She does not prescribe a code of conduct, stressing that respect is key to Kaupapa Māori research relationships. ‘Through respect the place of everyone and everything in the universe is kept in balance and harmony’ (Smith 1999, p. 120).
In accordance with this principle, knowledge generation and sharing in evaluation practice requires evaluation practitioners to prioritise the development and maintenance of appropriate relationships in order to be credible and for the evaluation to be rigorous. Whānau (extended family), hapū (sub-tribal) and iwi (tribal) structures are likely to be important connections, although under the connection principle Kaupapa Māori evaluations would prioritise collaborative relationships that aim to facilitate the best outcomes for Māori. In some circumstances these may be local and international connections for the creation and sharing of new knowledge of benefit to Māori. A number of Kaupapa Māori theorists stress the importance of non-Māori involvement under a Treaty-based partnership model (Bishop 1996; Cram 1997). Moewaka Barnes (2009) highlights the connection principle in her hikoi (march or walk) concept of evaluation. Kaupapa Māori evaluation is described as a collective, collaborative journey with negotiated and shared goals between evaluators and the evaluated where the evaluation journey is important for relationship-based learning (Kerr 2006).

**Change principle**

The idea of positive change for Māori is inextricably embedded in Kaupapa Māori theory and research. A Kaupapa Māori understanding of change is founded on transformative praxis and this is an important principle for all the featured theorists. Increasingly, Kaupapa Māori theorists call for ‘Māori to develop initiatives for change that are located within distinctly Māori frameworks’ (Pihama & Penehira 2005, p. 10). For Pihama, Kaupapa Māori theory critiques ‘all forms of oppression that seek to deny our fundamental place as Māori’ (Pihama 2001, p. 139). From this perspective, decolonisation means engaging with all forms of oppression and every structure that maintains oppression. Pihama warns that it must be Māori who analyse the impact of colonisation critically and seek changes on the basis of that critical analysis. Smith asserts that Kaupapa Māori needs to be transformative and asserts (in relation to Kaupapa Māori education) that there is ‘the need to focus on the process of “transforming”’, and on the transformative outcomes: What is it? How can it be achieved? Do indigenous people’s needs and aspirations require different schooling approaches? Who benefits?’ (1997, pp. 17–18). Moewaka Barnes (2009) expresses the change principle, as Kaupapa Māori research and evaluation having to be of benefit to Māori. For these reasons, Māori development is critical to the Kaupapa Māori research agenda.

The change principle also incorporates the concept of ‘koha’ that in simple translation could be taken to mean ‘reciprocity’—giving something back for whatever is received. For Smith (1999), the concept of koha is encompassed in ‘manaaki ki te tangata’ that stresses the collaborative approach to research in Māori contexts. In an evaluation, this would mean that the evaluation would not only aim to assist Māori transformation, but evaluators would be fully cognisant of the value of information given to them by participants and aim to ensure that all participants receive something of value in return (Moewaka Barnes 2009; Pipi et al. 2004). The range of possible options for contributing to a program and to evaluation participants is as wide and varied as the programs and participants themselves. However, the transformative change principle leads, in many cases, to evaluations contributing their koha in terms of capability and capacity building. Evaluation in a Kaupapa Māori frame also often means that a whākapaipai-based relationship or those formed in other ways prior to an evaluation, not only adds rigour and credibility to the evaluation, but is likely to endure after the formal evaluation period. Even new relationships, once established, may require evaluator contributions to a Māori group or community of their knowledge and experience well past the end of the evaluation.22

**Credibility principle**

The principle of research and evaluation credibility encompasses the idea of professional competence and also the concepts of research/evaluation credibility. The credibility principle features explicitly in the work of a number of Kaupapa Māori theorists (Irwin 1994; Smith 1999) and is implicit in the work of all theorists. Implications for credible ethical research practices are embedded within all the Kaupapa Māori principles previously outlined, thus the credibility principle is inextricably linked with them all.

