

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**MAPPING WHAT MATTERS
IN NEW ZEALAND MUSEUMS:
STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES ON MUSEUM
PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
In Management and Museum Studies**

**Massey University Albany
Auckland, New Zealand**

JANE ANNE LEGGET

January 2006

For Douglas,
who matters more than words can say

and

for my parents, Robin and Wilma Legget,
who first took me to museums

with love.

ABSTRACT

Accountability for museum performance was investigated in the context of New Zealand's public museums. Governing bodies account for museum performance through published annual reports, while performance assessment assists museum managers to achieve museums' objectives. Museum professionals also have expectations of museums. This research questioned whether museums were reporting on the aspects of their performance that mattered to a wider range of stakeholders.

The research is both descriptive and exploratory. A nationwide survey of museum directors gathered data about performance assessment at publicly-funded museums where one or more paid staff made management decisions. The Survey's descriptive findings, covering experiences and views of museum assessment practice, set the wider context for an exploratory Case Study of a large museum, combining qualitative and quantitative methods.

Various groups of stakeholders identified aspects of the case museum's performance that matter to them and the ways in which they might assess them. Maori perspectives were contributed by several participants, a recognition of the importance of taonga Maori collections in New Zealand museums. Diverse museum stakeholders co-created statements as potential performance assessment criteria. A concept mapping process, involving these statements, revealed distinct conceptual elements of the construct, an 'effectively performing museum', reflecting the respondent groups' differing realities, yet much common ground. Three analytical approaches, functional, structural and cultural, compared and contrasted the concepts and their relative importance.

The research identified dimensions of museum performance that could contribute to an integrated framework for museum performance assessment meaningful to a wider range of stakeholders. A conceptual model for museum accountability was developed. Findings suggest that museum performance indicators in New Zealand should extend beyond a focus on visitor numbers and satisfaction to include collection health, staffing quality, Maori concerns and community relationships. Assessment of these factors would enable museums to better account for their performance as community assets.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

So many people have assisted in different ways throughout this research, and I do not know how to thank them all.

First and foremost, to Professor Kerr Inkson, my chief supervisor at Massey University, Albany, my heartfelt thanks for your insights, patience and good humour. It has been a privilege to work with you. You have challenged and encouraged me throughout the journey. Professor Mason Durie, at Massey University, Palmerston North, has also provided valuable guidance as second supervisor. Professor Keith Dewar, now of the University of New Brunswick, offered enthusiastic encouragement at the start of this study.

Many colleagues and fellow doctoral students in various departments at Massey University, Albany, have offered ideas, support and friendship at different stages. Those in the multi-disciplinary Department of Management and International Business have introduced me to new perspectives. As Head of the Department, Associate-Professor John Monin has ensured both intellectual and practical support. Latterly, Dr. Andy Asquith has offered insightful comments with his dry northern humour.

At Massey University, Palmerston North, Dr. David Butts, Director of Museums and Heritage Studies, and Susan Abasa, Lecturer in Museum Studies, have given valued support as friends and colleagues, creating stimulating opportunities to reflect on the research with other museum-minded colleagues and students.

Special thanks are due to the Canterbury Trust Museum Board members, Te Ohaki o Nga Tipuna and their Museum Director, Anthony Wright, for allowing the use of Canterbury Museum for the Case Study. My warm thanks are also extended to the Museum's stakeholders who willingly participated. I also wish to thank the other Museum staff members and volunteers, both those who contributed to the research, and those who helped in other ways to make my contact with the Museum enjoyable and productive.

I am greatly indebted to the museum directors who responded to the Survey. Their participation is much appreciated. In addition, I acknowledge the expertise of museum colleagues Linda Wigley, Roger Mulvay and Larry Robbins.

Librarians at the Albany and Palmerston North campuses, Auckland Museum, Te Papa, and the Ministry of Culture and Heritage always provided excellent, friendly service. At the Albany campus the Printery team has been unfailingly helpful and understanding, and the Information Technology Services staff have been positively heroic!

