

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.

A Māori-centred inquiry into health governance:  
Māori directors on District Health Boards

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of Doctorate in Philosophy in Management at Massey  
University, Te Papaioea/Palmerston North, Aotearoa/New Zealand

Joy Colleen Panoho

2012



## Abstract

As is characteristic of colonised countries indigenous peoples experience phenomenal cultural and material loss culminating in marginalisation. Despite colonial devastation Māori, the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/ New Zealand, move forward with ever increasing presence and voice in every institutional sector in this country in an attempt to reclaim and restore Māori wellbeing. While disparities in health continue to demonstrate colonial devastation, health is one such sector where increasing Māori empowerment is evident. The relatively recent legal provision for Māori representation at a District Health Board level offers direct, regional Māori governance input. However, as with other sectors, inevitable neo-colonial vestiges constrain Māori autonomy. Rapidly developing indigenous scholarship opens up previously unavailable paths for indigenous researchers with which to increasingly empower Māori. However, the opportunity to do this within management studies, particularly within the governance field, remains limited. Governance and health governance theory, firmly grounded in Western rationality, has yet to benefit from indigenous challenge. Postcolonial theorists articulate and contest Western dominance in management studies and offer emergent challenge to governance theory. In the desire to know more about director activity and efficacy, current governance theoretical debate in management studies calls for primary or first-order data where directors themselves reflect on their governance experiences.

The juxtaposition of legislative changes to health governance and provision, rapidly developing indigenous scholarship, and emergent postcolonial challenge within management studies have given rise to this research question –

What is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards?

This study provides primary or first-order Māori-centric data on intra-board process. Māori research constructs guide the research process methodologically and analytically. Semi-structured interview data generating a thematic analysis reveals Māori not only experience the Western-hypothesised governance complexities and demands but also considerable additional complexity and demand. The assistance of a postcolonial lens brings into sharp focus the nature of these additional complexities and demands and attributes them to a deficit in Pākehā bicultural knowledge and accommodation. The neo-colonial hierarchal construction of Māori as the 'Other' evokes multiple dysfunctional mechanisms such as tokenism, stereotyping, institutional racism, political correctness, and evokes the 'burden of representation'. Mechanisms such as these impede intra-board activity, representing significant governance process loss. In addition the lack of accommodation of Māori cultural governance aspirations also represent governance process loss. The articulation of dysfunctional colonial mechanisms that manifest at the DHB board table is a first step in a reconstruction of a different intra-board functioning. This, in conjunction with due regard to Māori cultural governance contributions and aspirations, suggests transformational possibility.

# Acknowledgements

**Mā wai e tō te waka mātauranga? Māku e tō, māu e to. Mā te whakarongo e tō.**

Who will bear the canoe of knowledge? I will, you will, all who listen will.

Ko wai au?

Ko Ngātokimatawhaorua te waka: Ko Ngā Puhi te iwi  
Ko Whatitiri te maunga: Ko waipao te awa: Ko Te Tirarau te Tangata, Te Ariki  
Ko Te Parawhau rātau ko Te Uriroi, ko Patu Harakeke ngā hapū  
Ko Maungarongo te marae  
No Whangārei ahau

Te maunga:

Koia tēnei ko te whare tapu o Ngā Puhi  
I tēnei o ngā maunga i te pito o te Rangi  
Mai tēra pito, koia Whatitiri

This is the divine house of Ngā Puhi  
Within the mountains is the centre of the universe  
Here is that centre, this is Whatitiri

Te whenua ko au, ko au te whenua  
The land is me and I am the land

No reira, ngā mihi mahana ki a koutou

People, past and present, have walked with me in this PhD journey supporting this endeavor in fundamental ways. I acknowledge and express gratitude for this support.

To Lily Queenie Anderson who had the courage as a widow and mother to emigrate with her two sons from the grim urban density and poverty of London. To this woman who travelled from England, across Australia and eventually to rural Northland, to the bush and the mangroves to become my mother I give thanks. Thanks for the courage to seek a better life, thank you for the resilience and determination to get on a horse, to plant kumara and to embrace life without electricity. Most importantly however I acknowledge my mother's values, her

endurance and courage to challenge and confront the injustice of segregation and racism prevalent at the time. I had only a few years with her before she passed away but I am convinced her influence in my life was/is formative. She was a strong and outspoken woman. He wahine hinengaro pūkeke a ia. Her legacy continues in her daughters.

To my father Henare Hohepa Panohe who raised my sister and I, his black and white daughters. We never thought so at the time, but we were fortunate also to be raised in the bush and the mangroves, on and near our ancestral lands. Your humility, generosity, peace-making and patience, your manaakitanga, your wairua and aroha has left an indelible mark on my life. Ko te tohu o te Rangatira, he iti, he whakaiti, he whakaiti rawa. It is the mark of nobility to be small, to be humble, very humble. The dubious gifts of colonization, sugar, salt, tobacco, alcohol and toxic heavy industry, shortened your life. Today the corporation that grew prosperous from the indigenous factory labour in our village, the corporation that poisoned your lungs, offers scholarships to Māori tertiary students. A changing world. A painful postcolonial irony.

Thank you to my Irish American Catholic husband, my mentor, my devil's advocate, my supporter who became seriously ill in the middle of my PhD journey. I have profound respect for your academic achievements, your research leadership, and your lifelong intellectual dedication to the critique of Western rationality. However, it is your courage and strength of character that I now profoundly acknowledge and respect. To have held yourself so steadily in the face of this life threatening disease, to have survived a chemotherapy-resistant rapid and advanced cancer against all odds is a not just a tribute to you and to medical research but also a miracle. This is now a matter between him and God, and between me and God. Thank you also to Doctors Wyndham Wilson, David Halverson and Dan Fowler, and the Experimental Transplant Team at the National Cancer Institute in Bethesda MD. These doctors have dedicated their lives to research that literally saves lives. Without you this

thesis may never have been completed. Tēnā koutou ngā rangatira o matepukupuku rangahau. Ka mau te wehi! Nga mihi no Aotearoa.

Thank you also to my whānau. To my sister Lynne, who suffered my incessant curiosity and wild imagination and always supported my study. To my brother Peter, who travelled across the world as a child to grow up and work with our father on our land. My thanks also go to my brother Tom for his regular phone calls in our time of need. Arohanui to Peter and Rose, who have always been there for us and for our children. There for me for the tears on oncologists' bad news days. There for the struggle that never ends over the alienation of our land.

I express my appreciation and respect for the participants and contributors to this research. I am humbled by the generous gift of their time and their support of my mahi. Ko te utu mō te aroha, ko te aroha anō (Respect received is respect acknowledged). Thank you for your patience, for practitioners the wheels of academia turn so slowly!

This thesis was primarily funded by the Health Research Council. Contributions also came from Te Rūnanga-Ā-Iwi-O-Ngāpuhi, the Māori Education Trust, and from the Massey University Purehuroa Award. Thank you for your collective financial support of this project.

In terms of supervision, thank you to Dr Manuhuia Barcham, to Dr Te Tiwha Puketapu, and to Dr Janet Sayers. To Manu for being there at the start of this journey, to Te Tiwha for the guidance and patience gifted to this Ngā Puhi orphan, and to Janet for picking me up late in the process. Thank you for your sensitive support and for, somehow, wrapping it up literally at the last minute.

I want to acknowledge Professor Chris Cunningham for his initial and ongoing support of my study. Acknowledgements also go to Professors Pushkala and Anshuman Prasad and to Professor Bobby Banerjee for their ongoing interest and academic leadership.

Thank you to my mad and staunch friend Vicki Simon who shared the laughs and the pain of a mother, of a Māori health researcher, and of an outsider in the



Manawatu. Thanks for sharing the isolation, thanks for the help with negotiation (or not) of the manawhenua politics.

This thesis is dedicated to my children, to Hohepa, to Lily, and to Brigid. During the past few years they have endured not just the stress and demands of a mother's (interrupted) research and thesis writing journey but they also endured with courage and dignity the distress and uncertainty of their father's near fatal cancer and terrifying journey through transplant. Never forget where you are from. You too are from the bush and the mangroves, even though you live in and experience a global reality. Never be afraid to speak up and question injustice. May you always strive to have the courage and resilience of your grandmother, and the humility and aroha of your grandfather. Kia kaha, kia manawanui, kia piki te ora ki a korua.

No reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa.

# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Tables.....	xi
<b>Chapter One: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter Two: Governance .....</b>	<b>11</b>
The Practice-Theory Nexus: Same Yet Different.....	13
Health Governance .....	26
<b>Chapter 3: Colonisation, Founding Violence, the Study of Management .....</b>	<b>39</b>
Colonisation .....	40
Māoritanga to Tikanga Māori to Kaupapa Māori .....	42
Kaupapa Māori Scholarship .....	44
He Māori koe? (are you Māori?).....	45
Post-Colonial Theory and Critique or Postcolonialism .....	49
The Postcolonial in the Study of Management.....	55
Kaupapa Māori and management studies.....	64
<b>Chapter Four: Methodology .....</b>	<b>67</b>
Methodological Choice .....	69
The qualitative research tradition .....	71
Theoretically informed research and research standards.....	73
The Māori Research Tradition.....	74
The establishment of Kaupapa Māori.....	74
Locus of Power .....	84
A Note on Ethics.....	91
Methodological Details .....	92
Data.....	92
Transcription .....	93
Geography.....	93

Sampling.....	93
Demography.....	94
Gender .....	94
Experience.....	94
The interviews.....	94
Interview questions .....	96
Observation.....	96
Data summary.....	97
Data Analysis.....	97
Tā te rangatira, tāna kai he kōrero (For a leader, their discussion is their sustenance).....	107
<b>Chapter Five: No Hea Au? .....</b>	<b>109</b>
The First Theme: no hea au? (Where am I from?).....	110
Legislation and appointment .....	111
Tenure .....	117
Election.....	118
Grass roots as disparity.....	122
<b>Chapter Six: Ko Wai Au?.....</b>	<b>128</b>
The role of supporter and protector of all Māori in health .....	128
The role of the sole advocate for Māori (ill) health and the elephant in the room. ....	129
The role of supporter and protector of all Māori in health .....	134
The role of walking Treaty workshop, social engineer and race relations conciliator: .....	138
The role of the second class appointed director .....	142
The role of the token director, pea tētahi, e rua, ētahi, kore rānei? (perhaps one, two, some, or none?) .....	144
The role of the translator, Kei waenganui – (being in-between).....	148
Kāore e kitea he kanohi (a face not seen).....	150
Kāore e mihi, kāore e manākitanga (without an acknowledgement there is no respect) .....	151
The role of the de-indigenised director and the Ministerial directive.....	153
The Ministerial directive and representation .....	154
<b>Chapter Seven: Ko Wai Oku Whanaunga? .....</b>	<b>160</b>
Iwi relationship arrangements.....	160
Professional Māori networks – culturally interconnected not related.....	163
Conflicted interest or related interests?.....	164
Synergistic relations.....	166

Cultural relations.....	171
The translator - Kei Wanganui .....	173
Cultural distance and isolation .....	175
Māori health and hauora Māori – wellness.....	177
Raruraru (trouble) - inter and intra iwi conflict .....	180
<b>Chapter Eight: Discussion .....</b>	<b>183</b>
Reconsidering Health Governance and Legislation .....	186
Health governance, NPM and agency.....	186
Legislation and the historiographical revolution .....	189
Anger as a legislative vector .....	192
Intra-board Processes .....	195
The burden of representation.....	197
The Pākehā deficit – unsettling the settlers, decolonising health governance .....	201
Moving on from the ‘Us and Them’ Re-Inscribing DHB Intra-Board Process .....	203
<b>Chapter Nine: Conclusion.....</b>	<b>207</b>
The Research Question and the Research Objectives .....	207
The Study Background .....	207
Future Research .....	208
The Study Contributions .....	210
<b>References.....</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>229</b>
APPENDIX A: APPROVAL OF ETHICS APPLICATION FOR THESIS.....	230
APPENDIX B: REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO TE MATAWHANUI.....	231
APPENDIX C: INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS .....	233
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM.....	236
APPENDIX E: INTRODUCTION TO TRANSCRIPT .....	237
APPENDIX F: AUTHORITY FOR THE RELEASE OF TRANSCRIPTS OF RECORDINGS.....	238
APPENDIX G: TRANSCRIBER’S CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT .....	239
APPENDIX H: TE MATAWHĀNUI HUI INTRODUCTION .....	240
APPENDIX I: TE MATAWHĀNUI HUI FOLLOW UP .....	242
<b>Glossary of Māori words and phrases.....</b>	<b>244</b>



## List of Tables

Table 2.1 Summary of Health Reforms 2001 Research Project Findings.....	34
Table 4.1 Overall Research Goals.....	70
Table 4.2 “Community-Up” Approach to Defining Researcher Conduct.....	80
Table 4.3 Ethics Documentation and Participant Information .....	92
Table 4.4 Sample Set of Interview Questions .....	96
Table 4.5 Summary of Data Sources .....	97
Table 4.6 Tabulated Word and Paragraph Count for Data Analysis .....	106
Table 5.1 Research Goals .....	109
Table 5.2 Theme One .....	110
Table 6.1 Theme Two.....	128
Table 7.1 Theme Three .....	160
Table 8.1 Thematic Summary of Results.....	183

# Chapter One: Introduction

## **What is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards?**

In response to calls for more Māori input into the New Zealand public health system the government provided for regional Māori representation in health governance with the passing of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000. This thesis is a qualitative study of governance as experienced by these Māori directors. Importantly, this is not a study of Māori governance but rather a study of Māori directorial experience within a corporate and institutional governance setting, that is, the setting of District Health Boards.

Importantly also, this is a study of Māori directorial experiences within a colonised context. As such, it is necessary to explore and articulate the institutional implications of colonisation on contemporary colonised identities and practice particularly in relation to health governance. The setting for this study is in Aotearoa/New Zealand (NZ) where indigenous peoples entered into an agreement with the colonising British known as the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. Aotearoa/NZ, in postcolonial literature, is characterised as a white settler colony. The term 'Māori' constituted a collective of the indigenous peoples and the term 'Pākehā', constituted a collective of the (white) settlers. The terms, simultaneously created (Campbell, 2005), persist in contemporary understandings of identity.

Resistance to epistemic coloniality (2006) in Aotearoa/NZ has generated an indigenous, Māori-centred research tradition. In this thesis both this tradition and postcolonial theory and critique provide specific lenses for critical inquiry into the colonising process and on-going colonial practices that determine Pākehā/Māori relations. A review of governance literature provides theoretical tools with which to interpret the organisational setting, specifically, intra-board process.

In Aotearoa/NZ health care is publically funded. Publically funded health and legislatively determined health structures therefore underpin this governance setting, the provision and distribution of which is legislatively determined by the

current NZ Public Health and Disability Act 2000 (NZPH&D Act). In an attempt to democratise health governance (amongst other goals) the Act provided for the establishment of twenty one District Health Boards (DHBs) each comprising seven elected and four government appointed directors.

This research thesis – *A Māori-centred inquiry into health governance: Māori directors on District Health Boards* was initiated by the coincidence of multiple factors; legislative changes, Māori health research policy, personal interest, and importantly, by calls from Māori DHB directors themselves.

The motivation to better understand being Māori in a colonised world that, by definition, is non-Māori is the result of the author's lifelong cultural dissonance brought about by personal experiences of incommensurability between the two worlds. Incommensurability is used here in the literal sense of “no common measure” (Oberheim and Hoyningen-Huene, 2012). These personal cultural incommensurability experiences are not only mine, but are ubiquitous and lifelong for many Māori. This incommensurability can be illustrated by the use of an example. One simple example is the difference between an offer of koha and a fee. One is a discrete personally or collectively determined contribution of money or resources, the other an explicit exchange of a predetermined amount of money. For Māori this could create a tension. From a Western point of view, the same service receives the same payment, but for a Māori exchange of service, the appropriate koha could be different depending on the circumstances of the participants to the exchange.

Colonisation permeates everyday existence for Māori. Māori participate in everyday Western-determined life not simply by choice but by necessity. This creates cultural tension. Historically the political approach (albeit ineffective) was assimilation into Western culture. Contemporary Māori academic approaches, after decades of resistance, have attempted to address the corrosive effects of Western academic dominance by revisiting and reclaiming Māori ways of being. Reclamation and



revisiting however can result in a romanticism of the past in conjunction with an uncompromising and unrealistic rejection of Western participation and contribution. Yet, Māori are inextricably embedded in the Pākehā world through the process of colonisation. Often the Māori research approach means expectations of Māori participation in academia and research becomes restrained by theoretical engagement limited only to the Māori approach.

For a Māori researcher are the only options assimilation or rejection of Western theory? Postcolonial theory and critique in conjunction with Māori epistemological approaches offer a way to transcend this binary. Postcolonial scholars not only acknowledge the perils of such a binary, they specifically explore the potentially productive tension between the coloniser and the colonised. Postcolonial theory and critique, while suffering the allegation of contamination by Western theory, does not propose to be, and has never proposed to be non-Western despite foundational indigenous contributions. Postcolonial theory and critique instead proposes to privilege the colonised voice and experience and does so using the tools of the West.

My specific interest in Māori governance has also come from more recent concrete experiences; first as a young adult involved in Māori Land Court research, and latterly with management study, management practice, and governance consulting. Management study reveals consistent mono-cultural bias. The dominance of the Western approach has been thoroughly documented (Stablein & Panoho, 2011). Management practice, as a result, demonstrates this bias; so too does governance practice. This mono-cultural dominance has implications for both Western and non-Western participants in governance in Aotearoa/NZ. The implication of this mono-cultural dominance for Māori directors is explored in this study.

This thesis examines DHB Māori directorial experience using theoretical tools sensitive to Māori research approaches and engages with post-colonial critique. Māori research approaches, while necessary, are not sufficient. Whilst these perspectives are at times in tension and may be contradictory, this research utilises

these tensions productively to articulate the reality of Māori directors' lived experiences.