In a Kaupapa Māori theory framework, research credibility and researcher credibility are interdependent. Professional credibility of the researcher is strongly related to the culture and connection principles. Appropriate relationships and cultural know-how are as fundamental to the credibility principle of Kaupapa Māori research as having professional research knowledge and experience. Smith (1999) does not attempt to define systematic or scientific research standards but argues that establishing research credibility requires credible researchers and systematic and rigorous research methods. In her ‘Ethical Code of Conduct’, she articulates a range of ethical practices for engaging in Kaupapa Māori research/evaluation that illustrate some of the ways in which researcher credibility is built and maintained in Māori contexts. Irwin (1994) considers a definition of rigorous research within her Kaupapa Māori principles, first emphasising mentorship of elders as necessary to research being conducted competently within Māori contexts and requiring Māori researchers. Kaupapa Māori theorists argue that ‘being Māori does not preclude us from being systematic, being ethical, being “scientific” in the way we might approach a research problem’ (Smith 1999, p. 203; also see Irwin 1994; Moewaka Barnes 2009). Meanwhile, for Cram (2002, p. 13):

A Kaupapa Māori approach does not exclude the use of a wide range of research methods but rather signals the interrogation of methods in relation to cultural sensitivity, cross-cultural reliability, useful outcomes for Māori, and other such measures.
In evaluation the Kaupapa Māori credibility principle applies, as it does in evaluation generally, to the conduct of rigorous approaches using methods able to provide reliable answers to evaluation questions (Irwin 1994; Smith 1999). In Kaupapa Māori evaluation, the theory, methodology, methods and practices must all be appropriate to the Māori research context in order to provide reliable, competent and credible evaluations. The five key principles of Kaupapa Māori theory as previously outlined (including consideration of Māori control and challenge, culture and connection practices and ultimate positive change for Māori) are therefore integral to the sixth principle, evaluation credibility.

These six Kaupapa Māori principles, although having been developed within the very specific context of Māori and colonial history in Aotearoa New Zealand, show a surprising degree of similarity with international developments in the field of evaluation. The next section examines how Kaupapa Māori theory-based evaluations fit within that international evaluation context.

The international evaluation context

It is generally agreed among evaluation theorists that evaluation has its roots in social science research methodology and notions of accountability (Alkin 2004; Scriven 2001). That is the point at which general agreement between evaluation theorists seems to end. On questions of evaluation theory and practice, evaluators are divided on everything including the purpose of evaluation, how to conduct it, and what to do with the results.

The lack of agreement on the fundamental purposes of evaluation poses distinct challenges when trying to position the principles of Kaupapa Māori research within the field. To achieve a comparison of how the six principles of Kaupapa Māori research apply to the complex milieu of evaluation theory requires some degree of categorisation of evaluation theory.

Table 2, modified from a simple schema by Michael Scriven (2001), provides an overview of theories of evaluation that have risen to prominence as ‘the one true way’ (2001) in evaluation since the practice of systematic evaluation began. It is useful in that it indicates some of the primary shifts that have occurred over time and forms a basis for discussing how the principles of Kaupapa Māori evaluation relate to international developments in the field. By picking out the key developments in the field (which he sees as overemphasising their theoretical position), Scriven’s schema has provided a simple framework by which to compare the principles of Kaupapa Māori theory-based evaluation.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation in the international context

Table 2 shows Scriven’s schema and a summary of the alignment of Kaupapa Māori evaluation principles to evaluation theories. This schema and Kaupapa Māori alignment are discussed in more detail below.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation alignment with Decision Support and Consumer Service Evaluation

The application of scientific management to state-administered provision of welfare during the Great Depression years in the United States is widely recognised as the birthplace of program evaluation. In the years following the Great Depression, evaluation was strongly influenced by the development of social sciences. A focus on social inquiry and the use of science methods can be seen in the early work of theorists such as Ralph Tyler (1942) and Donald Campbell (Campbell 1957; Campbell & Stanley 1963, 1966).

For early theorists, the chief activity of evaluation was an unbiased assessment of the consequences of programs or parts thereof (Chelimsky 1997). At that time, the preferred analytical methods were quantitative.

Scriven describes the focus of evaluation in the early days as Decision Support (Scriven 2001). Decision Support-type evaluation theory asserts that it is the job of the evaluator to focus on identifying and meeting managerial information needs based on definitions of success determined at a managerial level (Wholey 1983). This early purpose of evaluation, that is, to assist with management decisions, remains an important focus for many evaluations today.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s some theorists had come to see the management-orientated model as deficient because it didn’t take program beneficiaries’ needs into account (Scriven 1983). At this time, Scriven (1983), the principle Consumer Service theorist, argued that programs generally exist to meet identified needs of consumers and evaluation should therefore privilege the needs of program consumers over management. The Consumer Service approach to evaluation is based on the consumer product metaphor and is primarily summative.