I am grateful to colleagues at the Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, for their welcome in 2003. They provided me with opportunities to reflect on this research in a refreshingly different academic and professional environment.

Several friends beyond museums and academe have played key roles. Jane Pearce, Colin Nicholson and Keir Pearce-Nicholson have been wonderful hosts in Christchurch. Helen Potter, Gillian Taylor, Kathryn Trounson and Sandra Ward have cheerfully helped with design and production of documents.

I am extremely grateful to two organisations that have funded this study. The Foundation for Research, Science and Technology made the award of a Bright Futures Top Achievers Doctoral Fellowship, which initially made it possible to undertake the research. The Dame Catherine Tizard Scholarship Award 2001 from Local Government New Zealand enabled me to conduct the Case Study in Christchurch.

Many other friends and colleagues at home and abroad have helped in innumerable ways. Thank you all for your humour, hospitality and hugs.

None of this would have been possible without the love, forbearance, encouragement and support in so many ways of Douglas Russell. Thank you for being there with me, for chivvying me along, for making me smile, for rescuing me from technology hiccups and, most of all, for providing me with fortitude when it was much needed.

**MAPPING WHAT MATTERS IN NEW ZEALAND MUSEUMS:
STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES ON MUSEUM PERFORMANCE
AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

CONTENTS

Abstract		i
Acknowledgements		iii
Table of Contents		v
List of Tables		viii
List of Figures		xiii
Glossary of Maori Words		xv
Abbreviations		xviii
Chapter One	INTRODUCTION: MUSEUMS, NEW ZEALAND AND ACCOUNTABILITY	1
	1.1 Museums as Complex Organisations	2
	1.2 The New Zealand Museum Sector	15
	1.3 Accounting for Museum Performance	26
	1.4 Developing the Research Focus	32
Chapter Two	REVIEWING THE LITERATURE	39
	2.1 Accountability and Stakeholders	41
	2.2 Assessment of Museum Performance	44
	2.3 Assessing Museum Performance in New Zealand	53
Chapter Three	RESEARCH METHODS: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION	72
	3.1 Purpose of Study	72
	3.2 Research Considerations and Design	73
	3.3 Research Procedures – Survey	78
	3.4 Field Research Procedures – Case Study	85
	3.5 Ethical Considerations and Research Result Issues	100
Chapter Four	SURVEY STUDY: MAPPING THE SECTOR	104
	4.1 Survey Response: Level of Response and Survey Respondents	105
	4.2 Museum Demographics – Key Findings	108
Chapter Five	SURVEY STUDY: PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT IN NEW ZEALAND MUSEUMS	122
	5.1 The Practice of Performance Assessment	124

	5.2	Perspectives on Performance Assessment	138
	5.3	Benchmarking Museum Performance	147
Chapter Six		CASE STUDY: CANTERBURY MUSEUM, ACCOUNTABILITY AND STAKEHOLDERS	161
	6.1	Historical Background	162
	6.2	Canterbury Museum in 2002	168
	6.3	Public Accountability at Canterbury Museum	176
	6.4	Stakeholders in Canterbury Museum	187
Chapter Seven		COLLECTIVE PERSPECTIVES: INITIAL FINDINGS FROM THE CASE STUDY	193
	7.1	The Focus Groups and their Demographics	193
	7.2	Rating the Statements: For the Total Stakeholder Group	210
	7.3	The Sorting Exercise: For the Total Stakeholder Group	212
	7.4	Relative Importance of the Concepts	218
	7.5	Summary	219
Chapter Eight		THROUGH DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDER LENSES: THREE PERSPECTIVES	222
	8.1	Functional Analysis	223
	8.2	Structural Analysis	244
	8.3	Cultural Analysis	252
	8.4	Summary	260
Chapter Nine		STAKEHOLDERS COUNT: TOWARDS MEANINGFUL PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY	263
	9.1	Who Matters: Stakeholders and Accountability	264
	9.2	What Matters: Dimensions of Performance	273
	9.3	The Heart of the Matter: An Integrated Framework for Meaningful Accountability	289
	9.4	Limitations	301
	9.5	Conclusions	302
Chapter Ten		CONCLUSION	305
	10.1	Achievement of Research Objectives	306
	10.2	Contributions of the Study	307
	10.3	Implications of the Study	308
	10.4	Summary: What Counts and Who Counts	312
		BIBLIOGRAPHY	313