This chapter has begun with an introduction to the setting and to the theoretical orientation of the thesis, which draws on the insights available in both postcolonial theory and critique and the Māori-centred research tradition. Specifically, the research objectives are to generate primary governance data that is Māori-centric and to explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership heterogeneity. What now follows is an overview of subsequent chapters with signposts to the content of each.

Chapter Two backgrounds the emergence and development of the phenomenon of corporate governance (hereafter governance) and situates early and on-going governance literature in the legal and economic paradigms. Governance is defined as the collective activity of the board of directors. Director activity therefore serves as a proxy for governance. Commonly, organisational performance is considered the responsibility of directors. As a multifaceted phenomenon with many features that are appealing to the practitioner the practice-theory nexus is examined. The marginal yet potentially significant nature of the directorial role, the practical nature of the directing task (Spencer, 1983) and the extent of public scrutiny (Forbes & Milliken, 1999) all make governance appealing to practitioners. The importance and the place of multiple regulatory reports examining governance, often following governance failures, are discussed. Of particular note is the consistent regulatory call for board heterogeneity or diversity.

Following the introduction of this more general literature, the focus then turns to the governance literature within the management field. Paradigmatic differences between the economic and legal field and the management field are contrasted. The problematic, contested nature of organisational performance in relation to director activity is examined. Importantly, management scholars question whether organisational performance can be unambiguously credited to director activity.

Scholars call for first-order data or primary data where directors themselves are asked about their activity. Thus, this study provides first-order or primary data in response to the call for more insight into director activity.

The chapter traces the increasing complexity of governance theory from the simplistic legal and economic paradigm, through to the sociological contributions from management scholarship including stewardship theory, stakeholder theory, and resource-based theories. Despite this significant sociological enrichment, scholarly understanding of governance remains incomplete. To address this lack of understanding, discussion in the chapter turns to a more specific focus, that is, governance process.

Management governance scholars have characterised governance process as that of a black box activity and current debate focuses on peering into the black box by observing directors in action, and by asking directors themselves to recount their experiences of governance. There have been many calls for more research of this kind.

While the governance setting for this study is in the public sector, specifically in health, New Public Management (NPM) doctrine introduces private sector governance goals thus evoking corporate governance inquiry. NPM governance activity and outcomes are embedded in legislation thus health governance is reviewed specifically in relation to current public health legislation, the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000. Findings from an extensive health reform research project commissioned following the Act are recounted and summarised with particular attention to a report on Māori DHB experience. The findings indicate Māori DHB experience differs from that of non-Māori. In particular, Pere et al. (2007) point to the need to further investigate DHB intra-board process.

Governance theory, Māori research epistemologies, and postcolonial theory and critique underpin the theoretical and methodological basis for this study. Having

reviewed governance literature in Chapter Two, Chapter Three introduces and interconnects postcolonial theory and critique with Kaupapa Māori.

In tracing the Aotearoa/NZ colonial experience the establishment and growth of Māori epistemology and methodology is documented from Māoritanga to tikanga Māori to Kaupapa Māori. The contemporary international and trans-disciplinary profile of Kaupapa Māori epistemology is recognised. Having acknowledged the early promise of Kaupapa Māori, the contemporary problems with Kaupapa Māori and critical theory are then articulated. The existing tensions between postcolonial understandings and Kaupapa Māori understandings, in particular those of identity and essentialism, are discussed.

An overview of the colonial process contextualises health disparity, using Veracini's (2003) founding violence construct. A contemporary review of Māori health disparity is provided. Attempts to examine mechanisms behind the legislative move to appoint Māori to DHBs are made.

Central theorists and central tenets of postcolonial theory and critique in relation to this thesis are introduced along with current debates within the field. Management literature, also implicated in the colonial project, is examined. The utility of a postcolonial lens within management study is proposed and extant postcolonial theorising in management is reviewed. Multiple sub-fields of management studies, already contested by critical management theorists, are now beginning to be examined with a postcolonial lens. Sub-fields such as international management, human resource management, organisation development and change, organisation culture, public sector management, and corporate governance are noted. In particular, the diversity debate in relation to colonisation is reviewed. The importance of the need to geo-politically locate any postcolonial debate is noted. The chapter ends with an overview of indigenous approaches to the academic study of governance.

Semi-structured interview data, supplemented by observational and archival data provide the empirical basis for this research. Chapter Four discusses the methodological theory that informs this thesis and details the methodological steps in the data gathering and analysis phases of this study. The qualitative turn in management research is noted and issues of theoretically informed research and research standards are discussed. The indigenous challenge to Western methodology introduces Māori research. The emergence of a Māori research tradition is discussed in relation to Kaupapa Māori. The ways in which this research is theoretically informed and adheres to research standards are examined and discussed. Methodological choices are made and explained using both Cunningham's (2008) participation and outcome criteria and Bishop's (2005) Locus of Power (p. 112) analysis. Specific methodological steps and participant contribution is then outlined. The chapter continues with discussion of the thematic data analysis strategy. The data management and reduction deliberation process is documented and all strategies that were considered, including those that were unsuccessful are explained. This account is important because the deliberative process brought into focus a productive theoretical tension between Māori understandings and non-Māori understandings of intra-board process. Participants report governance experiences consistent with governance literature and research which is not a surprise given Māori DHB directors function and perform as non-Māori directors' function and perform. However, governance consistencies are not the focus of this thesis. Instead reported experiences that are not accounted for in governance literature are the focus. Throughout this thesis process, theory/context interplay (Golden-Biddle and Locke, 2007) and cultural values (Table 4.2) inform and enrich. The thematic organisation of the results significantly enriches this thesis and facilitates considerable insight into intra-board process. Chapters Five to Seven report the results of this study. In an attempt to offer transparency and offer fidelity to participant contributions, generous interview data

is provided. Māori director reported experience is thus collated within Māori consistent research traditions and is thematically organised around each of the following three questions: No hea au? (Where am I from), Ko wai au? (Who am I?), and, Ko wai ōku whanaunga? (To whom am I related?). Chapter Five reports on the first theme (No hea au?), and captures experiences that relate to legislation, appointment, tenure, election and the grass roots of directors.

Chapter Six reports participants' experiences that relate to intra-board process. This theme (Ko wai au?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their roles at the board table and how these experiences affected board process. At any one time in their governance activity Māori directors appear to address multiple simultaneous role demands, as do non-Māori directors. However, Māori DHB directors face additional demands; they negotiate with their 'Māori' representative role (as defined by their presence on the board) and they negotiate and navigate their iwi role (as manawhenua or not) and they navigate and negotiate their professional role as a DHB director (as participants in a Western governance setting).

Chapter Seven reports experiences that relate to participants' complex professional and cultural nexus. This theme (Ko wai ōku whanaunga?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their cultural and/or professional connections and how these connections affect their intra-board processes. Māori directors spoke consistently of the complexity of their formal and informal relationships in both their cultural nexus and their professional nexus in relation to their directorships. This theme is about the interconnections between Māori directors and Māori stakeholders.

Chapter Eight provides a discussion that represents a synthesis of all three themes reported in the previous three chapters. A postcolonial lens brings the (neo) colonial construction of Māori identity into sharp focus, particularly in relation to health governance. The empirical nature of this study, in combination with existing theoretical approaches has allowed for fresh insights. Three in particular are

developed. First, prior to this study the nature of the legislation was presumed to be relatively straight forward. Participants' experiences in light of postcolonial theoretical interpretations require a reconsideration of this assumption. The place of anger as a vector for legislative change in a postcolonial context, for example, is one such insight. Second, intra-board process is discussed with a postcolonial lens. Specifically concepts of political correctness, stereotyping, institutional racism, and the burden of representation are critically examined. Third, transformational possibilities are proposed. While the place at the DHB table for the Māori director has emerged from an historical place of anger, struggle and resistance, their presence now offers a governance opportunity that non-Māori at the DHB table have yet to fully embrace and comprehend. Using the tools of postcolonial theory and critique the gaze is then turned toward the coloniser. A subsequent deficit in Pākehā knowledge is examined before transformative possibilities are proposed. The ways in which participants report Pākehā director understanding of Māori identity not only limit and constrain Māori director contribution but also place increased demands upon the Māori director. These limits and constraints result in governance process loss.

The interaction between the theoretical underpinnings of this study prior to data collection with the thematic analysis based on participants' views has invited previously unforeseen connections with additional literatures. These additional literatures have offered tools with which to interpret, articulate, and understand new theoretical/empirical interplay with implications for governance theory and practice. Thus, in this chapter additional literature is introduced.

In concluding this thesis Chapter Nine recapitulates the coincidence of factors that brought about this thesis by back grounding the study setting and by foregrounding the study findings. Potential contributions to existing literatures are noted. Opportunities for further research are offered. The chapter ends on a restatement of the study's contributions to extant literature in each of the three theoretical

paradigms, those of governance theory, postcolonial theory and critique, and Kaupapa Māori.



## Chapter Two: Governance

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of governance literature. The focus will be on corporate governance, followed by public sector governance, and then specifically New Zealand health governance. The legislative environment that established and defined District Health Boards, essential to an understanding of the New Zealand health governance context, is introduced.

This thesis is thoroughly embedded in the corporate governance literature, and specifically in the management contribution to that literature. As will become apparent health governance draws on a different literature, that of health policy and health management, not management. While there are differences between corporate governance theory and practice and health governance theory and practice the question of what it is that directors do remains unaddressed in the latter, and unanswered in the former.

The chapter begins with an overview of the importance of governance and an overview of the origin of governance. There is an attempt to trace theoretical developments and influences from the early economic and legal scholars with their single theory approach, that of agency theory, to current management scholars with their multi-theoretic approaches. Theoretical debates and theoretical gaps within the literature are introduced. A dominant, yet problematic, performance focus has directed governance research although emergent challenges question the utility and reliability of such an approach. Theoretical focus on governance process research using qualitative methodologies is proposed and supported by the management governance community as promising.

The chapter concludes with a brief background on the introduction of New Public Management into the NZ public sector and how that has, in particular, influenced health governance. The paradigmatic difference between health sector governance research and management governance research is identified. Relevant NZ health

governance research and commentary is discussed with attention to one substantially supportive document, that of *Report No. 6 Māori Health and the 2001 Health Reforms* (Pere, Boulton, Smiler, Walker, & Kingi, 2007).

While there is much debate on the finer points of what governance may constitute, it is generally accepted that governance is largely enacted through the activity of the board of directors. Whilst management and stakeholders are important, it is the board that governs. The activity of directors is different from that of managers and, in fact, so different from any other organisational activity that directorial activity is considered in a genre of its own *sui generis*. Fama and Jensen (1983), in describing their governance research, capture the unique nature of governance:

In more precise language, we are concerned with the survival of organizations in which important decision agents do not bear a substantial share of the wealth effects of their decisions. (p. 301)

Unique though problematic, governance phenomena are “polyvalent” (du Gay, 2002, p. 11). These phenomena engender commentary from all sectors; virtually everyone has a comment to make on the matter of governance. The social, political, and economic importance of governance is obvious and becoming increasingly so as the topic has become more fashionable. New Zealand recent business history, the Brierley turn, and the move to the New Public Management (Boston, Martin, Pallot, & Walsh, 1996) have raised the public profile of, and public participation in, governance.

The enormous practical importance of governance is apparent on an everyday basis, a fact evidenced by the high media profile of governance failures. Multiple supply chains and/or interconnected enterprises as well as multiple stakeholders groups are adversely affected by any one governance failure.

## The Practice-Theory Nexus: Same Yet Different

Governance is also a multifaceted phenomenon with many features that are appealing to the practitioner. The marginal yet potentially significant nature of the directorial role, the practical nature of the directing task (Spencer, 1983) and the extent of public scrutiny (Forbes & Milliken, 1999) all make governance appealing to practitioners. This interest is such that there is a convergence of practitioner and academic literature. Boundaries between governance practice and governance theory are blurred providing opportunity for governance scholars to have a direct influence on corporate practice (Daily, Dalton, & Cannella, 2003).

Regulatory bodies and legislation provide frameworks from within which directors practice. However, much of the regulation is retrospective - generated from corporate collapse and director pathology, leading to a body of prescriptive, compliance driven 'good governance' based on failures rather than generated from prospective good governance speculation (Ingley & Van Der Walt, 2005).

Governance is widely acknowledged as important for economic health and well-being. Stiles and Taylor (2001) speak not only to this importance but also to the demanding nature of the governance task:

Boards sit at the apex of organisations and have to deal with complex business problems in a short time-span and often with incomplete information. Their roles are multiple and often conflicting. In major organisations boards control huge resources and employ large numbers of people. The processes by which boards operate are therefore of major significance, not just to the individual companies but to the wider society. (p. vii)

Other commentators reflect more on the popularised role of the director (as the arbiter of governance) as mysterious, omniscient and powerful –perhaps either heroic or demonic. Mueller (1981) in *The Incomplete Board* speaks to this polemic

expectation: "the *Wall Street Journal* records daily the good and the bad inner wisdom exercised or missing in the modern boardworld" (p. 105).

Lorsch and MacIver (1989) in their comprehensive early study of director activity further fuel mysterious and contentious perceptions of directorial roles by entitling their directorial study *Pawns or Potentates*. Despite the consequences of governance failures, the media salience, and the public interest and fascination with the subject, governance remains a much misunderstood, conflated, and contested topic. There is a plethora of speculation, anecdotal comment, media commentary and popularised material as well as an abundance of prescriptive literature available to anyone on the matter of governance. Despite this, effective governance, in relation to organisational performance, while well-discussed, is not well-researched (Lockhart, 2010).

Daily et al. (2003), in their well-cited review, "Corporate governance: decades of dialogue and data," reveal the state of governance research at the time as follows,

The field of Corporate Governance is at a crossroads. Our knowledge of what we know about the efficacy of corporate governance mechanisms is rivalled by what we do not know (p. 371).

Given this statement; what is it that is known of corporate governance and governance mechanisms and how has this knowledge been arrived at? The Kuhnian (1970) approach to the production of knowledge tells us that the field arrives at a collectively understood or paradigmatic knowledge via the solving of a series of puzzles and that these solutions are, more or less additive, thus contributing to the body of knowledge. Furthermore, the path of paradigmatic knowledge production can be traced back, not unlike the notion of whakapapa, like layers on the land through which ancestry can be traced. Like whakapapa also the mixing of lines of descent (or paradigms) can be traced, so too can the variations (the limits and the promise) in their progeny. This is not to treat lightly the sacred concept of genealogy but rather to attempt to philosophically (re)locate the creation of knowledge within a Māori-centred domain:

The meaning of whakapapa is 'to lay one thing upon another' as, for example, to lay one generation upon another. Everything has a whakapapa: fish, animals, trees, birds, and every other living thing; soil, rocks and mountains also have a whakapapa...Whakapapa is a basis for the organisation of knowledge in respect of the creation and development of all things. (Barlow, 1991, p. 173)

What then is the whakapapa of governance knowledge? The study of governance is a relatively recent phenomenon. Early study of governance began within economic and legal paradigms. The origins of governance are said to begin with the separation of the owner from the firm (Berle & Means, 1932/1968). Berle, a lawyer, and Means, an economist, in their early and greatly influential study of the corporate system examined the repercussions of the separation of ownership of the firm from the control of the firm following the flurry of corporate formations in the USA at the turn of the century. The authors identified the divergence between the wishes of the owners and those of the managers. The separation of ownership and control meant owners engaged the services of managers, managers then became company controllers. The concern of the owners then became how to keep managers acting in their interests, as their agents, hence boards of directors were created.

Economists Jensen and Meckling (1976) further explore the relationship between owners and managers and introduced the agency-cost phenomenon in their seminal article, "Theory of the Firm." Put simply, an agency cost is incurred when the goals of the manager and the goals of the owner are inconsistent, where the manager seeks to maximise their own return at the expense of the owner. Shleifer and Vishny (1997) sum up this approach:

Much of the subject of corporate governance deals with the constraints managers put on themselves, or that investors put on managers to reduce the ex post misallocation and thus to induce investors to provide more funds ex ante. (p. 743)

Governance research within the legal and economic paradigm is commensurate with this view, so much so that many governance academics are themselves lawyers and economists. Most economists and lawyers who are scholars of governance are agency theorists. For a comprehensive and scholarly review of governance in the economic paradigm see Shleifer and Vishny (1997). Within this paradigm these authors offer a well-accepted definition of governance as follows:

Corporate governance deals with the ways in which suppliers of finance to corporations assure themselves of getting a return on their investment. (p. 737)

This literature review is a management-focused governance theory review as opposed to an economic or legal-focused review of governance. However, that is not to imply that management governance scholars have abandoned economic and legal contributions, rather they have enriched the field with broader sociological theorizing. As with any knowledge production process (the Kuhnian scientific revolution aside) accumulation of knowledge can be tangential rather than linear. Agency themes remain but have been supplemented. Rather than a displacement of governance theory from the economic and legal paradigm, management scholars are enriching and broadening the agency approach alongside their economic and legal counterparts. Challenges to the overly simplistic nature of the principal/agent relationship as the determinant of director activity gained momentum within the management paradigm where early theoretical orientations such as those of the stakeholder, and those of the manager as the steward emerged.

Stakeholder theory (R. Edward Freeman, 1994; R.E. Freeman & McVea, 2001) introduced the notion of other interests in the functioning of the firm beyond the shareholder and the manager. Rather than a theory, Freeman (1994) describes stakeholder constructs as a “genre...becoming one of the many ways to blend together the central concepts of business with those of ethics” (p. 409). By 1995 the stakeholder concept had become commonplace (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) PAGE.

Rather than the singular notion of maximisation of shareholder wealth, Freeman (1994) suggests that the task should be “to take metaphors like the stakeholder concept and embed it in a story about how human beings create and exchange value” (p. 418).

Again, in challenge to agency theory, stewardship theory, emerging in the late 1980s suggested that the interests of the manager and the owner can be convergent (Davis, Schoorman, & Donaldson, 1997) rather than necessarily divergent. Further, Davis et al. provide a more thorough examination of the “psychological and situational underpinnings” (1997, p. 21) to support notions of management motivation other than self-interest. Stewardship theory then, according to Davis et al. (1997) is based on an assumption that the steward or manager values “pro-organisational, collectivistic behaviours that have higher utility than the individualistic, self-serving behaviours” (p. 24).