Referring to Table 2, there is little congruence between Kaupapa Māori principles and evaluation theories in the early days where Decision Support and Consumer Service held both practical and theoretical sway. The change principle is the only point of alignment and even here, the two concepts of change are divergent. Decision Support evaluations typically focus on collecting data on management concerns such as budgets, time frames, targets and value for money—information that is used to inform decisions about changes to programs or their funding. This type of information may be collected in Kaupapa Māori evaluations, but it occurs ideally within a context where issues of control, challenge, culture, connection and positive change for Māori are major considerations. Where change is a key focus for Decision Support evaluations it is generally according to management’s criteria of success.

A Kaupapa Māori approach to evaluation does not preclude collecting data for decision support. Iterations based on this approach, such as Utilisation-focused Evaluation (Patton 1978, 1997) consider a range of stakeholders in ways that may be consistent.
TABLE 2: ALIGNMENT OF NEW DIRECTIONS IN EVALUATION THEORY (ADAPTED FROM SCRIVEN 2001) WITH KAUPAPA MĀORI PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation theories schema</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Kaupapa Māori evaluation principles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Support</td>
<td>*Evaluations assist program managers to make decisions about programs. Includes goal achievement models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Service</td>
<td>*Summative focus on assessing if the needs of program consumers were being met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Approach</td>
<td>Evaluation is always formative. *Emphasis on context in evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Evaluation</td>
<td>*Evaluation should always be a collaborative effort with the evaluated</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory-driven Evaluation</td>
<td>*Generating explanations of success and failure as the core function of evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist/Postmodern Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation is always a projection of subjective values onto the subject matter</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Evaluation</td>
<td>*Evaluation exerts power that should be used to provide solutions to social problems</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with the Kaupapa Māori cultural, change and the credibility principles. However, the inclusion of cultural considerations in Utilisation-focused Evaluation (UFE) would generally have been out of concern for the ‘personal factor’ (Patton et al. 1977) and the buy-in that identification with the evaluation generates (Alkin 2004). The UFE concern with change is based on the evaluator being able to adapt the evaluation to suit the context and needs of the intended end users in the best way, in order to ensure a higher probability of utilisation. Although UFE can, in some cases, pay considerable attention to the context including the culture, and place great emphasis on generating change, this is motivated by the overarching goal of achieving evaluation utilisation and may be quite removed from the underlying concerns of a Kaupapa Māori approach to evaluation.14

The Consumer Service approach focuses on assessing whether the needs of program recipients have been met, and therefore, is closer than Decision Support evaluation to the Kaupapa Māori change principle. Change for Consumer Service evaluation is about assessing whether consumer needs are being met. For Kaupapa Māori evaluation the focus is on ensuring that the evaluation is of benefit to Māori, as well as assessing the benefits or otherwise of the program to Māori. The change principle has led most Kaupapa Māori evaluation theorists to advocate for ‘formative evaluation’ alongside the more summative approaches of Consumer Service evaluation.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation alignment with a Formative Approach