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A** **Survey Instruments**
- A.1** **MUHEC Approval**
 - A.2** **Covering Letter**
 - A.3** **Project Information Sheet**
 - A.4** **Survey Form**
 - A.5** **First Reminder Letter**
 - A.6** **Second Reminder Letter**
 - A.7** **Professional Announcement**
- APPENDIX B** **Case Study Instruments**
- B.1** **MUHEC Approval**
 - B.2** **Project Information Sheet**
 - B.3** **Focus Group Letter**
 - B.4** **Stakeholder Identification Information Sheet**
 - B.5** **Focus Group Information Sheet**
 - B.6** **Informed Consent Form**
 - B.7** **Focus Group Demographics**
 - B.8** **Task Letter**
 - B.9** **Task 1 – Rating Instrument**
 - B.10** **Task 2 – Sorting Task Instructions**
- APPENDIX C** **Case Study Data Summaries and Maps**
- C.1** **A. Functional Analysis: Governance**
 - C.2** **B. Functional Analysis: Sector**
 - C.3** **C. Functional Analysis: Community**
 - C.4** **D. Structural Analysis: Internal**
 - C.5** **E. Structural Analysis: External**
 - C.6** **F. Cultural Analysis: Pakeha**
 - C.7** **G. Cultural Analysis: Maori**
 - C.8** **H. Collective Analysis: All Stakeholders**
 - C.9** **I. Summary of Strongly Perceived Concepts**
- APPENDIX D** **Case Study Statements – text and ratings**
- D.1** **Statements**
 - D.2** **Statements with Ratings**
- APPENDIX E** **Treaty of Waitangi Text**
- APPENDIX F** **Museum Definitions**

Note: Appendix D.1 is also provided as a foldout at the end of the thesis.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1.1: Principal business sectors where individual museums may fit, whether in the public sector, non-profit and for-profit spheres.	4
Table 1.2: Summary of museum products and services experienced by 'the public', with staff involvement	6
Table 1.3: Regular museum activities, rarely experienced by 'the public', with staff involvement	7
Table 1.4: Dimensions of museums' 'stock' as capital	13
Table 1.5: Other museums resources, characterised as capital.	14
Table 3.1: Research approach	77
Table 3.2: Research questions guiding the development and organisation of the survey instrument	80
Table 3.3: Survey data collection schedule	84
Table 3.4: Research questions guiding the development and organisation of the Case Study.	87
Table 3.5: Process planned for stakeholder identification by 8 members of case museum workforce, facilitated by researcher.	92
Table 3.6: Steps in the basic Concept System process and those used in the Case Study (showing the contributors at each stage).	94
Table 3.7: <i>Step 2:</i> Process for preparing 'possible performance statements' prior to the sorting and rating tasks (<i>Steps 4 and 5</i>)	96
Table 3.8: <i>Steps 4-6</i> Outline of sorting and rating tasks.	97
Table 3.9: Emergent analytical approach: comparison of original plan with actual plan	99
Table 4.1: Categories of non-response	106
Table 4.2: Frequency distribution of management background of museum managers	107
Table 4.3: Frequency distribution of institutional self-descriptions	109
Table 4.4: Analysis of <i>Other</i> categories of museum identified	110
Table 4.5: Frequency distribution of legal status of museum, distinguishing public sector and independent museums by 'ownership'	111
Table 4.6: Museums by budget size, as defined by Donnelly, 1996	113
Table 4.7: Frequency distribution of size of operating budget	114
Table 4.8: Frequency distribution of proportions of public sector funding in museum operating budgets	115
Table 4.9: Cross-tabulation of proportions of public sector funding with size of museum operating budgets	115
Table 4.10: Cross-tabulation of proportions of public sector operational funding with museum ownership status	116
Table 4.11: Museum attendances. Frequency distribution of annual visitation levels	117