Psychological complexity and ethical contributions broadened our understanding of the activity of boards of directors and signalled initial departures from the simply economic and simply legal explanations. However, still little is known about directorial activity. The fundamental question “what is it that directors actually do?” remained unanswered. Huse (2009) credits Miles Mace of the Harvard Business School as one of the first management scholars to comprehensively research director activity and expose the “disparity between board task expectations (myths) and actual board task performance (realities)” (Huse, 2009, p. 1).

Early work by Pfeffer (1972; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) theorised directorial activity as one of resource contribution; that it is the resource a director brings to the board table that matters. This contribution, also known as board capital, is both relational and human (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003) and provides the link between the organisation and its external environment (Hillman, Cannella, & Paetzold, 2000). Resource dependency theory, with the research focus on interlocking directorships, developed with some favour suggesting links between board demography (as a

proxy for an assumed set of behaviours and beliefs) and performance implications (Milliken & Forbes, 1999). What a director knows however is difficult to determine. Furthermore it is not clear that what a director knows is able to be recognised and demonstrated. Because intra-board activity is limited (Monks & Minow, 1995) with only minimal and episodic opportunity for substantive interaction (Forbes & Milliken, 1999) many opportunities are said to simply fail to eventuate. As with other roles much is inferred rather than directly observed.

Resource dependency theory significantly influenced research into board demography as a variable of organisation performance at the expense of other avenues of research (Pettigrew, 1992). Pettigrew in this confrontative review of the managerial and organisational literature on managerial elites uses a sociological lens to critique taken-for-granted views on board operation and activity based on demography:

A good deal of literature in this area is non-academic, even, nonanalytical, and relies heavily on unquestioned assumptions as a basis of prescription (p. 165).

The resource based theorists, in identifying the phenomenon of interlocking directorships, have generated resistance to what has been labelled corporate oligarchy by class-based or hegemony theorists (Koenig & Gogel, 1981; O'Higgins, 2002; Pettigrew, 1992; Westphal & Zajac, 1995). This governance connectedness has also been of some popular interest in New Zealand (Jesson, 1987; Panoho, 2003).

Class-based or hegemony theorists see outside directors with interlocking directorates as deliberate participants in the corporate elite. These corporate elite enjoy pervasive legitimate and formal power (Koenig & Gogel, 1981). This is particularly the case with the appointment of prestigious directors where their recruitment can be seen as a signal of focal board success (Stiles & Taylor, 2001). Others take a somewhat softer approach suggesting a more socially driven theory where connectedness eases the burden of social approval and impression



management (Spencer, 1983). Still others have extended the cultural homophily or demographic similarity phenomena to include CEO and director interrelationships (Westphal & Zajac, 1999).

In furthering the notion of cultural homophily, Westphal and Stern (2007) investigated whether being less confrontative and more likeable as an outside director had any influence on a director's success in the director labour market. They were also interested in whether a minority status moderated 'likeability' and subsequent labour market success for a director. In a mixed methods study they compared and contrasted the phenomenon of director ingratiation behaviour with three classic directorial roles of monitoring, advising and controlling in relation to on-going and additional directorial appointments. They found a positive relationship between increased strategic advice and increased likelihood of appointment to further boards via interconnecting fellow directors. They also found a positive relationship between increased ingratiating behaviour and increased likelihood of further board appointments. With regard to increased monitoring and control behaviour however they found an inverse relationship. However, if a director was a member of a minority group, increased strategic advice was negatively correlated with increased likelihood of further appointments and even more so with minority women:

Specifically, ethnic minorities and women are rewarded less than male Caucasians on the director labor market for engaging in a given level of advice giving or ingratiation behavior (that is, they improve their chances of receiving a board appointment less by engaging in these behaviors), and they are punished *more* for engaging in monitoring and control behavior. (p. 17)

In recognising gender and racial minority status Westphal and Stern (2007) signal an important yet undeveloped path in governance research. Recently research has focused on diversity both independently and as a follow-on from the Higgs Review (Higgs, 2003) which considered diversity on boards was essential. The Higgs

Review, commissioned by the British government, examined directorial effectiveness and roles. It recommended “a commitment to equal opportunities” (p. 42). Following this recommendation, a subsequent report investigated diversity (Tyson, 2003). Most diversity research has focused on gender. For full coverage of governance and gender issues see Burgess and Tharenou (2002), *Women on Corporate Boards of Directors* (Vinnicombe, Singh, Burke, Bilimoria, & Huse, 2008) and Huse (2009, 2011).

Despite this overwhelming support for diversity from regulatory bodies and alike, organisational and social conformity scholars present a pessimistic view of the credibility and influence a diverse group member can enjoy. Differences in demography can lower social cohesion between group members (Tyson, 2003; Westphal & Milton, 2000). Social cohesion is a desirable group property, particularly within groups that have limited interaction time and complex tasks. Reduced social cohesion via conflict can have a negative impact on board functioning (Forbes & Milliken, 1999). Whilst conflict is seen to have benefits, Finkelstein and Mooney (2003, p. 107) found that their directors had an ‘approach-avoid’ response to conflict, reporting that the first two goals for effective board process described by directors are to engage in constructive conflict and to avoid destructive conflict.

While emergent governance literature also considers race (Hillman, Canella & Harris, 2002) there remains a dearth of research on diversity, particularly diversity other than gender. In other literatures diversity as a concept is highly problematic and contested. Postcolonial literature (Bhabha, 1990) and Kaupapa Māori literature (Smith, 1999), for example, view the term negatively because it does not convey enough of a relational aspect of power. Instead using discursive terms such as centre-periphery and Māori-Pākehā are preferred. There is very little interplay between postcolonial literature and management literature and virtually none in governance save for the work of a small critical management group of scholars (Banerjee, 2003; Sullivan, 2007, 2009). Diversity research in governance, apart from that of gender, has yet to gain critical mass. When it does, it will be welcomed.

However, as briefly mentioned, there is concern with the use of the term. A fuller discussion of the diversity literature in the study of management follows in the next chapter.

Other governance research indirectly assists diversity by cautioning against too much similarity amongst directors. Some scholars suggest that the extent of social cohesion amongst demographically similar directors could inhibit contribution where conflict is likely to arise (Aldefer, 1986 and Lorsch & MacIver, 1989, as cited in Johnson et al., 1996). Furthermore, in suggesting that corporate failure is linked to homophily, a diverse director theoretically has the potential to escape the obedience bias by playing the devil's advocate, thereby playing an ethical monitor role (Morck, 2008). Others suggest though that impact of demographic similarity on firm performance is complex and indirect (Forbes & Milliken, 1999).

Suffice to say that the issue of diversity and how it relates to board functioning is as yet unresolved. Research has suggested heterogeneity as a central principal of good governance (Aldefer, 1986; Lorsch & MacIver, 1989 cited Johnson et al., 1996; Higgs, 2003; Tyson, 2003). However a fundamental tension exists between the preferences for the harmony of the corporate elite (Forbes & Milliken, 1999; Westphal & Milton, 2000; Finkelstein & Mooney, 2003; Westphal & Stern, 2007) and the preferences for the potentially disharmonious diverse.

Many management governance scholars suggest strategic input is a central directorial role (Carpenter & Westphal, 2001) and is not only important but is a defining characteristic of Boards (Stiles & Taylor, 2001). Directors themselves consider strategic input as a central directorial task (Ingley & van der Walt, 2005). Few scholars however have pointed out that (independent) directors do not implement strategy. Directorial strategic input therefore is purely cognitive (Forbes & Milliken, 1999) and cannot be directly measured as an output such as firm performance. Given the reliance of firm performance on strategic implementation, and, given that directors do not implement strategy, the notion that directors are

responsible for firm performance is an inferential leap (Pettigrew, 1992, as cited in Forbes & Milliken, 1995).

Furthermore, at a practitioner level, directors and boards themselves do not appear to evaluate and review their own strategic contributions either at all, or very often. A New Zealand interview study of directors revealed only 25% of those interviewed took part in annual evaluation, with a further 22% every 2-3 years. Most interviewees reported evaluations were done if required or never (van der Walt & Ingley, 2001).

Early research into governance focused comprehensively on the inside/outside director aspects (J. L. Johnson, Daily, & Ellstrand, 1996) and related more directly to the monitoring function directors are said to perform. The assumption behind this was the greater the number of independent directors (compared to those that are executives in the firm) the greater the fiduciary scrutiny. This research direction had considerable influence on governance practice via regulatory authorities and reviews (Cadbury Report, 1992; Higgs, 2003, Sarbanes-Oxley Act 2002) thus the inside/outside director ratio became a foundation of prescriptive practice. In New Zealand the Securities Commission publication *Corporate Governance in New Zealand: Principals and Guidelines* is one such regulatory body. Despite this widespread adoption the straightforward nature of directorial independence has since been questioned by theorists (Daily et al., 1995) as overly simplistic. "Inconsistent and non-additive" findings remained a feature of governance research (Stiles & Taylor, 2001, p.11).

Much early governance research and review led to widespread belief that independent or non-executive directors are better monitors than their executive counterparts. Corporate life has responded accordingly with a study of firms in the Standard & Poor's 500 revealing a 75% independent director membership on the average board (Finkelstein & Mooney, 2003) Management scholars have found that director independence, in opposition to the prediction of agency theory, is not a

predictor of effective monitoring (Finkelstein & Mooney, 2003). Some scholars suggest that the insider/outsider dichotomy is somewhat misleading since outside directors can effectively become organisation members through strong identification with the organisational culture (Forbes & Milliken, 1999). In New Zealand the influence of networking ties, hegemonic practices, in combination with limited absolute directorships, generates less independence amongst directors. In recent New Zealand governance history, during periods of capital growth, clusters of directors were found to be representative directors a category that differed from the simple inside/outside dichotomy (Panoaho, 2003).

Spencer (1983) noted that directors did not explicitly conceptualise independence as their role. Spencer conducted in depth interviews with directors stating that her “research originated in a degree of puzzlement regarding the role of the outside or non-executive director.” (p. xi). Spencer found that her participants revealed both complexity and ambiguity with their role as outside directors. Her participants described the nature of their role, the issue of competent role performance, the relationships they form with relevant others, and the ways in which power and/or influence are exercised. Spencer’s early study, using sociological approaches, appears to have been isolated. Over a decade later, others suggested approaching governance research by examining director roles (Daily, Dalton, & Rajagopalan, 2003; J. L. Johnson et al., 1996).

Johnson et al.(1996) in their comprehensive governance review reported little empirical consistency in research on boards of directors, in particular with aspects of board composition, performance measurement and directorial roles. There were questions around inferences and secondary relationships. Instead these authors suggest continuing the emergent qualitative research by asking directors themselves what it is they do and what they perceive their roles to be. While what they found during their review was not as insightful as they had expected they conclude with

the following, “for us, it is entirely too early to cancel the next series of expeditions for a search of the ‘boards of director’ phenomenon” (p. 25).

A number of management academics have since pursued a more process based approach (as opposed to outcome based) to research with directors because there are too many intervening variables between director input and organisational outcome to claim direct relationships. Increasingly team/group dynamics and role construction is becoming a feature of research with directors. Research into directorial activity has moved away from outcome and more into process.

Forbes & Milliken (1999) respond to the management scholars call to find out more about board processes by exploring board demography and suggest group dynamics and workgroup performance literature be integrated with board process literature to at least begin to gain some insight into intra-board activity as a decision making enterprise. They found there was no “clear consensus as to which demographic characteristics lead to which outcomes...” (p. 490) although they report that boards themselves are changing, becoming more aware of their own functioning and becoming more reflexive:

It would have been unthinkable to encounter such a rigorous self-analysis from one of the characteristically unresponsive boards documented by Mace (1971) almost 30 years ago. (p. 489)

They suggest governance research be directed more toward the study of group process variables making use of the extensive group behaviour research that already exists, reminding us however that the ‘board of directors’ does have some unique features and not all/any group research approaches would be useful. In particular, they claim, the episodic nature of director interaction leads to somewhat differing assumptions about their group functioning with indicators such as cohesion. To this end, the authors identify three factors that they “propose will significantly influence a board’s task performance and cohesion: effort norms, cognitive conflict, and the board’s use of its knowledge and skills” (Forbes & Milliken, p. 493)

In depth qualitative research into directorial activity continued with a large study (Roberts, McNulty, & Stiles, 2005) commissioned for the Higgs Review. The British government, following the Cadbury Report (1992), appointed Higgs in 2002 to conduct a *Review of the role and effectiveness of non-executive directors*. In his covering letter accompanying the report Higgs echoes the call of management scholars:

Against a background of corporate turbulence, it is very much the purpose of this Review to let in some daylight on the role of the non-executive director in the boardroom and to make recommendations to enhance their effectiveness.  
(p. 4)

The central finding in the Roberts et al. (2005) study was that existing theoretical constructs of governance do not “adequately reflect the lived experience of non-executive directors and other directors on the board.” (p. S5)

Rather than the dominant quantitative focus with emphasis on second order data, first-order data (Spencer, 1983) or primary research (Stiles & Taylor, 2001) once again has been suggested. Furthermore, Stiles & Taylor (2001) in their qualitative study found intra-board processes affect board functioning:

The board structure is both a condition and a consequence of actions and interactions. The board sets the conditions within which members operate, but its structure is also affected by the interaction of its members, and the negotiation of power and influence over time. (p. 3)

In summary, despite disparate approaches there is general agreement that a director fulfils three general roles, those of; the monitor, the strategist, and the advice giver (Hillman, Nicholson, & Shropshire, 2008). What is not agreed upon is how process issues affect role effectiveness; “Scholars and practitioners are interested in board effectiveness, yet we know relatively little about directors’ engagement in the boardroom” (Hillman et al., 2008, p. 441).

The term 'black box' is often used to refer to boardroom engagement. Governance research *inputs* (such as board composition) and *outputs* (such as organisational productivity) are measured and observed but what happens in between (boardroom engagement) is unmeasured, not able to be seen, or invisible, thus black or blacked out. Nicholson, Pugliese, & Bezemer (2011) videotaped observations of board meetings in an attempt to open up the black box, demonstrating that simply using agenda minutes as a determinant of director activity belies the complexity of board interaction. Two NZ theses have recently examined these intra-board processes (Edlin, 2007; Martyn, 2006).

Leblanc and Schwartz (2007), citing multiple early significant reviews of governance (Zahra & Pearce, 1989, Johnson et al., 1996, Pettigrew, 1992, Gillies & Morra, 1997, as cited in Leblanc & Schwartz, 2007) reiterate the call for more qualitative research into director behaviour in their article "The Black Box of Board Process":

The "what" and "how" of a board of directors –its work and its process – is clearly one direction towards which new research efforts on boards of directors ought to be directed. (p. 845)

### **Health Governance**

During the 1980s New Zealand followed the international trend to reform public sector management, during which time a "group of ideas known as 'new public management' (NPM)" (Hood, 1991, p.3) emerged. For a full discussion of what Hood refers to as the NPM doctrine, see "A Public Management for all Seasons" (Hood, 1991). Such reforms were also known as neo-liberal reforms where "... political government has been restructured in the name of an economising logic" (du Gay, 2002, p.17).

In a briefing to government, Treasury (1987) documented existing public sector issues: "The current system creates confusion as to managerial responsibility which in turn serves to reduce accountability" (p. 59). They suggested managerial reforms



to the incoming Labour government, which were subsequently endorsed. The reforms essentially adopted control and accountability measures for government departments more in line with those of the private sector. As a result, institutional and corporate management became indistinguishable; new (modern) public management adopted corporate practice. Commercialisation, corporatisation, and privatisation became part of the public sector discourse. Boston (1996) comments that not only were these reforms sudden, as with the commercialisation SOE Act 1986 but also comprehensive:

New Zealand's reforms have meant not just a change in the instruments or techniques of public management; they have also brought about significant changes in the style and mode of governance and the culture of the public service (p. 6).

NPM is described as a blending of economic theory, and/or public choice theory (Boston, 1996) and management theory (Hood, 1991; du Gay, 2002). NPM, via economic theory, introduced agency costs (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) into the public sector thus displacing "traditional military-bureaucratic ideas of 'good' administration" (Hood 1991. p.3). Public sector managers were seen to engender the same agency/principal risk as private sector managers, agency/principal relationships developed. Just as the owner had become separated from the firm (Berle & Means, 1932), so too had the government become separated from their departments. Institutional designs were profoundly altered. For a full review of institutional changes in New Zealand see Boston (1996).

Applied to the Health sector in New Zealand NPM was already influencing reforms. The *White Paper: A health service for New Zealand* (McGuigan, 1975) was the first review to require accountability in the health sector and involved increased management functions such as planning and implementation of national policy although these requirements were not adopted at the time (Lockett-Kay, 2005, p.38). Significant institutional reform continued as successive governments struggled to

achieve consensus amongst the health sector's stakeholders culminating in the current New Zealand Health and Disability Act 2000.

Fiscal and health outcome accountabilities became the consistent findings in successive reports such as; *Choices for Health Care* (Scott, Fougere, & Marwick, 1986) and, *Unshackling the Hospitals* (Gibbs, Fraser, & Scott, 1988). For a full history of contemporary health reforms in New Zealand see Lockett-Kay (2005). Community consultation and involvement also increasingly featured although not as consistently throughout the reforms. Increasing accountabilities became the legislated burden of the health boards of the time, The State Sector Act 1988, and the Public Finance Act 1989:

...required that chairpersons of the boards were accountable to the Minister for the boards' outputs, signalling a new accountability and transparency for health sector governance.... (Department of Health, 1989). (Lockett-Kay, 2005, p. 44)

The health sector was said to be suffering from 'change-fatigue' with the introduction of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 (NZPH&D Act) signifying the fourth major restructuring in the NZ health sector in twenty years. Given the substantial nature of the reforms brought in with the 2000 Act, and given the amount of historical reform in the health sector the government of the day contracted a simultaneous research and monitoring project in health management and governance. In the interests of this thesis, this commissioned project, known as the Health Reforms 2001 Research Project has generated a unique and useful database from which to examine DHB governance and is discussed below.