The great debates about evaluation purpose, approaches and methodologies heated up in the 1970s and 1980s, fuelled by emerging differences in fundamental epistemologies underlying evaluation. Championed by Cronbach (1982) who argued that evaluation’s primary purpose was for enlightenment rather than instrumental uses, evaluation was considered to be not just about providing management assistance or making summary judgements about a program. Whereas his predecessors, such as Campbell and Stanley (1963), had been influential in promoting internal validity as the sine qua non of evaluation research, Cronbach sought to establish generalisable knowledge, envisioning program evaluation as ‘a process by which society learns about itself’ (Cronbach & Associates 1980, p. 2). In Scriven’s schema this approach is characterised as the Formative Approach.15
In Cronbach’s theories on the Formative Approach we see the beginnings of a stronger alignment with Kaupapa Māori principles. The Formative Approach aligns to some degree with the change principle and with the Kaupapa Māori culture and connection principles. The emphasis on program evaluation being essentially formative—that is, evaluation conducted with the ‘intent to improve’ (Scriven 1991, p. 168)—aligns, to some degree, with the change principle where positive change for Māori is a key aim. Cronbach contends that insights into complex social problems are attained by looking at how programs operate across multiple settings (Cronbach & Associates 1980) and introduced the idea that evaluation give serious consideration to how context influences programs and to gaining multiple understandings. This approach legitimised the consideration of context-specific factors such as culture and appropriate connections and also opened the door to the development of relativist evaluation theory and practices. However, Cronbach’s approach, emphasising formative evaluation input, stops well short of defining evaluation as needing to fulfil any kind of social justice function, which is implicit in evaluation based on Kaupapa Māori principles of control, challenge and change.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation alignment with Collaborative, Theory-Driven and Constructivist Evaluation

As previously stated, the purpose of Scriven’s schema is to highlight some of the overemphasised theoretical positions in evaluation. With the ascendency of Transformative Evaluation from Collaborative Evaluation, different degrees of emphasis were placed on various aspects of evaluation (Scriven 2001). It is important to note that there may be significant overlaps between all of these theoretical positions. For example, Collaborative Evaluation approaches, such as Empowerment Evaluation can align strongly with transformative approaches; while Theory-driven Evaluation may well be collaborative and have a transformative emphasis.

In Scriven’s schema all the developments in evaluation that ‘allow those who are being evaluated to participate in the evaluation’ (Scriven 2001, p. 27), such as collaborative, participatory and empowerment evaluation are positioned together under Collaborative Evaluation. Evaluation as a collaborative exercise resonates with all Kaupapa Māori principles, and particularly with the control and connection principles. Collaborative evaluation approaches, developing at about the same time as Kaupapa Māori theory, moved further towards allowing for a social justice function in evaluation, in that multiple stakeholder voices, including minority voices, are deliberately sought in all phases of an evaluation.

Postmodern philosophical positions about inquiry also had a major influence on evaluation paradigms from the 1970s onwards. Social reality was increasingly seen as constructed and so, for evaluation, there was no ‘right’ description of a program. Seeking synthesis and consensus became the modus operandi of postmodern evaluation (Stake 1996). Scriven loosely aligns constructivist and postmodern evaluation theory with theory-driven evaluation (Scriven 2001, 2003). Theory-driven Evaluation (TDE) developing out of lessons learnt in the 1970s and 1980s about the difficulties of programs addressing major social problems effectively, aimed to explore the theory and processes involved in achieving results as well as addressing the question of whether results were achieved (Chen 1990; Donaldson 2001). Scriven characterises TDE as a theoretical approach to evaluation predicated on the notion that generating explanations of success and failure is a core function of evaluation.

TDE so defined, requires articulation of a program theory of change and the explanation of successes and failures of the program according to the theory of change (Donaldson 2007). TDE is not so much defined by a theoretical position as it is by a process (Donaldson 2001, 2007). Depending on who is involved in the process and how, TDE might either align closely with Kaupapa Māori principles of evaluation or be widely divergent. Although, it is difficult to relate it directly to Kaupapa Māori principles, this in no way precludes the use of theory-driven evaluation processes in Kaupapa Māori evaluations. Indeed TDE is now a widely used approach in Kaupapa Māori theory based evaluations because it not only facilitates Māori control of the evaluation and its parameters, but also assists with articulating Māori aspirations and determinants of program success.

Kaupapa Māori evaluation alignment with Transformative Evaluation

Transformative Evaluation theorises evaluation as a process aimed at the solution of social problems (Mark, Henry & Julnes 2000; Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey 1999). In Scriven’s schema he includes Democratic Deliberative Evaluation along with Transformative Evaluation theorists. Democratic Deliberative Evaluation (DDE) encompasses democratic and dialogical approaches to evaluation where all relevant interests in the evaluation are given full expression. The DDE approach, championed by House and Howe (2000), rose to prominence as theorists embraced the idea that the democratising function of evaluation is a key function of evaluation along with the transformation of society towards equity goals. For example, in more recent years Patton has developed UFE by broadening the scope to include other approaches and has introduced Developmental Evaluation where the evaluator becomes a part of the program team to assist with program development (Patton 2010). According to Patton, ‘using evaluation to mobilise for social action, empower participants, and support social justice’ are now ‘options on the menu of evaluation process uses’ (Patton 1997, cited in Alkin 2004, p. 49). With the
inclusion of these other approaches Patton’s approach has evolved towards a transformative theoretical position and a theory of evaluation that resonates strongly with Kaupapa Māori evaluation principles.