Table 4.12:	Total numbers and categories of staff reported	118
Table 4.13:	Frequency distribution of numbers of full-time and part-time staff	118
Table 4.14:	Frequency distribution of numbers of voluntary staff	119
Table 4.15:	Frequency distribution of Museums with Service Agreements	120
Table 4.16:	Cross tabulation of museum membership of Museums Aotearoa and budget size.	121
Table 5.1:	Three core questions framing the Survey design, and the rationale for asking them.	123
Table 5.2:	Cross-tabulation of museum budget size and museums' engagement in regular performance assessment	125
Table 5.3:	Frequency distribution of periods of regular museum assessment	126
Table 5.4:	Frequency distribution of reasons for regular museum assessment, shown in descending order of frequency.	126
Table 5.5:	Frequency distribution of the <u>single most important</u> reason for regular museum assessment, grouped by formal requirement of public accountability against managerial purposes	127
Table 5.6:	Cross-tabulation of museum budget size and the principal reason for performance assessment	128
Table 5.7:	Cross-tabulation of type of entity and the principal reason for performance assessment	128
Table 5.8:	Frequency distribution of types of criteria used for museum assessment, in descending order of frequency	129
Table 5.9:	Frequency distribution of most important criterion used in museum assessment, in descending order of importance.	130
Table 5.10:	Cross-tabulation of the range of numbers of aspects of museum activity assessed with the museums' budget size	131
Table 5.11:	Frequency distribution of aspects of museum activity regularly assessed, in descending order of frequency	132
Table 5.12:	Museum activity assessment showing an association with ownership status	133
Table 5.13:	Museum activity assessment aspects showing an association with budget size	134
Table 5.14:	Museum activity assessment aspects showing an association with budget size	134
Table 5.15:	Comparison of frequency distributions of stakeholders involved in developing museums' performance assessment criteria (Q1f), and those using or receiving the information (Q1g)	135
Table 5.16:	Frequency distribution of the primary internal uses of performance assessment	137
Table 5.17:	Frequency distribution of the primary external uses of performance assessment	137
Table 5.18:	Ranking of means for value of performance assessment to museum management tasks, in descending order	140
Table 5.19:	Ranking of means for value of different aspects of museum work in the assessment and reporting of a museum's performance, in descending order within functional categories	141

Table 5.20:	Ranking, in descending order, the means of the value of reporting on these broad categories of museum work to the assessment of museum performance	142
Table 5.21:	Ranking of means for value of approaches to the assessment of museum performance, in descending order as internal or external approaches to assessment.	143
Table 5.22:	Frequency distribution of benefits of regular assessment of museum performance	144
Table 5.23:	Frequency distribution of <i>benefits</i> of regular assessment of museum performance identified by respondents, shown in descending order of frequency:	144
Table 5.24:	Frequency distribution of difficulties of regular assessment of museum performance	145
Table 5.25:	Frequency distribution of <i>difficulties</i> associated with regular assessment of museum performance identified by respondents, shown in descending order of frequency	145
Table 5.26:	Frequency distribution of museums engaged in benchmarking activity	148
Table 5.27:	Frequency distribution of types of benchmarking activity engaged in by responding museums	149
Table 5.28:	Frequency distribution of types of museums engaged in benchmarking against other museums	149
Table 5.29:	Examples of benchmarking partnership with other museums, summarised from responses	150
Table 5.30:	Frequency distribution of formality of benchmarking activity	151
Table 5.31:	Frequency distribution of criteria for museum benchmarking partners, in descending order of frequency	151
Table 5.32:	Aspects used by 15 responding museums in their benchmarking activities	152
Table 5.33:	Frequency distribution of museums' experience of using museum standards	153
Table 5.34:	Frequency distribution of responding museums' current use of various standards	154
Table 5.35:	Frequency distribution of benefits of benchmarking with other museums' performance	155
Table 5.36:	Cross-tabulation of level of benefits with engagement in benchmarking	155
Table 5.37:	Frequency distribution of benefits of benchmarking museum performance identified by respondents, shown in types of benefits in descending order of frequency	156
Table 5.38:	Frequency distribution of difficulties of benchmarking performance with other museums.	157
Table 5.39:	Cross-tabulation of level of difficulties with engagement in benchmarking	157
Table 5.40:	Frequency distribution of difficulties of benchmarking museum performance offered by respondents, shown by category in descending order of frequency	158
Table 6.1:	Statistics covering Canterbury Museum activities in 2000-2001 (Source: Canterbury Museum Trust Board, 2001 , 12)	169