The Act provided for, and specified the functions of the current District Health Boards (DHBs) at pt 3 ss 1-3. In addition, and in keeping with the increasingly recognised significance of Māori-Pākehā relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand the Act entrenches the Principles of Te Tiriti at pt 1 s 4. However, as with any legislated

entrenchment of Treaty Principles, interpretation becomes the issue, there is no further reference to Te Tiriti in the Act. Instead, specific references to Māori health policy and Māori health expectations guide DHB Māori health accountabilities. Importantly, and without precedence the Act makes provision for the specific appointment of Māori directors to District Health Boards at pt 3 s 29(4). However, there is no absolute duty to appoint Māori, rather "...the Minister must endeavour to ensure" Māori representation at the DHB governance level. Further provision in the Act is also made for community consultation, representation of Māori, and specific reference is made to "reduce health disparities by improving the health outcomes of Māori and other population groups:" (pt 1 s 3(1)(b)).

There are currently 20 DHBs some of which have interdependent directorships (such as Otago and Southland, Midcentral and Whanganui) otherwise they are discrete and individual boards. DHB boundaries are geographically and population based, the higher the population density the smaller the catchment area, conversely the lower the population density the larger the catchment area. There is considerable demographic variety amongst DHBs. Nationally there are multiple provincial towns with few city centres, only modest national population (about four million) with considerable rural and/or inaccessible area. Each board has potentially 11 independent directors; there is provision for up to seven to be elected (triennially under the Local Electoral Act 2001), and four to be appointed. Chair and Deputy Chair positions are appointed by the Minister and these positions can be filled by elected members. Generally maximum director tenure is three terms although the Minister has discretion to extend (or terminate) appointed tenure.

DHBs are formally Crown Entities under the Crown Entities Act 2004, that is they are "bodies corporate that are established by or under an Act" (pt 1 sch 1) and are specifically Crown Agents and as such "...must give effect to government policy when directed by the responsible Minister" ( s 7(1)). DHB objectives and functions are outlined in pt 3 ss 22-23 and are highly prescriptive in terms of accountabilities to

the Minister (via policy statements and goals) and in terms of community consultation and collaboration. Co-operative agreements and service agreements are also highly prescribed at ss 24- 25.

Further obligations and accountabilities regarding day to day business and strategic decisions such as DHBs are centrally funded and are annually responsible for the administration of some \$12 billion in health funds (Magrane & Malthus, 2010, p. 428). Despite this highly prescribed governance environment the Agency theory driven role of the director as a monitor maintains prominence:

The importance of strong governance and internal controls within the public sector entities such as DHBs was brought to the fore recently when the largest fraud in New Zealand public sector history occurred at the Otago DHB in 2008. (p. 428)

How, or in what way does the highly prescriptive nature of DHB directorship duties and Ministerial accountabilities affect directorial activity? Devlin (2006) specifically questions the nature of DHB governance given this prescriptive nature:

Take for example, the ability of DHBs to actually prescribe their board's strategies. DHBs implement policies developed by the Ministry of Health. They do not necessarily contribute to or prescribe the policies themselves. So, in reality, such boards are in fact, management committees overseeing the activities of their managers rather than setting the strategic direction of their organisations. (p. 67)

Within corporate governance research questions remain regarding the black box (Leblanc & Schwartz, 2007) of governance process. Given how corporate governance principles have influenced public sector governance via NPM doctrine, it is likely the same process questions are relevant for public sector governance research and practice. However, health sector governance and corporate governance do not share the same whakapapa of knowledge and are paradigmatically different (Kuhn, 1970).

The theoretical framework for health governance is said to have originated from social coordination theories (Tenbenschel, Mays, & Cumming, 2011) generating governance categories such as network, hierarchical, and community (Barnett et al., 2009; Hughes, Lockett-Kay, Boulton, Barcham, & Mafile'o, 2007; Tenbenschel et al., 2011).

Authors in the public health governance sector note tension between boards of directors and Ministerial accountabilities as well increasing complexity and increased collaboration amongst stakeholders (Tenbenschel et al., 2011; Barnett et al., 2009). Their research emphasis appears to be with the reconciliation between evolving and increasingly complex accountabilities and how that relates to outcomes and performance. For a thorough debate on health sector governance in NZ in relation to modes of governance see Tenbenschel et al. (2011) and Barnett et al. (2009). Barnett and Clayden (2007) however note that there is increasing public sector governance research emphasis on "...board functioning and effectiveness..." (p. 33).

Given that health sector governance does not appear to engage with corporate governance literature despite similar struggles with director roles and activity and struggles in particular with monitoring and performance measurement what is it that corporate governance literature can offer to the health governance field?

Governance scholars in management look to governance process research to gain insight into board functioning and effectiveness. However, very little process research or direct, primary, or first-order research has been done with public sector directors in NZ. In direct contrast to corporate governance literature in management, health governance does not appear to look to first-order data for insight:

Even these much welcomed empirical studies have been criticised for over-reliance on one source of data, usually the perceptions of the board members (Peck, 1995). (Barnett & Clayden, 2007, p. 9)

Public sector commentary exists. Devlin (2004, 2006) questions the adoption of universal or dominant governance principles and practice into New Zealand governance settings for multiple reasons: NZ has a unique small business profile, a complex public sector set of bodies corporate, and separate governance legislation for not-for-profit organisations. In particular, Devlin (2004) questions director appointment in the public sector, given the requirement for community representation:

The appointment of directors or board members in the public sector is highly politicised with political and social agendas often taking priority over efficiency and effectiveness goals. (p.22)

Where, in relation to such appointments the best person for the job is sacrificed to "...ensure Māori, in particular, and/or other so-called "disadvantaged groups", are appointed (not elected) to boards" (p.22). Devlin continues:

It is not difficult to imagine the difficulties a Chair might have in moulding a coherent, effective board from a mix of elected candidates and persons appointed on the basis of their ethnicity, gender or level of disability, all in the name of politically correct "representation." In true Kiwi style, it is surprising that many of these public sector bodies operate at all. (p. 22)

Public sector commentary of a different nature arose from a former DHB director. Modlik (2004) signalled relevant practitioner issues for Māori in public sector governance and was himself a DHB director. Multiple issues of cultural incommensurability that potentially affect board functioning were said to arise for Māori when operating in the non-Māori context of a board of directors. Not only does this commentary offer a valuable process clue as to intra-board functioning but it also provides preliminary guidance for research into Māori/Pākehā DHB director dynamics. This commentary has been seminal in the formation of the research question, the *a priori* assumptions and in the direction of this thesis.

While this is not a literature review of public sector governance, research relevant to DHB governance was investigated. Apart from the Magrane and Malthus (2010) study of Audit Committee Effectiveness specific DHB research centred on one seminal study, that of the Health Reforms 2001 Research Project. The initial four year project consisted of extensive independent empirical studies commissioned by the then Minister of Health (Rt Hon Annette King) carried out by multiple authors from NZ Tertiary Health Research Centres. Dr Jacqueline Cumming led the research group. General findings from the report indicated that the DHB model:

...operates in a way that is closer to the values, culture and aspirations of more people than the arrangements in place during the 1990s and that there is increased attention being paid to the health of the population as a whole, with the Government's strategies playing a key role in setting the direction for the sector.(Victoria University of Wellington Public Affairs, 2007)

The Health Services Research Centre published eleven reports from this extensive study. Two are of direct relevance to this thesis; *Report No 2: Governance* (Barnett & Clayden, 2007) and *Report No 6: Māori Health and the 2001 Health Reforms*. (Pere et al., 2007). One further (journal) publication, "Implementing new modes of governance in the New Zealand health system: An empirical study" (Barnett et al., 2009) is also directly relevant to this thesis. Findings from Report No 2 and Barnett et al. (2009) are reviewed below in Table 2.1. Report No 6 is discussed separately, following the table.

For the Health Reforms Reports five health sector participant groups were surveyed or interviewed: government sources, DHB directors, DHB Chairs, DHB CEOs, and Non-Governmental Health Organisations (NGOs). This research provides first-order data although with a different theoretical underpinning and with a wider range of participants other than DHB directors.

Despite differing paradigmatic memberships, the governance report did examine board processes (and functioning) issues and defined them as follows: Board

member role and capability, Meeting processes and procedures, Internal Board relationships, Relationships with management, Relationships with clinicians, and External relationships (Barnett & Clayden, 2007, p. 35). Those findings that relate specifically to governance process issues are synthesised as follows in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 Summary of Health Reforms 2001 Research Project Findings.**

Election	<p>General concerns regarding skill gaps and specifically that the electoral process leads to skill gaps. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Concerns expressed at the underrepresentation of Māori via election (Barnett et al., 2009)</p>
Appointment	<p>Participants report concerns by iwi that the appointment process lacked transparency. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007, p.18)</p> <p>Chairs expressed concern over not being more involved in the supplementary appointment process to ensure representation and skill mix..." (p. 124). Barnett et al. (2009)</p>
Community engagement	<p>Highly variable among DHBs (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Most board members agreed that there were procedures in place for facilitating community input (Barnett et al., 2009)</p> <p>80% of board members surveyed "agreed that the board had procedures for seeking input from Māori communities" (p. 125) However, Māori board members did not share this view. (Barnett et al., 2009)</p>
Ministerial role	<p>Pre reported that the extent of "strong direction from government" (p. 16) denied their strategic autonomy (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p>
Intra-board relationships	<p>Provided a positive assessment with regard to board process despite finding that there had been problems between management and board members and that clinicians were generally disengaged however, "Overall relationships among Board members have been positive, with the development of a 'team' approach." (p. xii) (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Reported disengagement with clinicians..." their significance to DHBs is such that there is a strong imperative for them to be more positively engaged and subscribe to organisational as well as clinical perspectives." (p. xiii) (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Māori were less likely to agree that relationships were good. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p>
Governance role	<p>DHB board members were clear about their governance role, 87% (2002), and 94.8% (2004) agreed/strongly agreed they had a clear understanding of their role. In both survey periods 75% agreed/strongly agreed they were able to influence Board decisions. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p>



---

Conflict of interest	<p>Director accountability conflicts featured in particular although over time they featured less. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Accountability conflicts for Māori did not appear to be a significant problem “Among Māori members 30% agreed or strongly agreed that accountability to their whānau/hapū/iwi was a source of personal tension...” (p. 65). (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p> <p>Conflict of interest matters was a significant topic of discussion although they report 73% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed these were well managed however Māori and women were less likely to agree. (Barnett &amp; Clayden, 2007)</p>
----------------------	--

---

Of particular relevance is Report No. 6 (Pere et al., 2007). A Māori specific data set was collected by a subset of the researching group. This report was methodologically similar with five health sector participant groups surveyed or interviewed: government sources, DHB directors, DHB Chairs, DHB CEOs, and NGOs. Nine Māori DHB members were interviewed and a further two made written contributions. One focus of this report was to examine Māori participation in relation to participation requirements under the Act. Te Tiriti Principles were central to their investigative process and analysis.

A number of findings in this report are relevant to this thesis. Pere et al. (2007) report participants’ concerns: in relation to Treaty responsibilities, in relation to Māori health policy, in relation to community consultation, and in relation to Māori provision and capacity:

A key issue for Māori working in the NZPHDA model is the relationship between the Crown as a Treaty partner and Māori, and how DHBs fit within this framework. (p. xv)

Researchers found regard to Te Tiriti Principles amongst respective DHBs extremely variable, and accordingly attention to, and commitment toward, Māori health goals was also highly variable. In one case:

Participants were more scathing of their Board’s commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi, particularly as the partnership had not proceeded well at

governance level. A perceived lack of commitment by the DHB to Māori was seen to be a real problem, and delays in appointment processes had not assisted in improving the way in which the DHB works with Māori. (p. 11)

There was a “general view that the Ministry was not meeting its Treaty obligations to Māori, especially at the service delivery level” (p. 29). Concern over possible Crown delegation to DHBs of Treaty responsibilities was expressed. While not explicitly stated it can be inferred that attention and commitment to Te Tiriti Principles correlated positively with intra-board processes:

Participants’ comments revealed concerns over the Board’s own understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi, and its implications for Māori participation. One participant noted that racist comments were passed and feelings of marginalised participation of DHB members, who identified as Māori, were described. Another participant noted that although all papers being considered by the Board are supposed to consider issues for Māori, that this was often not the case. In this Board, during the course of interviews it was apparent that participants were hesitant to discuss Māori issues and many participants delegated responses to questions to the Māori. One participant went so far as to suggest that they were “not allowed to talk about the Treaty.”

Both Māori and non-Māori participants in this DHB reported their disgust and embarrassment at comments made by some DHB members about Māori and Tagata Pasifika. At least four different examples of inappropriate behaviour were relayed, which included the demonstration of an arrant lack of understanding of the value of the Treaty of Waitangi by one DHB member. (p. 17)

Despite incidents of racism such as these participants generally reported positive and supportive intra-board relationships and report positive regard for the legislative reform:

...the greatest achievements of the DHB model were the opportunities it allowed for greater understanding of community need, for innovation, and scope to try different models of practice. (p. xviii)

While Māori health policy was also positively regarded by Māori participants concerns over variable DHB acknowledgement and implementation of policy were noted with only some participants reporting an ability to have impact.

A need for more sophisticated consultation that appropriately recognises the multiple Māori networks particularly in relation to service delivery was reported. Researchers found that while “by Māori for Māori health care was the preferred model for Māori” (p. xvii) serious lack of workforce capacity, lack of workforce development (a DHB statutory obligation), lack of commitment and understanding of Māori delivery models, and inadequate funding all limited Māori agency in the achievement of this goal. Associated with these concerns was a possible conflict within DHBs who act both as a funder and as a provider, potentially competing with Māori health provision.

Management governance scholars suggest process be defined as “effort norms, cognitive conflict, and the board’s use of its knowledge and skills” (Forbes & Milliken, 1996, p. 493) Process governance scholars in this paradigm hypothesise that process variables fundamentally affect board functioning in areas of task performance and cohesion (Forbes & Milliken, 1996). Given the findings in the Pere et al. (2007) report this thesis proposes that intra-board attention to and commitment toward Ti Tiriti Principles is a critical process factor affecting task performance and cohesion.

In summary, recent NZ health governance research, although originating from within different paradigms, involving stakeholders as well as DHB directors, and with different methodologies (surveys and case studies, for example), offers insight and support for this thesis. Of note are the discrepancies in findings between the governance report and the Māori health report. The findings indicate a Māori DHB

experience differs from that of non-Māori. In particular, the Māori health report (Pere et al., 2007) findings substantially point to the need to further investigate intra-board process.

Following multiple historical reforms, relatively recent legislation has prescribed the framework for public health provision and accountability in Aotearoa/NZ. In recognition of serious health disparities between Māori and non-Māori the same legislation has provided for Māori participation DHB governance.

Chapter Three, the next chapter, attempts to trace socio-political motivations behind this legislative move. An overview of the colonial process contextualises the serious health disparities and important theoretical influences are reviewed.

## Chapter 3: Colonisation, Founding Violence, the Study of Management

The NZPH&D Act, amongst other specific Māori provisions, *potentially* provided for the appointment of Māori directors to DHBs. This unprecedented move placed Māori at the District Health Board table.

While the board table has a unique set of organisational characteristics and is the specific topic of governance it is nonetheless a workplace and while directors are not employees a director labour market does exist. The preceding governance literature review revealed the limitations in existing research and the promise of new directions. The need to more closely and directly research intra-board process was identified. Also identified was the problematic, yet preferred, heterogeneity of board members. The NZPH&D Act introduces DHB heterogeneity.

This chapter attempts to examine the possible motivations/mechanisms behind the legislative move to appoint Māori to DHBs by providing an overview of the colonial process in New Zealand thereby sketching an historical context for this legislative change. Veracini's (2003) founding violence construct deliberately links Māori health disparity to the process of colonisation.

This chapter also attempts to examine and disrupt the colonial Māori identity which has become institutionally embedded. The juxtaposition of colonial identity with contemporary identity reveals on-going struggle with (neo) colonial identity imposition by the state. Legislative moves requiring representation of Māori by Māori such as the NZPH&D Act provide the opportunity to examine the ways in which Māori directors on DHBs are both enabled and constrained in their role by their ascribed (neo)colonial identity or categorisation as Māori.

The study of organisations and management is implicated in the colonial project, playing a role in determining and forming identity in organisations. The effects of which are manifest in multiple management fields such as human relations (HR), international management (IM), leadership, and governance amongst others. HR

literature that has focused on workplace or employment equity is reviewed. In particular, issues with management research such as the conceptual shift in focus from fair outcomes to the demands of managing diversity, and the applicability of global models of research to the local are discussed. Lorbiecki & Jack (2000) conclude that a management studies focus on race and workplace discrimination is limited and suggest instead looking to PCT for tools to better address employment equity.

The significance of other theoretical positions in relation to identity formation such as Kaupapa Māori (KM) and postcolonial theory and critique (PCT) is discussed. Both KM and PCT challenge the binary construction of the Māori/Pākehā identity where Māori is positioned as the postcolonial Other. KM in particular confronts the 'discourse of deficit' ascribed to and imposed upon Māori (Bishop, 2003) and PCT confronts the homogenisation of the Other (Bhabha, 1994). Both theoretical positions inform us that identity and power are closely related.

The ways in which these confronting theoretical positions are changing the way management knowledge is being produced is noted. In the case of KM colonial history and contemporary Māori scholarship is traced. A fuller examination of KM and its impact in this thesis will be presented in the methodology chapter. Emergent management research by postcolonial scholars is discussed and the utility of a postcolonial lens in management is supported.

### **Colonisation**

When the Missionaries arrived, the Africans had the Land and the Missionaries had the Bible. They taught us how to pray with our eyes closed. When we opened them, they had the land and we had the Bible. (Desmond Tutu, as cited in Banerjee, 2003, p. 255)

The indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand were colonised by the British during the nineteenth century. Whilst initial contact was positive and a subsequent Treaty (The Treaty of Waitangi/ Te Tiriti o Waitangi) was signed in 1840, it was soon

apparent that possession of land was a driving settlement force. Attempts by Māori for generations to enforce Treaty provisions proved futile with only recent (Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975) emergent recognition. The Treaty, in particular Treaty interpretation and translation, is a much researched, contested and widely debated topic. For example, even the assumption that Te Tiriti and the Treaty are interchangeable is questioned (Mikaere, 2011). For a comprehensive review of Treaty issues see Jackson (1992) and Orange (2011).