It is obvious that Kaupapa Māori principles in evaluation resonate with democratic deliberative approaches and strongly correlate with transformative evaluation approaches. DDE, with its focus on mitigating power differentials in order to ensure that all stakeholders are given an equitable voice during an evaluation, aligns with the Kaupapa Māori principles of control and challenge and also takes into account the contextual factors such as culture. The DDE emphasis on reflective reasoning, with shared and negotiated decision-making, is congruent with Kaupapa Māori’s principles of connection and change. However, Kaupapa Māori evaluation is not as concerned with democracy as it is with a type of control that enables Māori to have the strongest ‘voice’ in evaluations that occur within Māori contexts. The argument for the right to this level of control is predicated on Māori rights to self-determination guaranteed by the Crown under the Treaty of Waitangi. The ultimate aim of Kaupapa Māori theory and its practice in evaluation is to transform society in order to make it a better place in which Māori can thrive. With the focus on change, Kaupapa Māori and transformative evaluation are closely aligned. However, even the newer iterations of evaluation approaches that emphasise cultural competency, advocacy and partnerships (Mertens 2008) may totally miss the mark in terms of allowing for the tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) that underpins the control principle in Kaupapa Māori evaluation. Wehipeihana (2008) cautions that these approaches often facilitate access to Māori by non-Māori evaluators and may still serve the needs of the non-Māori evaluator more than the Māori themselves.

Conclusion

Scriven’s schema is a useful tool for highlighting some of the major directions in evaluation theory from the 1940s to the present. Since the schema was developed, there has been no new ‘cornucopian revolution’ in evaluation and more recent approaches would fit within the existing schema. In 2011, it still provides a simple, useful framework from which to compare and contrast Kaupapa Māori principles with major developments in the evaluation field. This comparison confirms that Kaupapa Māori theory-based evaluation, arising from the specific context for evaluation of Māori programs in Aotearoa New Zealand, is a unique expression of evaluation theory and yet is congruent with theoretical developments in the international evaluation field.

Kaupapa Māori theory is an evolving praxis, and this article is but one small attempt to capture Kaupapa Māori theoretical roots and the legitimacy of its foundations within evaluation’s theoretical landscape. There is some urgency concerning this endeavour as little has been written about the theoretical foundations of Kaupapa Māori or other Māori approaches to evaluation, even though Māori approaches are developing quickly with ever-widening influence. The identification of Kaupapa Māori principles must be recognised as a bounded and limiting approach to describing what a theory of praxis is. Kaupapa Māori evaluation is not a set of principles to be referred to in evaluation—it is theory that articulates Māori-lived reality poorly.

Not all Māori approaches to evaluation are identified as Kaupapa Māori, although many share similar principles. Some Māori evaluation theorists and practitioners, while acknowledging the influence of Kaupapa Māori theory, have developed methodologies in parallel to, rather than embedded in, Kaupapa Māori approaches. Indeed, the developments in Māori evaluation praxis have been described and debated whenever Māori evaluators meet at evaluation conferences and on evaluation websites and blogs. This is living theory. It is being challenged, critiqued and developed by both the old and a new generation of theorist–practitioners in research and evaluation. Some have moved beyond Kaupapa Māori to new theories while still acknowledging the platform for theorising, writing and practising evaluation within Māori world views provided by Kaupapa Māori theory.