Table 6.2:	Populations of the contributing local authority areas, including those identifying as Maori.	171
Table 6.3:	Composition of the Trust Board, 2002, as legislated by the 1993 Act section 5 (2)	172
Table 6.4:	Interpretation of the major phases in the Museum's development.	175
Table 6.5:	Proportions of visitors from different originating sources (Source: Canterbury Museum Trust Board, 1986 , 32)	181
Table 6.6:	Participants in the stakeholder identification exercise	188
Table 6.7:	Stakeholders in the Museum identified by the museum staff group	189
Table 7.1:	Demographic characteristics of the 11 focus groups comprising the Total Stakeholder Group (TSG)	195
Table 7.2:	Museum involvement and study participation rates of the 11 focus groups comprising the Total Stakeholder Group (TSG)	196
Table 7.3:	The top twenty 'possible performance statements' as rated by the 47 raters, presented in descending order by means.	211
Table 7.4:	The four 'possible performance statements' rated lowest by the 47 raters, presented in descending order of means.	212
Table 7.5:	Concept names and cluster content summary for the Total Stakeholder Group's concept map using the 13-cluster solution.	215
Table 7.6:	Mean Coherence Values for the 13 TSG concept clusters, presented in ascending order of MCV.	217
Table 7.7:	Mean Cluster Ratings for the 13 TSG concept clusters, presented in descending order of MCR	218
Table 8.1:	Composition of the data sets in the three analytical approaches, shown as Key Response Groups (KRGs).	223
Table 8.2:	The composition of the three KRGs in the functional analysis	226
Table 8.3:	Dimensions of effective museum performance strongly identified through the functional analysis, using data sets for (A) Governance KRG; (B) Sector KRG and (C) Community KRG.	233
Table 8.4:	Functional analysis: Concepts of the Governance, Sector and Community KRGs, shown in descending order of their respective perceived relative importance.	235
Table 8.5:	Matrix of correlations of pattern matches between the Governance, Sector and Community KRGs.	244
Table 8.6:	The composition of the two KRGs in the structural analysis	245
Table 8.7:	Dimensions of effective museum performance strongly identified through the structural analysis, using data sets for (D) Internal KRG and (E) External KRG.	248
Table 8.8:	Structural analysis: Concepts of the Internal and External KRGs, shown in their respective descending orders of relative importance.	249
Table 8.9:	The composition of the two KRGs in the cultural analysis	253
Table 8.10:	Dimensions of effective museum performance strongly identified through the functional analysis, using data sets for (F) Pakeha KRG and (G) Maori KRG.	255

Table 8.11:	Cultural analysis: Concepts of the Pakeha and Maori KRGs, shown in their respective descending orders of relative importance.	256
Table 8.12:	Comparative distribution of concepts across all KRGs and the TSG collective response, in descending order of importance	261
Table 9.1:	A typology of generic museum stakeholders to be considered for accountability purposes	267
Table 9.2:	Case Study Interpretation: framework of performance assessment domains relevant for public accountability purposes as perceived by Canterbury Museum stakeholders	274