Treaty aside it is widely acknowledged that the British arrival in New Zealand generated the founding violence that is characteristic of settler colonies (Veracini, 2003). Founding violence facilitated alienation of indigenous land. As is also characteristic with colonised peoples, binary (Māori/Pākehā) and hierarchical ethnic identities were simultaneously and immediately created (Campbell, 2005) and persist into today. Māori numbers diminished in inverse proportion to the increase in Pākehā population.

Christianity, disease, muskets, and land alienation collectively led to unprecedented population decline. As a result Māori socio-political structure, in particular, the leadership of the chief irreversibly changed; mana amongst rangatira was irretrievably lost. The self-regulating leadership triad of the Rangatira, the Tohunga, and the Kaumātua was extinguished. As a consequence leadership attributes of the kaumātua and kuia were elevated and universalised (Winiata, 1967) intensifying their role whilst also isolating them in their leadership tasks. Māori existence was threatened. Within this chasm, amidst this crisis arose a number of charismatic leaders in the Weberian sense. Te Whiti and the Hauhau, Tamihana and the Kingi movement, Te Kooti and the Ringatu were all charismatic protest leaders (Winiata, 1967, p. 57) during The New Zealand wars, a “time of turbulence” (King, 2003, p. 211). At this time the Māori population declined to such a level that Māori culture was threatened with extinction (King, 2003; Winiata, 1967).

## **Māoritanga to Tikanga Māori to Kaupapa Māori**

Fortunately, by the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Māori population was stable and recovering with intermarriage amongst Pākehā increasing. These children of mixed marriage, half-castes or cultural hybrids (Bhabha, 1994), consequentially had access to higher education and were emerging as a new type of leader. They became national leaders; they were recognised and celebrated as such by Māori and Pākehā alike. Men such as James Carroll, Apirana Ngata, and Maui Pomare, were known as the Aristocrats of knowledge (Winiata, 1967) or simply the educated Māori (Walker, 1993). These new leaders became parliamentarians and were able to politicise 'Māoritanga' by simply placing themselves in that Western arena. The term, used initially by Sir James Carroll in 1920 was later defined by Sir Apirana Ngata as the "inculcation of pride in Māori history and traditions, the retention as far as possible of old time ceremonial, the continuous attempt to interpret the Māori point of view to the Pākehā in power" (Walker 1974, p. 45, as cited in Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002, p. 31). These men were able to give voice to the colonised:

Their scarcity value as Māori academics, their break into fields previously reserved to Europeans, gave them status among both Māori and European. And their intellectual training, combined with personal experience of the processes of Māori-European interaction, gave them insights which were necessary to guide the Māori people. (Winiata, 1967, p. 149)

Carroll and Ngata's term Māoritanga, whilst contentious, persisted for decades as a more or less agreed upon term to mean the Māori way. The Māori way however does not sit well with the more essentialist approaches amongst Māori. The word Māori, originating in a Pākehā encounter was colonised by Pākehā to mean the collective indigenous people of New Zealand. The notion of one people, a homogenous group, known as Māori was generated. So too was the notion of one people, a homogenous British group, known as Pākehā was generated. The terms were simultaneously created (Campbell, 2005). Prior to European contact whānau



and hapū organisation dominated, with iwi as a concept, an ideological and spiritual connection to an eponymous ancestor. The notion of iwi was realised only in times of conquest and challenge. However, the colonial pressures and administration led to iwi being reconstituted as an ever-present and dominating identity (Ballara, 1998). Today, this leads to the neo-colonial creation of iwi authorities redefined with Western governance mechanisms as sites for resource allocation (Panoho & Stablein, 2012). The descriptive term Māori then is entrenched in colonial and indeed postcolonial discursive practices.

Contention aside, the crucial discourse of Māoritanga was adopted by the Department of Education and expanded to include, Tikanga Māori (tika – right), Taha Māori (taha – side) and Kaupapa Māori during the 1980s. The education field, in particular the Auckland University education department, proved to be fertile ground. It was to become the birthplace of the Kaupapa Māori research constructs. The critical pedagogical work of Paulo Freire appears to have been catalytic for the then few Māori scholars in education at Auckland. The term Kaupapa Māori, superseding others, has become established internationally across multiple disciplines as both an epistemological and a methodological approach. Unlike Māori, the term Kaupapa retains its indigenist meanings even when projected into contemporary understandings and exists independently of its more modern scholarly adaptation. In a more relaxed usage organisations are assumed to have their own Kaupapa or agenda or strategy. In the formal sense, the term has been attributed to the spiritualism and traditionalism emerging from old knowledge (Sharples, as cited in Pihama et al., 2002, p. 32). Kaupapa Māori in a research context has become a specialised and meaningful term that has been drawn into scholarly circles (G. H. Smith, 1997; L. T. Smith, 1999).

As noted above, the development of Kaupapa Māori as a research approach has been significantly influenced by Freire, a Brazilian philosopher in education born in 1921. He developed a methodology for teaching literacy described as a “new unity of

theory and praxis” (Shaul, 1972, p. 11). Freire, himself politically oppressed and exiled to Chile in 1964, believed that the delivery of education was “an exercise of domination ..... with the ideological intent of indoctrinating them [the oppressed] to adapt to the world of [their] oppression” (Freire, 1972, p. 52). His work was heavily influenced by a mix of the early critical theorists (Marx, Fromm, Marcuse and de Beauvoir), some postcolonial philosophic influences (Fanon and Memmi), and the political activist Che Guevara. It is no surprise then that his critique was radical, his address emancipatory, and his methodology one of praxis. He concluded that education was used as a powerful tool of oppression, a tool that dehumanised the recipients. The Freirian emancipatory notion of becoming fully human through reformed education praxis also embodies Kaupapa Māori education principles.

Of additional note is the considerable contribution feminism has made to the Kaupapa Māori discourse (Irwin, 1992; L. T. Smith, 1999). The challenge issued to positivist methodology from feminist theory and critical theory, the creation of Māori-led and controlled education (Kōhanga Reo), and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal collectively propelled the notion of Māori-led and Māori-determined research forward.

### **Kaupapa Māori Scholarship**

Smith and Bishop continue to broaden their Kaupapa Māori epistemological reach well beyond education, speaking or writing to even wider Māori and non-Māori academic audiences by publishing in methodological texts, for example, the *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Publications such as these signal possibilities for the extension of Kaupapa Māori research methodologies into more mainstream social sciences where many Māori researchers struggle with Western methodologies and call for more critical analysis of unquestioned Western methodologies. However, in speaking or writing to wider audiences KM epistemology and methodology has carried forward a legacy fraught with

assumptions of Māori identity and authenticity for both the researcher and the researched.

### **He Māori koe? (are you Māori?)**

KM essentialist features and elements of socio-political resistance within the paradigm place boundaries around the Māori and the Western scholar; this has become somewhat limiting for Māori researchers. The question, of course, is not only are you Māori?, but are you Māori enough?, and who is the arbiter of such decisions? Challenges, emergent from multiple standpoints (Eketone, 2008; Mahuika, 2008; Moeke-Maxwell, 2005; Webber, 2009) mostly focus on what Mahuika terms the “totalising narrative of Māoriness” (p. 9). Such a narrative simply serves to essentialise, reinforcing the binary Māori/Pākehā identities and thus marginalising some Māori scholars.

While many scholars seek to constructively engage with and push the KM boundaries, others simply reject the entire indigenous premise at the outset. Rata, for example, (2000, 2003a, 2003b, 2005) has published a long standing critique of neotribalism and neotribal capitalism. The Openshaw and Rata (2007) attack on KM’s cultural essentialist tendencies has been addressed by Andreotti (2009) who responds with the assistance of postcolonial scholarship, offering an alternative to the rigidity of essential cultural attributes:

Perhaps a more effective way of engagement in this specific context, *beyond* absolute relativism *and* cultural supremacism, could be the negotiation of principles for dialogue where heterogeneity in cultures, identities, affiliations and ways of knowing is emphasised. (p. 223)

What of postcolonialism and indigeneity? How might the indigenist position view postcolonialism? We can look to Aotearoa/New Zealand for some insight. Kaupapa Māori proponents take issue with postcolonialism although what is defined as discourses of post-coloniality is not specified:

Many indigenist intellectuals actively resist participating in any discussion within the discourses of post-coloniality. This is because post-colonialism is viewed as the convenient invention of western intellectuals which reinscribes their power to define the world. (Smith, 1999, p.14)

Despite this rejection of discourses of post-coloniality Smith, in her ground-breaking exposition of colonial domination in Aotearoa/NZ does deploy post-colonial notions:

Part of this project of this book is 'researching back', in the same tradition of 'writing back' or 'talking back', that characterises much of the post-colonial or anti-colonial literature. It has involved 'knowingness of the coloniser' and a recovery of ourselves, an analysis of colonialism, and a struggle for self-determination. (Smith, 1999, p. 7)

Other indigenous scholars unproblematically acknowledge the blended nature of indigenous theorising; "critical theorists have been instrumental in creating space in the academy for decolonising thought, and indigenous knowledges and their contributions ought to be noted for that" (Kovach, 2009, p. 93). There is further discussion of this topic in the methods section where both the problems and the promise of KM are addressed and KM research principles are integrated into a broader Māori research tradition. Suffice to conclude Māori identity and Māori scholarship amongst KM scholars is actively debated.

### **Founding violence**

As is characteristic of settler colonies, founding violence facilitated alienation of Māori land in Aotearoa/NZ (Veracini, 2003). In his comparative study of Australian and Israeli colonisation Veracini points out that violence in colonial founding was not only a feature at the time of contact but also that the consequences of that violence persist into today for colonised peoples and was/is the basis of the foundation and continuation of the nationhood. The founding violence of colonisation, (acknowledged only via historical re-description), is not situated in a discrete moment in time but rather persists throughout nationhood:

on the one hand, the responsibility of the settler state in invasion, dispossession, and displacement— the violence peremptorily used against the Indigenous population to enforce balances of power that would be appropriate for the colonising project; and, on the other hand, the institutional working of the settler state, a machine used and deployed with all its strength to accelerate the disappearance— cultural, but especially demographic and even historical— of the Indigenous presence.....whereas one aspect refers to the history that precedes the establishment of the colonial relation, the other characteristic refers to the history that follows that moment. (p.340)

Colonisation introduced a dominant and pervasive Western rationality and practice that forever unbundled what was once a complex, holistic, self-regulating society (Durie, 1994; Walker, 1990; Winiata, 1967) into apparently autonomous factions. Māori hauora or well-being had thus become (and remains) health, one such oversimplified autonomous faction; as a result, Māori health suffered and has yet to recover.

Whilst the health problems of the nineteenth century, such as malnutrition and infectious diseases, are no longer apparent contemporary Māori health remains poor, “the old threats to health have been replaced by modern health problems” (Durie, 2005, p. 7). As Reid and Robson (2006) have summarised: “In almost every major disease category, Māori bear a disproportionate burden of risk, morbidity, disability and mortality” (p. 17).

Health researchers directly link Māori health disparity to founding violence (Veracini 2003) or contemporary effects of colonisation (Paradies, Harris, & Anderson, 2008). Closer investigation is emergent, as they point out:

It is well established that indigenous Australians and Māori have higher levels of ill health and mortality than non-indigenous people. It is also clear that the disadvantage suffered by indigenous peoples is associated with both historical and contemporary racism, colonisation and oppression. Both an

'adequate state of health' and 'freedom from racism' are rights enshrined in legislation in Australia and Aotearoa (New Zealand). Although several recent national and international reports have shown a link between racism and public health, there is little research on this topic in Australia or Aotearoa. (p. 1)

Nairn, Pega, McCreanor, Rankine, and Barnes (2006) in a review of media, racism and public health in Aotearoa/NZ concluded that "the evidence shows that oppression and marginalization are inimical to a people's health" (p.191). Also in Aotearoa/NZ, Harris et al.(2006), in an extensive quantitative study, investigated how (self-reported) experiences of racism both within the health sector and outside the health sector may relate to health disparity. They found "Māori were more likely to report experiences of self-reported racial discrimination in all instances assessed, and were almost ten times more likely to experience discrimination in three or more settings than were Europeans." (p. 2005). Further they concluded:

Racism, both interpersonal and institutional, contributes to Māori health losses and leads to inequalities in health between Māori and Europeans in New Zealand. Interventions and policies to improve Māori health and address these inequalities should take into account the health effects of racism. (p. 2005)

A recent NZ study examining institutional racism (Came, 2011) in healthcare management identifies "how systemic racism manifests in the realms of public health policy making and funding practices" (p. 1). Studies such as these clearly question not just the health service interface but also institutional and managerial understandings of (public) health policy and provision as well as public health governance. In support of the founding violence construct, Nairn et al. (2006) "regard institutional racism as both driving the processes of colonization and as a continuing consequence of those processes" (p. 184).

Founding violence therefore reminds us of the role the State has to play in both reinforcing and potentially addressing the ways in which institutional workings of the settler state affect the indigenous. While Māori health is of political and economic concern, there is much debate over how disparities are to be addressed. In an attempt to address disproportionate Māori health needs the State made a relatively recent, unprecedented move to give explicit reference in health legislation to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, along with multiple explicit references to Māori health policy goals. In addition, the NZPH&D Act provided for the *potential* appointment of Māori directors. While Māori have continuously and consistently been involved in their own health care since colonisation opportunities for strategic input and management in public health provision have been only recent. The opportunity for direct voice at the governance level is more recent still.

Returning to the unbundling brought about by Western colonisation, Professor Sir Mason Durie (2011) reminds us that those issues of health disparities for Māori are but one, yet interconnected piece of the (on-going) founding violence puzzle:

Whether the new approaches to health care for Māori can be translated into health gains is a question of considerable importance. Any suggestions that continuing disparities in the health standards of Māori and non-Māori is evidence that the current approaches have been unsuccessful is a shallow analysis that fails to take account of the wider socio-economic context in which Māori live. It implicitly places an unfair burden on the health sector as a panacea for the ills generated within wider society. (p. 286)

### **Post-Colonial Theory and Critique or Postcolonialism**

In borrowing du Gay's (2002, p. 11) term for governance, colonisation can also be described as polyvalent. The use of the term 'colonial' with its various prefixes has been uttered in a range of ways recently amongst scholars with various meanings. Some slip it in almost in-passing; others appear to use the term as a counter point, as

though it is an on-going betrayal by the coloniser. The term post-colonial, whilst related is sometimes used to mistakenly represent postcolonialism or postcolonial theory and critique. The term post-colonial “belonged to the realm of international relations and economic practice and had somewhat of a literal reference – that of a post independent State”(Young, 2001, p.59).

While territories and peoples have been colonised since the beginning of human history it is the past 500 years with the expansion of the West into the East that is referred to as colonisation (or the colonising period). It is this period, and beyond, that is the subject of discussion for postcolonial theorists (Anshuman Prasad, 2003b).

Tensions between the various factions of postcolonialism as well as between postcolonialism and other theoretical/political/philosophical positions abound. Not all critics however are informed. The term ‘postcolonial’ is at times understood to mean postcolonial theory and critique when in fact it may be simply used to refer to an historical or a contemporary period. Other times the term becomes conflated with other distinct approaches such as Kaupapa Māori (Marie & Haig, 2006). In engaging with PCT, it is important to distinguish between those commentators who engage postcolonial theory and critique and those who make casual reference, or otherwise, to the term postcolonial.

Despite the disparate and contentious debates amongst scholars and activists, indigenous and non-indigenous, and despite the pervasive and widespread acts of colonisation there is some literary coherency in the establishment and development of postcolonial theory and critique.

Contributions to postcolonial theory and critique have been made by many great leaders, activists, heroes, organic intellectuals and scholars. Names such as Gandhi, Guevara, Mao, Fanon, Memmi, Nandi, Said, Spivak, and Bhabha are associated with and/or central to postcolonialism. The latter three, Said, Spivak, and Bhabha, are said to constitute the holy trinity of postcolonial scholarship (Young, 1995). Each of the trinity has been significantly influenced by the earlier contributors.



Each has contributed distinctive political and/or disciplinary insights. For example, Fanon, Memmi, and Nandi have all made psychodynamic contributions exploring the effects of the colonisation of the mind and political resistance. Memmi articulated the psychological entanglement and the mutual pathology of the symbiosis and dependence experienced by the coloniser and the colonised. As Gandhi (1998) astutely observes, “Memmi’s political pessimism delivers an account of postcoloniality as a historical condition marked by the visible apparatus of freedom and the concealed persistence of unfreedom” (p. 6-7). Others, such as Mahatma Gandhi, of course, have been known more for their political and religious anti-colonial strategies of resistance.

In addition to these distinctive contributions there is also the temporal distinction between the foundational bodies of work and the more recent tenets. This is somewhat parallel to the historical processes that have followed colonisation – the processes of anti-colonialism and nationalism have been embellished by theoretical perspectives such as the critical and, more latterly the poststructural. Scholars such as Said, Spivak, and Bhabha moved the theory and critique from the anti-colonial to the postcolonial. Said (1978), one of the first academics to use the post structural tools of western critical theory to gaze back at the West, used the “supremely fictional” (p. xvii) terms the Orient and the Occident to illustrate how the hierarchical discourse of difference was constructed by the West. In his preface to the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition of *Orientalism* (Said, 1994), he identifies his theoretical tools and speaks to the pervasive and ubiquitous nature of colonial knowledge production:

I have found it useful here to employ Michel Foucault’s notion of a discourse...My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage-and even produce-

the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period. (p. 3)

Said's (1978) publication *Orientalism*, has been described as "path-breaking" (Prasad, 2003 p.9) and has been proposed as the precursor to postcolonialism (Gandhi, 1998).