In this dynamic mix, Kaupapa Māori and other Māori approaches to evaluation have influenced the general approach to evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand and have a growing impact on indigenous evaluation theory and practice. One example of the Māori impact on the national evaluation scene is the use of Māori concepts (expressed in Māori language) in the Aotearoa New Zealand Evaluation Association (anzea) Draft Evaluator Competencies. The Māori language is used:

"in response to some particular ideas or concepts being better expressed and more fully captured in another language, in this case Te Reo. The use of Te Reo is not meant to confine these particular ideas or concepts to Māori, rather they are intended to apply to and be inclusive of all people. (anzea 2010, p. 6)"

The final version of the Evaluator Competencies produced by anzea, Aotearoa New Zealand’s professional evaluation body, also indicate a very strong commitment to culturally competent evaluation, in that cultural competence is not merely a peripheral aspect but a central component of the framework of evaluator competencies. In Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori have long argued that culture is a central part of evaluation and for issues of power and control and Māori/ non-Māori relationships to be addressed. Kaupapa Māori theory has provided a theoretical platform for that argument, premised on Māori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. Although obviously specific to this context, our struggle to articulate, critique and utilise a Māori theoretical foundation for evaluation is instructive to other indigenous peoples. It may perhaps also be useful to the wider international evaluation field as we all continue together in the struggle to develop evaluation theory."
Notes

1 Kaupapa means platform or base.
2 Aotearoa is the Māori term for New Zealand.
3 For a summary of early development of Kaupapa Māori and Kaupapa Māori theory, see IR1 (2000, pp. 3–8).
4 This Treaty was written in order to recognise: a British Governor of New Zealand; and ownership by Māori of their own lands and Māori rights as British subjects.
6 Theorists have been included in this article because they have been instrumental in the development of Kaupapa Māori theory (e.g. Smith, G, Pihama, L), while others have written about the theory as praxis in research and evaluation (Bishop, R, Irwin, K, Moewaka Barnes, H, Smith, L, Walker, S).
7 Although these theorists acknowledge Kaupapa Māori theory in their writings, they do not necessarily all identify as Kaupapa Māori theorists.
8 This is not to imply that Moewaka Barnes is the only noteworthy Māori evaluation theorist. There are many other influential Māori evaluation practitioner–theorists who have not been included in Table 1 because their theories or their published works do not fit within the framework for this article. The writer has attempted to acknowledge and include the important contributions of other Māori evaluation theorists by referencing their work at appropriate places throughout the article.
9 The writer understands that Kaupapa Māori theorists may themselves have resisted compartmentalising Kaupapa Māori theory, seeing it as ‘the deconstructive mode of Pākeha writers’ (Walker 1996, p. 118). Kaupapa Māori theorists are invited to critique this interpretation of their writings on Kaupapa Māori theory and by so doing will further engage with the theory.
10 Indicated in Table 1 with an asterisk (*).
12 For more information on reciprocity in evaluation see: Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Māori Guidelines Hui 2007 (a collaboration between SPEaR and Aotearoa/ New Zealand Evaluation Association (anzea) and SPEaR Good Practice Guidelines, Social Policy Evaluation and Research (SPEaR) Committee (2008), Ministry of Social Development, Wellington.
13 For a fuller schema of evaluations theoretical landscape see Alkin (2004), Evaluation Roots: Tracing Theorists’ Views and Influences, Sage, California.
14 Patton has moved on to ‘Developmental Evaluation’ that resonates more strongly with Kaupapa Māori principles. Refer to the section in this article: ‘Kaupapa Māori alignment with Transformative Evaluation’.
15 Here Scriven is not referring to ‘formative evaluation’ as such, but to evaluation theory that all but denies any summative merit in favour of formative educative approaches to evaluation.
16 Although Scriven’s schema, developed a decade ago, does not include some of the more recently named evaluation approaches such as ‘Advocacy Evaluation’, it is likely that he would include these approaches in the general group of those that seek to be transformative.
17 ‘Theory’ is used in this context to denote the very specific ‘theory of change’ that explains how a particular program is expected to achieve results.
18 In recent blogs and presentations, Scriven has been seeking a ‘Third Cornucopian Revolution’ in evaluation. For interesting discussions on this topic see <http://genuineevaluation.com/author/scriven>.
19 See Kennedy and Wehipeihana (2006) for a stocktake of policies, guidelines and standards for ethical research involving indigenous peoples nationally and internationally. The stocktake identifies a set of principles that resonate strongly with the Kaupapa Māori principles in evaluation, as outlined in this article.
22 See Kawakami et al. (2007) for a discussion of how indigenous evaluation values and methods may improve the general practice of evaluation.
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