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure 3.1: Overall Research Process (Research Design Map after Edwards, 2000)	79
Figure 3.2: Case Study Concept Mapping Process	91
Figure 6.1: Canterbury Museum 2005	161
Figure 6.2: Canterbury Museum c. 1870	163
Figure 6.3: Vision and Mission statements in 2002, adopted in 1996. (Source: Canterbury Museum Trust Board, 1997 , 2)	168
Figure 6.4: The Discovery Gallery, a magnet for younger visitors. (Source: Canterbury Museum)	170
Figure 6.5: Core values of the Museum in 2002, presented with explanatory statements used when originally adopted in 1996 (Source: Canterbury Museum Trust Board, 1997 , 2).	174
Figure 7.1: Concept map for Total Stakeholder Group's responses, showing the 13-cluster solution	213
Figure 7.2: Point map for Total Stakeholder Response, the mean distribution of the 140 statements within the 13 clusters	216
Figure 8.1: Concept map for Governance KRG, showing the 9 - cluster solution	228
Figure 8.2: Concept map for Sector KRG, showing 11-cluster solution	230
Figure 8.3: Concept map for Community KRG, showing the 11-cluster solution	232
Figure 8.4: How the Sector KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Governance KRG.	238
Figure 8.5: How the Community KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Governance KRG	239
Figure 8.6: How the Governance KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Sector KRG.	240
Figure 8.7: How the Community KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Sector KRG.	241
Figure 8.8: How the Governance KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Community KRG.	242
Figure 8.9: How the Sector KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Community KRG.	243
Figure 8.10: Concept map for Internal KRG, showing the 13-cluster solution	246
Figure 8.11: Concept map for External KRG, showing the 13-cluster solution	247
Figure 8.12: How the External KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Internal KRG.	250
Figure 8.13: How the Internal KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the External Stakeholders.	251
Figure 8.14: Concept map for Pakeha KRG, showing the 13-cluster solution	254

Figure 8.15:	Concept map for Maori KRG, showing the 13-cluster solution	255
Figure 8.16:	How the Maori KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Pakeha KRG.	258
Figure 8.17:	How the Pakeha KRG assigned relative importance to the concepts identified for the Maori KRG.	259
Figure 9.1:	Maori as museum stakeholders.	273
Figure 9.2:	Version of the Value-for-Money model adjusted illustrating accountability responsibilities in New Zealand's publicly-funded museums	290
Figure 9.3:	Stephen Weil's evolving Matrix of Success	291
Figure 9.4:	A generic conceptual model for framing performance accountability of publicly-funded museums (showing interconnections of performance domains).	293
Figure 9.5:	<i>Te Hono ki Ranana - the Connection with London.</i> Pigmented ink drawing by John Bevan Ford, 1993.	298

GLOSSARY OF MAORI WORDS

Drawn from various sources including Starzecka (1996), Williams (1971) and Harre Hindmarsh (2005)

<i>Aotearoa</i>	The contemporary Maori name for New Zealand (usually translated as “land of the long white cloud”)
<i>hapu</i>	Sub-tribe
<i>hui</i>	Meeting, gathering, debate
<i>iwi</i>	Tribe, tribal group
<i>kaitiaki</i>	Guardian or custodian. In the museum context, Kaitiaki Maori are Maori museum staff.
<i>kaitiakitanga</i>	Traditional guardianship of taonga, including natural resources and knowledge, exercised as mandated by the iwi, hapu or whanau, with responsibilities to care for and protect them for future generations
<i>kaumatua</i>	Tribal elder
<i>kaupapa Maori</i>	Maori perspectives, or ways of operating aligned with Maori protocols
<i>kawa</i>	Purpose or way of doing things, sanctioned by Maori
<i>koha</i>	Gift or present, acknowledging support, reciprocal relationships and traditional protection and hospitality
<i>kohanga reo</i>	Maori language immersion pre-schools (literally ‘language nests’)
<i>koiwi</i>	Human remains
<i>kuia</i>	Female tribal elder
<i>kura kaupapa</i>	Maori language immersion schools (primary and secondary)