Bhabha (1994), renowned for his focus on the potential for transformation in the liminal or third space in between the coloniser and the colonised recognises the utility of such a space:

The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation. The 'right' to signify from the periphery of authorized power and privilege does not depend on the persistence of tradition; it is resourced by the power of tradition to be reinscribed through the conditions of contingency and contradictoriness that attend upon the lives of those who are 'in the minority' (p. 3)

Of note here is that Bhabha disrupts the notion of the coloniser as the unchallenged power to determine on-going articulation of difference or identity. Bhabha instead suggests the relationship between the colonised and the coloniser is one of ambivalence and contradiction. Importantly the ambivalent and contradictory nature of the relationship is what enables agency on the part of the colonised where the coloniser's tools can be used to disrupt and destabilise the coloniser's power and control (Prasad, 2003). Bhabha suggests a subversive use of the third space (P. Prasad, 2005). Also of note here is the potential empowerment and agency Bhabha theorises as possible in this third space. This is in direct contrast to the feminist argument that questions whether the subordinated can use the subordinator's tools. This is in reference; in particular, to the famous line by Audre Lorde "can the master's tool dismantle the master's house?" (1983, p. 94).

However, the third space also known as one of hybridity, is not without contention and suspicion primarily due to the racial/biological assumptions of superiority

associated with colonisation. In McKinley's (2005) postcolonial examination of Western eroticised images of Māori women where "fine-boned facial structure and pale skin" (p. 485) were exalted she notes:

The offspring of intermarriage was seen as a benefit to the Māori race and a sign of superiority [by colonisers]....Māori were seen as "bodies" and Europeans were seen as the "minds". This meant that intellect was the preserve of Europeans and inter-racial reproduction was also a means to "civilising" Māori by increasing their "intellect", or mental vivacity, by increasing the proportion of "white blood." Hence, hybridity was seen as a biological condition under which other "hybrid" conditions, such as increased intellect, could exist. (p. 485-486)

For this reason care is taken to note that Bhabha does not refer to biological hybridity but nor it is at odds with his approach either. Pushkala Prasad (2005) asserts, despite the biological etymology, that hybridity "has legitimacy partly because it offers a progressive way of adopting an anti-purist stand on race and culture without necessarily relinquishing the importance of difference" (p. 245). As Webber concludes, "the politics of hybridity theory and the notion of 'hybrid identity' are complex" (2009, p. 24).

The authenticity of the voice that espouses postcolonialism is one of the more serious concerns shared by both the ex-colonised and the ex-coloniser. Not only is the question can the subaltern speak?, but also, can the subaltern hear? (Wright, 2001). The debate around subaltern-speak and the competing multiple subalternities amongst the ex-colonised poststructuralists, Marxists, feminists, and the indigenists (Gandhi, 1998) provide resistance and complexity. For many reasons, much of the postcolonial theory and critique is contested ground (Panoho, 2007). The absence of an originary moment (Gandhi, 1998), the eclectic mix of activists (Prasad, 2005), the oppositional mix of academics, the multi-disciplinary span of the theory, and the differing natures of colonial encounters, all provide for a vibrant yet dispersed

community. Multiple texts are able to fully inform the reader on debates within postcolonial theory and critique (Ashcroft, Tiffin, & Griffiths, 2000; Gandhi, 1998; Lewis & Mills, 2002; Young, 1995).

Spivak is said to have made a foundational contribution to PCT (Young, 2001) with her challenge to first world feminists and her insights into essentialism and anti-essentialism (Prasad, 2003). Of note here is her sanctioning of the term 'strategic essentialism' in theory and in praxis where a group claims distinctive and bounded characteristics in order to achieve recognition and/or secure resources. This sanctioning of essential, defining characteristics generates much debate within the postcolonial field (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004; Ajnesh Prasad, 2012) and within the KM field (Smith, 1999; Moeke-Maxwell, 2005;) and within discussion of hybridity (Bell, 2004; Drichel, 2008; J. T. Johnson, 2008; Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Webster, 1993). Debate on essentialism continues.

While it is certainly the case that postcolonialism is "remarkably focused [yet] distinctly unruly" (P. Prasad, 2005, p. 262) this does not necessarily compromise the integrity of the theoretical positions but it does require making choices among the multi-theoretic approaches. Postcolonialism is in a conflicted state, in many ways illustrative of the effect of colonisation itself, i.e., complex, fragmented, ambivalent, and embedded. In drawing on postcolonial tenets we must be mindful of this conflicted state. Semantic debate over terminology cautions us to declare our position to identify our specific literatures and to localise our position.

The noting of specific historical experiences of colonisation is important and raises a particular concern with postcolonialism, that of the homogenisation of the experience of the colonised. Banerjee (2003) has suggested one should always ask who is defining the term and for what purpose? Others also caution against the tendency to homogenise:

Rigorous attention to conjuncture and politics of location is critical to specifying both the limits and the value of the term 'postcolonial' (Frankenberg & Mani, 1993, p. 292)

Although postcolonial theory can universalise and oversimplify the colonised and the coloniser positions there are commonalities in the experience of the colonised that offer acknowledgement, solidarity, and insight. In terms of the conjuncture of politics and location in Aotearoa/NZ the founding (yet unconstitutional) document that definitively locates our nation is the Treaty of Waitangi:

When asked to speak of our geo-political region we are committed to Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi as a starting place for telling the specificity of our locatedness. (Morgan, Coombes, & Campbell, 2006, p. 52)

If we do not politically locate our research we risk mistaken assumptions and therefore lose the utility of the postcolonial lens. Thus this thesis is located geo-politically within Aotearoa/NZ.

### **The Postcolonial in the Study of Management**

Just as this thesis is geo-politically located, so too it is located in the experiences of Māori directors on DHBs and therefore in the academic community of management, and specifically that of governance. Contemporary management scholars call for examination of Western dominant organisational theory and practice:

...we believe that the construction of the modern organisation, and the control systems it has fostered, is inextricably linked to the construction of the discourse of modernity, a discourse that owes its primacy to the processes of colonisation.(Mir, Mir, & Upadhyaya, 2003, p. 48)

Drawing on Alvesson (1993) and Alvesson and Deetz (2000), Anshuman Prasad (2003a) suggests a postcolonial organisational approach would serve to defamiliarise

and thus provide fresh insight into what would otherwise be considered routine organisational matters:

The question [to] grapple with is whether (and in what ways and forms) modern Western colonialism – and non-Western resistance to this colonialism – may have some important implications for how we choose to manage, think about, and work in contemporary formal organisations. (p. 4)

Postcolonialism has informed multiple disciplines such as cultural studies, subaltern studies, museum studies, art history, development studies, and many others.

However, postcolonialism is only emergent in management study (Anshuman Prasad, 2003b; Westwood & Jack, 2007), despite the fertile ground for study that postcolonial organisations provide (Panoho & Stablein, 2012; Westwood & Rhodes, 2004).

Nkomo (2011) also holds promise for postcolonialism in management studies where:

postcolonial scholarship within organization studies [can] open up spaces for interrogating multiple histories of colonialism and postcoloniality and the ways in which subjugated peoples choose to resist the strictures placed upon them through the tropes of colonialism(s). (p. 381)

In employing Said's Foucauldian analysis we can conclude management study is as discursively implicated in the pervasive and ubiquitous colonial production of knowledge as other Western disciplines. Western economic influences drive the endeavour to control and manage resources, including human resources to achieve an efficient and profitable end. The infiltration of NPM into public sector policies demonstrates how far reaching the dominant economic goals within management have spread. Legislative interventions attempt to address social injustice such as discrimination and under representation and are incorporated into management theory and practice via notions of diversity. Regulatory boards and reviews, such as the Higgs Review (2003) and the Tyson Report (2003) advocate board diversity.

However, as will be explained, the diversity literature has had a problematic origin and problematic developmental path.

Management research into employment equity became research into managing diversity (Humphries & Grice, 1992). The move from equity to diversity signalled a significant shift in meaning and causal attribution (Humphries & Grice, 1995; D. Jones & Stablein, 2006; Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000). The attribution moved from unequal and unfair toward different and difficult (Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000). New Zealand research has generally reflected global managing diversity discourses and this has not been without challenge. Legislative policies such as Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) and Affirmative Action (AA) have provided for legal modes of intervention. However, whether intervention has been effective enough (Humphries & Grice, 1995) and whether the shift from equity to diversity has compromised potential benefits have been questioned.

Despite the widespread adoption of diversity management doctrines by management theorists and human resource practitioners alike the very basis of discussion underlying diversity has been challenged by many (Humphries & Grice, 1995; D. Jones, Pringle, & Shepherd, 2000; D. Jones & Stablein, 2006; Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000; Nkomo, 1992; Anshuman Prasad, 2006). Although managing diversity is seen as problematic there could be opportunities for subversive action:

The rhetoric of 'workplace' diversity can act like a Trojan horse, providing a vehicle to resist and transform relations of organisational power, while speaking of human resource management (HRM) and demographic change. (Jones & Stablein, 2006, p. 145)

Editors Konrad, Prasad, and Pringle (2006) in their *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* draw together multiple critical approaches to diversity in management studies. They point out existing tensions with diversity research:

At its core, the concept of diversity is all about matters of *difference* and *inclusion*. However there remains no easy agreement on either the nature of differences that should be considered or the kind of inclusionary measures that should be practised. (p. 2)

The global adoption of managing diversity discourses poses problems when applied to the local where "a politics and location" (Frankenberg & Mani, 1993, p.292) is imperative. Jones, Pringle and Shepard (2000) call for recognition of the local:

Here Māori have a specific status as the Tangata Whenua, or indigenous people. Although Māori form only about 14 percent of the population, local models of biculturalism, based around a metaphor of partnership between Māori and Pākehā (non-Māori settlers, primarily of British descent) are the driving force for re-thinking ethnic difference in New Zealand organisations. For Māori practitioners in the study, the advent of a "diversity" model was seen as a threat to the objective of establishing Tangata Whenua status. (p. 365)

Furthermore, in the unquestioning adoption of global theory we also adopt inherent theoretical weaknesses. Race, in particular had not been a focus and in fact was conspicuous by its absence from the agenda. Nkomo (1992), an early management commentator on race, provocatively uses the Grimms Brother's fairy-tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes," to draw comparisons with the way organisation behaviourists "have chosen to address race in organisations" (p. 488) or, in fact, not chosen to address race:

...the silencing of the importance of race in organisations is mostly subterfuge because of the over-whelming role of race and ethnicity in every aspect of society. (p. 488)

In addition, in the adoption of global (Western) theory, non-Western contributions have become obscured, appropriated, or written out. Prasad (2003a) notes that some management practices and technologies have been appropriated by the West



without recognition. In using a postcolonial lens to revisit the historical origins of action research, Cooke (2003) provides an example of appropriation where ironically, early investigation of inter-racial relations has generated constructs upon which organisational development (OD) and management of organisational culture (MOC) theories have developed.

OD and MOC are said to have derived from Kurt Lewin's action research theory. Lewin developed this theory during the observation of inter-group processes amongst ethnically diverse participants (Cooke, 2003). In quoting Lewin, Cooke makes the postcolonial connection clear:

Inter-group relations in this country will be formed to a large degree by the events on the international scene and particularly by the fate of the colonial peoples..." (Lewin, 1946, p. 45-46, as cited in Cooke, 2003, p. 81)

Neither colonisation nor race are an important enough part of the organisation discourse in management, as Nkomo attests, instead diversity discourses dominate. Further, according to Cooke, "orthodox histories of change management had written out Lewin's left politics" (p. 81), thereby also writing out the contribution made by the participants themselves. Cooke concludes that MOC has appropriated social interaction modes from "participants that [sought] to understand their involvement with the project of action research and group dynamics mostly in terms of their response to the impact of colonisation, imperialism, and racism on their lives" (p. 87).

Lorbiecki and Jack (2000), in examining diversity theory and diversity practice discourse, chart the evolution of diversity management through four stages and note each as a turning point; demographic, economic, political, and critical. From the outset the move to be more accommodating toward diversity in the workplace was an:

essentially 'Modernist' rationale predicated on a 'means-end' relationship where managing diversity is the 'means' and the successful attainment of organizational goals the desired 'end.' (Lorbiecki & Jack, p. S19)

In other words, managing diversity was good for business. In practice however workplace diversity has not been as simple as this. Lorbiecki and Jack point out a number of negative responses such as majority backlash and resentment. They trace this hostility and rejection back to Elias and Scotson's (1994) notion of collective fantasy of superiority and Said's (latent postcolonial) seminal notion of cultural secondariness (Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000). The fourth or critical stage in the evolution of diversity management has brought to light questions about the ability of the managing diversity discourse in and of itself to bring about social change. Rather, as Bhabha (1990) asserts diversity discourse is simply a (neo)colonial tool to maintain social power relations.

Lorbiecki and Jack (2000) present a pessimistic view of existing approaches to racism and discrimination in the workplace and instead suggest the utility of a postcolonial approach:

Post-colonial theory offers a fresh perspective to diversity management because it asks us to pay particular attention to processes of Western knowledge construction which stereotype and subordinate the 'Other' (p. S25)

Prasad (2006) also suggests postcolonial utility:

Postcolonial theory's analyses of social and cultural marginality are of great value to investigators of workplace diversity and multiculturalism, because the project of workplace diversity is linked to ameliorating the conditions of those on the margins of the organisation." (p. 125)

Bhabha (1990) theorised diversity as a (neo) colonial construct possibly before its adoption by management studies, and cautions the use of it:

Although there is always an entertainment and encouragement of cultural diversity, there is always a corresponding containment of it. A transparent norm is constituted, a norm given by the host society or dominant culture, which says that 'these other cultures are fine, but we must be able to locate them within our own grid'. This is what I mean by a *creation* of cultural diversity and a containment of cultural *difference*. (p. 208)

Multiple theoretical approaches reveal that occupational segregation is a consequence of deeper seated historical, political and economic dynamics. Workplace equity therefore is but one consequential demonstration of such dynamics. The study of such organisational phenomena (pay equity, discrimination and racism for example), based in the functionalist paradigm, has offered only limited insight into ways in which identities are constructed and performed (Ajneesh Prasad, 2012). The adoption of PCT in the study of management offers insight into workplace equity by scrutinising the deeper seated historical, political and economic dynamics that situate the occupational segregation.

While aspects of human resource management such as managing diversity are obvious sites for PCT challenge, other fields of management studies have also come into question. The field of international management is of particular concern to PCT scholars in management because it can be clearly seen as a socio-culturally and geopolitically parallel process to initial acts of colonisation. While it is no longer as acceptable for one country to seize the resources of another, economic infiltration and expansion via investment and management provides for a more subtle (neo) colonisation and manifests in material consequences for the colonised (Banerjee, 2000; ÖzkazanÇ-Pan, 2008). Ozakazanc-Pan drawing specifically on Said, Bhabha, and Spivak, in a revisiting of IM asks:

How did management ideas and practices developed in the West become normalised as universal theories for studying people and business under globalisation? (2008, p. 970)

Westwood and Jack (2007) hold management and organisation studies to account with the publication of their “Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies:” “Given its provinces of investigation it would be lamentable and intellectually disingenuous if the field continues to turn a blind eye to PCT” (p. 247). The authors provide a set of principles to guide both a deconstruction and a reconstruction of current theory and practice “reconfiguring the field” (p. 254):

Methodologically it opens up a space for knowledge systems that have been repressed, marginalised or silenced by the colonising propensities of the West’s discourses, knowledge systems and institutions. It involves mitigating, as far as possible, against the silencing effects of Western knowledge construction such that the subaltern can speak and be actively listened to. (p. 254)

However, in doing so, as is signalled by the use of the term subaltern, Westwood and Jack (2007) actively support Spivak’s (1993) strategic essentialism construct:

Through methodological interventions PCT seeks to return agency to such people, allowing a reclaiming of an “essential identity” as a temporary strategic device to resist dominance and exclusion, give voice to reassert a unique identity...( Westwood and Jack, 2007, p. 254)

As is apparent thus far essentialism is a problematic term and a term under much critical discussion within PCT factions and between PCT and other theoretical approaches, such as KM for example. In his close examination of analytic dichotomies, Ajnesh Prasad situates the essentialist/anti-essentialist and eventual strategic essentialist terms first amidst feminist debate where feminism is “in a crisis of its own making” (2012, p. 572) which forced feminists to account for the multiplicity of feminist identities. Spivak (1993) in her nomination of the strategic essentialism term acknowledges its problematic nature:

Feminisms return to the problem of essentialism – despite their shared distaste for the mystifications of Woman – because it remains difficult to engage in feminist analysis and politics if not “as a woman” (Spivak, 1993, as cited in Prasad, 2012, p. 573)

Nkomo (2011), in an extensive discursive review of African leadership and management reveals the on-going absence of realistic images of African leaders in both “Western texts as well as the alternative, *African management philosophy*” (p. 378) and suggests the homogenisation of the Other underlies the (re)production of such unrealistic images. Nkomo reveals the limitations of essentialising culture and identity via historical recollection:

The challenge for those seeking to re-write ‘Africa’ into management and organization studies is finding a third space not only in the sense of Bhabha’s formulation but building something new that does not end up reiterating the binary oppositions and hierarchies of colonialism. Thus, the difficult question is how then do we perform the gaze without falling into the trap of essentialism? (p. 378)

While the strategic benefits of collective or essential identity may be obvious, the disadvantages may not. The greatest concern is that of the risk of reproduction of the same hierarchical and binary mechanisms of colonisation whereby the already marginalised are further marginalised. In Aotearoa/NZ, for example, not only are Māori a diverse people as with any population but, due to alienation from economic and cultural resources, are diverse in their cultural expression. For example, not all Māori are able, nor perhaps wish, to speak for Māori.

PCT and governance is of central interest in this thesis. Given the extent of Western institutional and legal control exercised over governing bodies the question of whether, and if so how, does Western governance theory and practice accommodate non-Western governance theory and practice arises. There is currently little or no theoretical work in corporate governance in Aotearoa/NZ that is informed by

postcolonialism. While there has been some commentary on Māori governance practice models within Māori organisations, for example, Penehira, Cram & Pipi (2003), this commentary proved problematic. The authors concluded that the limitations of a colonially determined State deny Māori the opportunity to independently determine governance arrangements. Thus the study of Māori governance is a study of Māori governance within Pākehā determined parameters. Penehira et al. (2003) point this out:

This report began with an examination of Kaupapa Māori with the strong 'take home message' that Kaupapa Māori is about our right to be Māori. Kaupapa Māori governance is therefore about our right to implement culturally appropriate models of governance to guide our institutions and organisations. However, the literature review highlighted the tensions between talking about Kaupapa Māori governance within a context in which we do not have sovereignty. (p. 31)

### **Kaupapa Māori and management studies**

Management studies, informed by KM, include examinations of Māori business and discussions of KM methodology (Cash & Taurima, 2002; Frederick & Henry, 2004; Gillies, Tinirau, & Mako, 2007; Henry & Pene, 2001; Henry & Pringle, 1996; Overall, Tapsell, & Woods, 2010; Pihema, 2006; Ruwhiu & Cone, 2010; Ruwhiu & Wolfgramm, 2006; Taurima & Cash, 1999; Tinirau & Gillies, 2011).

The Overall et al. (2010) case study specifically investigates governance in an indigenous, entrepreneurial social context. They point out that neither governance nor entrepreneurship literatures adequately accommodate the Māori world view. They profile a Māori company that has adopted a twin advisory governance process. The directors are supported by both a rangatira (elders and leaders) group who provide cultural integrity and stability and by a business and legal mentoring group who offer fiscal and legal support. Structurally, the intention was to strategically

generate interaction between the two groups, thus allowing for a more bicultural enterprise.

KM informed management research varies in the extent to which KM principles guide research and analysis. Factors such as the participants' organisation and research location, the researcher identity and motivation, and the research question, and, supervisory capacity all enable or constrain the extent to which Kaupapa Māori principles are able to be fully applied in research. As yet, KM research in management has not engaged with PCT.

Significant Australian governance studies, informed by PCT, contribute to our understanding of the role the corporation has in determining recognition for the indigenous in governance arrangements. Banerjee (2007), in his discursive analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), reveals how the pervasive stakeholder approach, as a conduit for CSR, is generated from within neo-liberal discourse:

Attributes of power, legitimacy and urgency that determine stakeholder salience are ultimately a function of power discourses between institutional, state and corporate actors and the process of stakeholder integration tends to either disallow alternative practices or assimilate them. (p. 32)

Given this analysis, stakeholder theory and practice then has an implication for those stakeholders that are attributed the least power, the least legitimacy, and the least urgency. Given the significant adoption of NPM, we can see how public sector arrangements have been influenced by stakeholder identities, in particular the references in the NZPH&D Act to specific stakeholder groups illustrates this. Banerjee uses examples from the corporate extractive industries in Australia where aboriginal land and communities become mining sites. He identifies this as "the practice of stakeholder colonialism" (p. 33):

Given the profound incommensurabilities between the needs of the indigenous and those of the corporations it is difficult to see how an inclusive stakeholder approach can address the needs of this stakeholder group. (p. 37)

The Harvard Project (2012), although centred in development and public policy studies and established to work with Native Americans, has had considerable influence on indigenous governance discussion in Australia. Sullivan (2007) in his critique of the popularised application of the Harvard Project principles to Australian indigenous development draws attention to potential weaknesses in the application of the model outside the North American context.

PCT scholars are actively and simultaneously (re) writing back to the management centre in multiple management fields including human resources, international management, leadership, and governance. One of the consistent themes has been that of identity and how identity has been constructed and where identity sits in relation to authenticity given Bhabha's assertion that;

The 'right' to signify from the periphery of authorized power and privilege does not depend on the persistence of tradition; it is resourced by the power of tradition to be reinscribed through the conditions of contingency and contradictoriness...(1994,p. 3)

Thus the review of colonial history, the review of management studies and the review of KM and PCT management, along with the review of governance literature, inform the development of an effective methodology for the investigation of the experience of Māori directors on DHBs.



## Chapter Four: Methodology

**Ko te utu mō te aroha, ko te aroha anō**

**(to the directors-respect received is respect acknowledged)**

This study is a Māori-centred inquiry into health governance and asks directors themselves to reflect on their governance experiences. Existing governance research directs us to explore board process in order to generate primary data. Māori research traditions seek to generate Māori-centric data and direct Māori researchers to research with Māori using Māori research methodologies. Kaupapa Māori epistemology in particular points to a differing world view.

It is in this chapter that the both the practical and the theoretical aspects of this thesis come together in a manner that hopefully provides a coherent and relevant account of this research journey. Essentially this chapter details the methodological process undertaken and considers the ways in which these processes are informed by theory. Methodological choice in relation to the research question and the nature of the data is explained followed by a brief note on the emergence of, and place of, the qualitative as a meta-tradition of inquiry. Following this, the matters of theoretically informed research and research standards are considered. The ways in which epistemological assumptions influence methodological matters are detailed.

The emergence of a Māori research tradition is then considered. The development of Kaupapa Māori research is explored noting foundational (Bishop & Glynn, 1992; G. H. Smith, 1997; L. T. Smith, 1999) and contemporary (Cunningham, 2008) views. Both methodological views, the former, emerging from the education field, the latter from the health field, inform this study.

Methodological aspects of this project are discussed using the Māori Research framework (Cunningham, 2008) under the following headings: Research intent, Māori involvement as researchers, Methodology, Māori involvement as participants, Contribution to capacity building in Māori research, and, Addressing priorities and

Outcomes. This research is evaluated using Bishop's Locus of Power analysis, which he summarises as: Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimacy, and Accountability (Bishop, 2005, p.112). In addition, the issues of researcher motivation and researcher control are considered.

Following this there is a straightforward description of core methodological details such as who participated, how participants became involved, what was asked of them, and when and where the research took place. Methodological tools for analysis are introduced. 'Mainstream' ethical considerations are summarised. The issue of (Western) research ethics in relation to this research is considered.

This research, where possible, has been informed by Māori research tradition although this is a situation where research by Māori, with Māori, and for Māori has not fully accommodated Kaupapa Māori methodologies. Instead it represents a blended set of research methods because this research is an attempt to collate and analyse Māori directorial perceptions and participation in a corporate and institutional setting. In health the emergence of the Māori-centred research approach has provided for more flexible research parameters and these parameters have been incorporated in this research.

Kaupapa Māori research principles represent an ideal that is difficult to achieve in many contemporary settings for/with and by Māori researchers. Given Bishop's (1994) early view:

Kaupapa Māori (sic) research is located within an alternative world view and from within this world view solutions to problems can be generated, that is cultural aspirations can be met using the existing (albeit marginalised through colonisation) cultural preferences and practices of Māori culture. (p.183)

The founding violence (Veracini, 2003) of colonisation determines the extent to which participants' cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices can be achieved. The corporate governance setting is already signalled as problematic in preceding

reviews of literature. Inescapable constraints of the West aside, wherever possible, this research has been guided by Kaupapa Māori principles.

The chapter concludes with some data analysis strategies. The Māori research tradition, governance theory, and additional critical theories provide data organising strategies and theoretical tools for analysis.

### **Methodological Choice**

Even when epistemological choices are made there are a variety of methodological approaches available to generate organisational data, and an infinite number of research questions that can be potentially posed, each influences the nature of the data. The research question, a priori research assumptions, research objectives, and the methodological choice, all influence the data generated, and when congruent, can potentially produce insight. The genesis and justification for the research question and research objectives has been covered in the previous literature chapters. In short, management governance scholars call for more insight into intra-board process using empirical data.

The research process began with the a priori assumption that in governance processes there would be some experiences of cultural incommensurability. Incommensurability was used in both the literal meaning of “no common measure” (Oberheim & Hoyningen-Huene, 2012) and in the Kuhnian (1970) metaphorical meaning in describing the relationship between alternative paradigms. Cultural incommensurability was a personal experience of the researcher, a theorised assumption from postcolonial theory and an actual finding (Modlik, 2004; Durie, 2011). Generally stated the research objectives were; to generate first-order data and to explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership heterogeneity. Table 4.1 outlines the research goals of this study.

*Table 4.1 Overall Research Goals*

---

<b>Thesis Title</b>
A Māori-centred inquiry into health governance; Māori directors on District Health Boards
<b>The Research Question</b>
What is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards?
<b>The A priori Research Assumption</b>
That Māori directors will experience some incommensurability in a District Health Board setting
<b>Research Objectives</b>
To generate primary governance data that is Māori-centric
To explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership heterogeneity

---

The governance setting is the District Health Board. The data gathering approach is primarily interview based although to identify the data as simply interview data excludes the complexity and richness that accompanies the additional data sources such as observation, casual interaction and archival data within this cultural context. Instead the nature of the data collected in this study can be considered 'ethnodata' gathered from fieldwork or participant observation within a cultural context (Stablein, 2006). Thus, ethnodata in this context is a type of qualitative data relevant and meaningful to Māori. To ensure that such data is generated, the study integrates Māori cultural principles or tikanga. These principles come from the Kaupapa Māori tradition and are present in other Māori research traditions, such as that proposed

by Cunningham (2008). In this study therefore the concept of ethnodata is renamed as Māori-centric data.

As is apparent in the governance literature there is a dearth of research that examines directorial experiences, instead much governance research focuses on secondary data and little is known of directorial roles and first hand experiences. Furthermore as Māori research traditions privilege *kanohi ki te kanohi*, so too do Māori researchers. Fieldwork and the gathering of first-order data as a methodological approaches are entirely consistent with Māori research traditions. Fieldwork and the gathering of first-order data are also consistent with the qualitative tradition, and with the critical tradition. All three traditions provide guidance for this study.

### **The qualitative research tradition**

Stated simply qualitative research, for many different reasons and in many different ways, employs a non-statistical orientation to data collection as discussed below.

Despite persistent critique and movement away from the notion that measurement is equal to truth qualitative research is often considered the poor cousin of the statistical or quantitative genre. Early social scientists were encouraged to adhere to the research expectations of the scientific paradigm.

Social sciences, specifically the organisational sciences still appear to be ambivalent, believing the scientific methods and social scientific methods of investigation to be dichotomous:

Between these two extremes are those who believe the issue for organisational sciences is whether the field can strike an appropriate balance between theoretical tyranny and an anything-goes attitude. (Lundberg & Young, 2005, p. 60)

Despite this ambivalence, subsets or specific fields of organisational research are clear on where they stand regarding qualitative inquiry. While the

quantitative/qualitative traditions tend to be viewed in opposition this dichotomy is spurious and somewhat artificial (Stablein, 2006). Multiple research instruments such as surveys, triangulation, and sampling techniques are often incorporated into qualitative studies. Many qualitative studies therefore are mixed methods, using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

Social science maturation has been marked by paradigmatic challenge evidenced by a variety of phrases such as the 'qualitative turn' (Prasad, 2005) or the 'qualitative revolution' (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994b). Today it is generally accepted across a range of disciplines that the study of human phenomena cannot be usefully researched using the same methodological tools that have utility in the laboratory (Clegg, Hardy, Lawrence, & Nord, 2006). Management theory, particularly organisational theory, has progressed well beyond Frederick Taylor's scientific management and notions of human productivity, beyond the 'normal science model' where 'Time and Motion' were central measurements.

However, despite this methodological and epistemological liberation, despite the enormity of the qualitative turn social scientists still contest for epistemological space. Kaupapa Māori epistemology, feminism, postcolonial theory and critique, and numerous critical approaches all continue to challenge the notion of an objective science, proposing instead that all knowledge is socially constructed and therefore value laden or political in nature.

The historical, contextual, political, social, and material are all-encompassing features of much contemporary social science research and knowledge production. The tendency to separate these, particularly the political from the aesthetic is Western (Young, 2003). That is, the notion that activity can be politically neutral is artificial. Further Said notes that this separation, particularly the political from the aesthetic, is subterfuge on the part of the West and deliberately employed both to elevate the importance of Western knowledge, and to diminish the importance of non-Western knowledge; "The adjective 'political' is used as a label to discredit any

work for daring to violate the protocol of pretended suprapolitical objectivity” (Said, as cited in, Young, 2003, p. 58)

Indigenist social scientists, in particular, challenge this pretended suprapolitical objectivity by reframing research and knowledge as a product of the historical, contextual, political, social and the material. As Denzin and Lincoln (1994a) observed:

New epistemologies from previously silenced groups emerge to offer solutions to this problem....More action, activist-oriented research is on the horizon, as are more social criticism and critique. (p. 11).

In keeping with Denzin and Lincoln’s observation, this research, informed and guided by Māori and postcolonial epistemologies, emerges from two such previously silenced groups and as such, can be defined as an activist-oriented research where previously held assumptions, such as the unchallengeable superiority of Western governance, are disrupted.

### **Theoretically informed research and research standards**

In stark contrast to the positivist tradition where social phenomena are examined as inanimate or biological phenomena, the traditions employed in this research provide preconceptions, a priori theoretical assumptions are made (Prasad, 2005). This is a necessary and desirable practice without which such a study would simply produce literal translations (Stablein, 2006), mere observations. A priori theoretical assumptions are acceptable and routinely applied:

Theory, therefore functions throughout inquiry, and does not come into its own when inquiry is successfully concluded. It has a greater responsibility than that of an accessory after the fact: it guides the search for data, and for laws encompassing them. (Kaplan, 2005, p. 181)

Prasad (2005) argues that research traditions define and monitor their own standards:

It is suggested that proficient qualitative research can only develop within reputed and inspiring intellectual *craft traditions*. Such research is at once theoretically grounded and methodologically rigorous (even if its rigor takes different forms from that which is to be found in positivist research) (p. 6). ...the main point is that an understanding of standards comes with an awareness of a tradition and cannot be arbitrarily imposed from outside it. (p. 11)

This qualitative study is informed by established and emergent Māori research principles and epistemological assumptions, in particular Kaupapa Māori research. Kaupapa Māori is not compatible with the ontological and epistemological assumptions that undergird quantitative and much qualitative research and governance research is no exception. Māori research therefore has its own intellectual tradition and research standards within which this research should be evaluated.

### **The Māori Research Tradition**

Following on from the qualitative challenge to positivism in social science, indigenous researchers have further transformed the nature of knowledge creation. In particular, in Aotearoa, epistemologies and research methodologies and practices have been challenged by, and benefited from, the influence of increasing numbers of Māori academics. The researched have become the researchers (Smith, 1999).

### **The establishment of Kaupapa Māori**

The education field, in particular the Auckland University education department, proved to be fertile ground for the development of Māori research methodologies. It was to become the birthplace of the Kaupapa Māori Research constructs.

The struggle by Māori for control over how Māori children and young people are educated has led to the establishment of Kaupapa Māori education initiatives across all educational levels....The term Kaupapa Māori captures



Māori desires to affirm Māori cultural philosophies and practices. In short, Kaupapa Māori is about being fully Māori. (Pihama et al., 2002, p.30)

A number of factors influenced, or at the very least, were congruent with the emergence and acceptance of Kaupapa Māori methodology. The challenge issued to positivist methodology from feminist theory and critical theory, the creation of Māori-led and controlled education (Kōhanga Reo), and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal collectively propelled the notion of Māori-led and Māori-determined research forward (Smith, 1999).

The term Kaupapa retains its indigenist meanings even when projected into contemporary understandings and exists independently of its more modern scholarly adaptation. In a more relaxed usage organisations are assumed to have their own Kaupapa or agenda or strategy. In the formal sense, the term has been attributed to the old knowledge of spiritualism and traditionalism, emerging from 'old knowledge' (Sharples, as cited in Pihama et al., 2002, p. 32). Kaupapa Māori in a research context has become a specialised and meaningful term that has been drawn into scholarly circles.

Amongst the most noted early scholars are Linda Smith and Graham Smith. By 1997 Graham Smith had completed his doctoral thesis, *The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis*, and in 1999 Linda Smith published her powerful text, *Decolonising Methodologies*. Both were pivotal publications. Additional publications that raise the international profile of Kaupapa Māori Research include the Smith (2005) and Bishop (2005) chapters in the *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Indeed Linda Smith is an editor of the *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008).

Kaupapa Māori, has become established across multiple disciplines as both an epistemological and a methodological approach to guide research with Māori.

Māori directed methodologies have had significant influence on research practice. Kaupapa Māori methodology has opened up a continuum of epistemological and

methodological space. Generally speaking there are now a variety of ways in which to approach Māori research that can be Māori affirming. For methodology that means some sort of accommodation to the evolving Kaupapa Māori research tradition.

### **Criteria for Māori research: Advancement and Māori development**

While there is much concordance about the benefit of Māori research done by Māori there is debate amongst Māori about Māori research. The problem becomes Kaupapa Māori research principles and practice, while desirable, are not always possible. In an organisational sense Māori are as widespread throughout organisations and organisational settings as non-Māori. In fact Māori are predominately in non-Māori organisational and institutional settings. So too are Māori researchers. For this, and other reasons variations of Māori research methodologies have evolved to accommodate differing views of Māori research models. In health the emergence of the Māori-centred approach (as Māori research) has provided for more flexible research parameters. For example, stated simply, Māori Research is considered to be “any research which actively seeks to produce Māori knowledge outcomes” (Cunningham, 2008, p. 52).

Of note here is the term actively seeking implying a deliberate research motivation. Here *Māori knowledge outcomes* are further explained as increasing Māori capacity whether through practice or theory. In addition to determining whether or not the research is Māori research Cunningham considers whether the research provides for Māori Advancement or for Māori Development, or, whether the research has dual goals. For the purposes of this discussion the distinction between Development and Advancement is merged.

Cunningham’s (2008) dual goal framework proposes the following 7 criteria for research evaluation in relation to *Development* and/or *Advancement*: Research intent, Māori involvement as researchers, Methodology, Māori involvement as participants, Contribution to capacity building in Māori research, Addressing priorities, and

Outcomes. In this thesis the criteria are interpreted as follows. Italics immediately following each heading are quotes from Table 3.1 in Cunningham (2008, p. 53)

**Research intent:**

*Active intent to produce Māori Knowledge or capability outcomes or to inform Māori outcomes generally (Development and Advancement).*

This research *actively* intends to both “produce Māori knowledge and capability outcomes” by collaborating, documenting, and analysing the views of Māori directors themselves.