Maori

mana	Power, prestige, authority, integrity
mana whenua	Traditional authority over tribal lands
Maori	The indigenous people of New Zealand
marae	Traditional tribal meeting place. Iwi taonga are often housed there in the main house
matauranga	Maori traditional knowledge systems
Maori	
mauri	Essential spirit, life force
Pakeha	Non-Maori New Zealanders, usually of British or other European descent, although the term may encompass other national origins
rohe	Traditional territory
runanga	Traditionally an assembly or meeting for debate. This term is often applied to tribal authorities, councils, committees or other governance or administrative unit within iwi organisations
tangata whenua	People of the land, traditional inhabitants and owners
taonga	Treasured items of cultural heritage, highly valued by Maori and often associated with particular ancestors. In museum contexts the term is increasingly used to refer to collections of Maori material culture, but for Maori its use can encompass intangible heritage and knowledge, natural resources and land, especially wahi tapu. Sometimes also referred to as taonga tuku iho (treasures inherited from the ancestors).
tikanga	Traditional protocols, custom, ways of doing things
Te Papa	The national museum, the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa

<i>te reo</i>	The Maori language, considered to be an intangible taonga
<i>wahi tapu</i>	Places sacred to Maori and protected through ritual
<i>wairua</i>	Spirit, soul
<i>Waitaha</i>	The Canterbury region of New Zealand
<i>whakapapa</i>	Genealogy, line of descent
<i>whakatauki</i>	Proverb, saying
<i>whanau</i>	Family, extended family or other kin-group linked by whakapapa
<i>whare taonga</i>	Maori term often used for museums. Literally a house for treasures.

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

Unless otherwise specified, organisations are New Zealand ones

AAM	American Association of Museums
AASLH	American Association for State and Local History
AGMANZ	Art Galleries and Museums Association of New Zealand
CAG	Christchurch Art Gallery, previously the Robert McDougall Art Gallery
CCC	Christchurch City Council
CS	Concept System – proprietary software package used in the Case Study
FTE	Full time equivalent (of staff)
ICOM	International Council of Museums
IiP	<i>Investors in People</i> , a British human resource standards programme introduced to New Zealand in 1997.
IMLS	Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
KRG	Key Respondent Group (made up of one or more selected stakeholders). These are units of analysis for the concept mapping and pattern matching.
LEOTC	Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom. Contestable funding programme of the Ministry of Education.
MAANZ (also MAANZTRHKT)	Museums Association of Aotearoa New Zealand Te Ropu Hanga Kaupapa Taonga
MAP	Museum Assessment Programme, managed by the Institute for Museum services (now the Institute for Museum and Library

	Services), USA
MCH	Ministry for Culture and Heritage
MCR	Mean Cluster Rating – mean of individual importance ratings of all the Statements contained in one concept cluster
MCV	Mean Coherence Value
MDF	Museum Directors Federation
MGC	Museums and Galleries Commission (UK), forerunner of the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (UK).
MLA	Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (UK)
MoCA	Ministry of Cultural Affairs
NRB	National Research Bureau Ltd, which undertakes local authority benchmarking surveys
NZHPT	New Zealand Historic Places Trust- Pouhere Taonga
SD	standard deviation
SFG	Stakeholder Focus Group, convened for generation of statements and data collecting
SPR	Service Performance Reporting
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SR	Survey Response (followed by respondents identity number)
Statements	The 140 co-created “possible performance statements” used for the concept mapping process of the Case Study
TBL	Triple Bottom Line. Approach to company or institutional reporting, covering economic, social and environmental sustainability results.

TLA	Territorial Local Authority (local government)
TroNT	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
TSG	Total Stakeholder Group, the entire Case Study data set comprising the collective response of all 11 Stakeholder Focus Groups.
VFM	Value for Money