**Māori involvement as researchers**

*High level of Māori involvement as researchers (Development) or; Significant involvement of Māori – may be in advisory or kaitiaki positions.*

Kia tūpato He āta whakaaro, whakaaro āta ranei? (Cautious thoughts)

Māori Research has not only insisted non-Māori seriously question their role as researchers of Māori and Māori issues but it has also required Māori researchers to reflect carefully on their own position in their research processes with Māori. As the preceding review of Kaupapa Māori scholarship has revealed, Māori identity in relation to research with Māori is actively debated.

While contested matters of identity have additionally been fully discussed in the previous chapter, an additional (albeit more superficial) reference to identity is useful here. Being Māori is both being Māori and being ‘Western’. Māori identity is constructed within the confines of colonisation. The category Māori and the category Pākehā were simultaneously created (Campbell, 2005); it cannot be otherwise.

Postcolonial theory and critiqua informs us that on-going colonial attempts to present Māori as the homogenous Other is convenient for the State (Panoho & Stablein, 2012). However, Māori are not a homogenous category and are as varied as are Pākehā. The colonial phenomenon of Othering gives rise to tension and contradiction not just between Pākehā and Māori but also within Māori.

Nevertheless postcolonialism informs us that a homogenous identity, known as a strategic essentialism (Spivak, 1996), can be a politically useful way to deploy resources and to gain leverage. Tension and contradiction aside, to be Māori is a necessary but not sufficient requirement for research with Māori.

### **What are the reflections of this researcher?**

Ahakoā kei waho he ma, kei roto he Māori (although outside is white, inside is Māori)

This thesis represents a stage in my journey, a stage that reflects a personal and now, an intellectual, struggle related to identity, belonging and (in)justice. Such is the challenge issued by Kaupapa Māori to us all, Māori and Pākehā. I proceed proudly with my Whakapapa whilst now performing a Western life, due primarily to the pursuit of education. As Smith (1999) has noted; I am no longer one of the researched but instead I am one of the researchers. I am not a statistic anymore, and I struggle with the 'I', the privileging of the self. This research is generated by a researcher who has a specific inter-relational, cultural, historical, and political context and the I cannot and should not be extricated from that experience. There is no apolitical-self available:

The irreducible 'I' of the English language is relatively detached from its social context; indeed, that one can even distinguish between the "I" and the context is revealing in itself (Kondo, 1990, p. 32)

Philosophical angst aside, a PhD is an achievement awarded to an individual.

However, this research has been made meaningful and indeed possible only with the support, interest and involvement of many, in particular, the participants.

Ko te utu mō te aroha, ko te aroha anō

(To the participants, respect received is respect acknowledged)

### **Methodology:**

*Involves Kaupapa Māori or other Māori controlled methodologies (Development) or; Involves robust methodologies (Advancement).*

The methodology in this research is informed by established and emergent Māori research principles and epistemological assumptions. Kaupapa Māori research epistemologically centres Te Ao Māori, Te Ao Marama (Barlow, 1991; Mead, 2003) and in doing so claims and legitimates discursive space for itself. It follows therefore that methodological design and analysis will stem from the imperative to facilitate Māori authenticity and voice (Bishop, 2005) generating Māori-centric data.

While there is a flourishing literature base exploring and defining Kaupapa Māori research principles, little is available to illustrate the ways in which these principles are translated into research methodology for research in non-Māori settings such as the District Health Board.

In keeping with Prasad's (2005) assertion that "proficient qualitative research can only develop within reputed and inspiring intellectual *craft traditions*" (p. 6), this study looks to the Māori research tradition, and to Kaupapa Māori understandings for methodological guidance.

With reference to method, the thesis positions Kaupapa Māori as various sets of principles that draw on contemporary understandings of traditional cultural values. Whilst implicit values have become explicit, they guide but do not prescribe. A prescriptive set of rules is not part of the picture. Instead the research evolves on a case-by-case basis and is highly contextual. There is therefore no recipe and no standard set of guidelines from which to proceed, particularly for non-Māori researchers thereby offering some protection and privacy to Māori as research subjects. However the principles do provide practical guidance, they describe a way of being Māori that can be used as a methodological tool. Here, the observance of tikanga has provided a central tool. Of greatest relevance to this research are the cultural values used by Smith (2005, p. 98) summarised in Table 4.2.

*Table 4.2 “Community-Up” Approach to Defining Researcher Conduct*

Cultural Values (Smith, 1999)	Researcher Guideline (Cram, 2001)
Aroha ki te tangata	A respect for people – allow people to define their own space and meet on their own terms.
He kanoahi kitea	It is important to meet people face to face, especially when introducing the idea of research, “fronting up” to the community before sending out long, complicated letters and materials.
Titiro, whakarongo...korero	Looking and listening (and then maybe speaking). This value emphasises the importance of looking/observing and listening in order to develop understandings and find a place from which to speak.
Manaaki ki te tangata	Sharing, hosting, being generous. This is a value that underpins a collaborative approach to research, one that enables knowledge to flow both ways and that acknowledges the researcher as a learner and not just a data gatherer or observer. It also facilitates the process of “giving back,” of sharing results and of bringing closure if that is required for a project but not to a relationship.
Kia tupato	Be cautious. This suggests that researchers need to be politically astute, culturally safe, and reflective about their insider/outsider status. It is also a caution to insiders and outsiders that in community research, things can come undone without the researcher being aware or being told directly.
Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata	Do not trample on the “mana” or dignity of a person. This is about informing people and guarding against being paternalistic or impatient because people do not know what the researcher may know. It is also about simple things like the way Westerners use wit, sarcasm and irony as discursive strategies or where one sits down. For example Māori people are offended when someone sits on a table designed and used for food.
Kaua e mahaki	Do not flaunt your knowledge. This is about finding ways to share knowledge, to be generous with knowledge without being a “show-off” or being arrogant. Sharing knowledge is about empowering a process, but the community has to empower itself.

N.B. Adapted from Smith (2005, p. 98)

In this table Smith proposes a cluster of cultural values in relation to researcher conduct that identifies central and coherent aspects of tikanga. These values are further explained using “Researcher Guidelines” (Cram, 2001, as cited in Smith, 2005, p.98) where explicit behaviours are provided as illustrations of appropriate conduct. These central and coherent aspects of tikanga permeate this study. More than simply guidelines for researcher conduct, for methodological direction and for analysis, these values are inherently important values generated from Māori knowledge:

In point of fact tikanga Māori cannot be understood without making use of maatauranga Māori. All tikanga Māori are firmly embedded in maatauranga Māori, which might be seen as a Māori philosophy as well as Māori knowledge. While maatauranga Māori may be carried in the minds, tikanga Māori puts that knowledge into practice and adds the aspects of correctness and ritual support. (Mead, 2003)

In addition to considerations of researcher conduct, Kaupapa Māori methodologies also challenge the researcher to consider fundamental issues of social and political power and control the knowing researcher may have over the naive subject.

**Māori involvement as participants:**

*High degree of Māori involvement – may be involvement of Māori data or knowledge rather than people (Development) or; Significant degree of Māori involvement - may be involvement of Māori data or knowledge rather than people (Advancement).*

All participants are Māori and involved in District Health Board governance, most are directors.

**Contribution to capacity building in Māori research:**

*May have significant contribution to either workforce development or the development of Māori relevant methods and methodologies (Development) or; may have significant contribution to Māori workforce development.*

Public policy actively supports Māori health workforce development. *He Korowai Oranga* (Ministry of Health, 2002) calls for participation of Māori at all levels in the health sector. The *Whakatātaka Tuarua Māori Health Action Plan 2006-2011* (Minister of Health and Associate Minister of Health, 2006) reiterates this call for an increase in Māori health participation, in particular in the workforce development and governance sectors.

Research reveals some current governance arrangements as problematic for Māori. As the health governance review in the previous chapter has revealed Health Reforms research (Barnett et al., 2009) and the Health Reforms 2001 Research project have identified general governance issues amongst DHB members in *Report No. 2* (Barnett & Clayden, 2007). *Report No 6* further revealed specific governance problems, and promise, amongst Māori DHB members (Pere et al., 2007).

Participation at board level is important because it directly facilitates Māori contribution to strategy, monitoring, and resource allocation. Early management governance literature tells us that intra-board process moderates contribution (Forbes & Milliken, 1999; Johnston et al., 1996). However, little is known about intra-board process. Current health governance research tells us Māori directors experience intra-board tensions (Pere et al., 2007). Furthermore, practitioner commentary reveals additional pressures, both in terms of performance and scrutiny, are experienced by Māori when fulfilling DHB directorial roles (Modlik, 2004).

My research will ask Māori DHB directors to reflect on their experiences of DHB governance. Directors will be interviewed following a Kaupapa Māori research approach to avoid the cultural consequences of the discourse of deficit that dominates Western research.

Sensitive to the possibility of undue scrutiny the directors may experience, introductory information was prepared to signal not only the Māori-centred nature



of this inquiry but also to explicitly reassure potential participants that the nature of the research is experiential not performative:

The focus of my project will be on your experiences of the directorial process (not on any directorial outcome). I am interested in *your views* and *your issues* as a director. This is in contrast to much governance research which focuses on outcomes, not process. While outcomes are important there is some question as to whether “results” give us enough insight into director activity. I am interested in your views of the governance process. I stress again, I am not evaluating your activity as a director. (See Appendix H)

**Addressing priorities:**

*May address a priority issue for Māori or capability building or both (Development) or addresses a priority issue for Māori, may contribute to capacity building (Advancement).*

This research focus on Māori directors of District Health Boards follows from prior research and relates closely to the expectations and requirements laid out in the NZPH&D Act. As mentioned previous research and commentary has indicated both promise and problems. Additionally Boulton, Simonsen, Walker, Cumming, and Cunningham (2004) identify governance concerns:

Whereas previously Māori participation was concentrated in health service provision, the inclusion of specific provisions in the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 has resulted in greater Māori inclusion in governance, planning and decision making roles. However, there are concerns over strategy implementation, sustainability and workforce development. (p. S2:35)

This interim report, while focussing on more of the resource based views of governance, does signal intra-board issues. This is consistent with management governance literature, in particular board process literature, which suggests a group dynamic has the potential to enable and/or constrain resource contribution.

Pere et al. (2007) reveal more detailed concerns over Māori DHB governance issues, in particular concerns in relation to Treaty responsibilities, in relation to Māori health policy, in relation to community consultation, and in relation to Māori provision and capacity. This research intends to more fully investigate Māori directors perceived needs and governance demands in order to more effectively support Māori directors in their governance role.

### **Outcomes**

*Increases the Māori knowledge base and /or the capability to undertake Māori research (Development) or: increases the Māori knowledge base. May contribute to increased Māori capability*

The NZPH&D Act via an entrenchment of Treaty principles has specified representation of Māori at DHB level – Earlier research both foreshadows and confirms emergent concerns amongst Māori directors themselves about their roles - accountability tensions, cultural influences, contextual difficulties, strategy implementation, sustainability and workforce development. In addition to these issues facing Māori directors, Modlik (2004) identified emergent and significant cultural concerns both for Māori and non-Māori governance:

Increased opportunities in recent years for Māori participants in public sector governance have highlighted a number issues particular to Māori directors. These issues are relevant to those recruiting and working with Māori directors, as well as Māori directors themselves. (p. 20)

### **Locus of Power**

While criteria proposed by Cunningham are Māori participation and outcome focused, other criteria address the central concern of the dynamic of power between Māori participant(s) and researcher(s). Bishop (2005) suggests it is the Locus of Power in relation to Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimacy, and Accountability (p.112) that require careful reflection on the part of the researcher.

Some of these dynamics of power concerns, in a greater or lesser form, have permeated Western notions of ethics. Although, no doubt, well intentioned the Tikanga to Pākehātanga formal ethics scrutiny remains awkward and, at times, imposed culturally inappropriate rigidity. The overlaying of both a Māori research framework and a Kaupapa Māori framework supersedes even contemporary notions of Western ethics (see A Note on Ethics below). Thus it is each of the five concerns proposed by Bishop that will be considered in relation to this research as follows:

### **Initiation**

Who, and what, has initiated this research? The concern is that the research question is imposed from outside the participating group, and importantly from outside the cultural concerns, cultural practices, and the cultural preferences of the participating group. How the group is accessed is also related to these concerns.

This research thesis – *A Māori-centred inquiry into health governance: Māori directors on District Health Boards* was initiated by the coincidence of multiple factors; personal interest, legislative changes, Māori health research policy, and importantly, by calls from Māori DHB directors themselves.

In relation to personal interest the motivation to better understand being Māori in a colonised world which, by definition is non-Māori, is the result of lifelong cultural dissonance brought about by experiences of incommensurability between the two worlds. The specific interest in Māori governance had come from more recent experiences; first as a young adult involved in Māori Land Court research, and latterly with management study, management practice, and governance consulting.

Legislative changes to the nature of, and the delivery of, health care in New Zealand (NZPH&D Act) have (potentially) provided for Māori representation at District Health Board level. This change in legislation has offered a unique and discrete opportunity to support and strengthen Māori directorial activity.

The Health Reforms 2001 Research Project revealed directors themselves felt they would benefit from a better understanding of their role(s). Concerns specifically signalled were accountability tensions, cultural influences and contextual difficulties (Barnett & Clayden, 2007).

Prior to beginning my research the views, and the direct input, of two experienced Māori DHB directors, two of whom were DHB directors was sought. In addition the researcher was fortunate to have consultation with a kaumātua extensively experienced in Māori health governance issues that also offered support. This consultation process provided the confidence, and the affirmation necessary to develop the research proposal further and to approach the directors themselves. A significant portion of this research therefore has been driven by concerns expressed by Māori, and by the Māori participants themselves.

Kaupapa Māori research methodologies caution us never to assume access to participants as of right. Trust is a process, greatly assisted by discussion with relevant people, by personal introductions, by *kanohi ki te kanohi*, and by *whakawhanautanga*.

Access was investigated in the first instance via an e-mailed letter to the Māori Health Directorate (See Appendix A). This letter outlined my proposed research, situated myself in this research as Māori, and requested that this information be passed on to directors to determine their own interest in being interviewed – The process took many months. The Directorate facilitates a national collective of Māori DHB directors known as Te Matawhanui. Eventually contact with directors was initiated through attendance at their bi-annual hui. This was an invaluable source of contact for participants.

The process of access to Te Matawhanui hui was via considerable negotiation involving multiple levels of authority. Seeking access was a precarious process and was never taken for granted. It became apparent that administrators and professionals in the health sector had experienced research fatigue, particularly with

research with Māori. Eventually the collective decision of the directors themselves regarding my attendance at their hui was granted. I was, and remain, very grateful to have been granted access to Te Matawhanui. My role at Te Matawhanui was that of an observer. Identities and specific details of discussion at their hui is, by agreement, confidential.

Access to subsequent hui, and requests for interviews were on-going. Permission to attend each hui was sought and never assumed. Formal introduction of the researcher (as a mihi) and formal introduction of the research took place in person at the initial hui. The same introduction was also offered in writing to hui attendees (Appendix G). A general request for participation was issued both in person and, again, in writing at hui. Many directors offered (or were approached) their time, in addition many suggested others that they thought would be willing to participate and would be important contributors. Many more offered their support than were able to be interviewed due to the practical issues with their geographical location and with their available time.

Researcher access to, and attendance at, the Te Matawhanui hui provided the opportunity for potential participants to assess my motivation and my credibility including my Whakapapa. Te Matawhanui provides a 'Māori' space for directors, one where both their concerns, and their celebrations were culturally contextualised. Access to directors for this research was located within the cultural concerns, the cultural preferences, and the cultural practices of the directors themselves.

### **Benefits**

Here the concern is that the research will advance the interests of the researcher alone and that the research act itself may disadvantage the participants.

This concern can be certainly abated but not eliminated. Māori researchers, like non-Māori researchers, have academic goals and economic aspirations. While there is no doubt that the interests of the researcher are advanced given the central purpose of

this research is to generate a thesis to be submitted in ‘partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy’, this does not preclude mutual benefit, and/or indirect benefit.

Calls to increase Māori capacity at all levels are widespread. Management theory and practice, and in particular governance theory and practice has not begun to accommodate Māori. Māori directors, like non-Māori directors look to governance theory and to governance practice for guidance. This research at the very least will provide an archive of the collective Māori (DHB) directorial voice, a taonga tuku iho, a testament to those, as their kōrero reveals, that were amongst the first to directly place the Māori voice at the DHB table. Other benefits, in a more practical sense, are listed above under Outcomes.

### **Representation**

Here the central concern is that ‘Māori voice and lived experiences’ have been and are interpreted with a non-Māori lens, thus devalued. The question becomes how does the researcher represent the researched? The assumption is that a Māori researcher, having lived Māori experiences, is more able to represent Māori voice and Māori experience. While it is a problematic assumption, as postcolonial theory informs us, it is nevertheless a recognised and somewhat accepted assumption and follows from the concept of strategic essentialism (Spivak, 1993).

In this thesis the Māori research tradition informs methodology. I explicitly privilege Te Ao Māori in my representation of the researched in this project. Like all research assumptions the Māori research tradition is inextricably connected to cultural assumptions, which are in turn inextricably connected to identity. However, colonial experience, as articulated in Western research, Bishop (2005) reminds us, has created confusion about Māori identity:

Many misconstrued Māori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Māori and non-Māori alike,... (p. 111)

Therefore, my representation is constructed within the confines of this colonised experience despite my aspirations that it be otherwise.

Further, given that this is a study of corporate and institutional governance, management and governance theory informs my interpretation of director's views as well.

### **Legitimacy**

Here the concern is that a non-Māori research process will be generated from a discourse of deficit because it will be conducted from outside of Māori lived experience. The view is that research with Māori cannot and should not be conducted with uncritical methodological tools because such tools are unable to either recognise or to value Māori perceptions. The incommensurability and the hierarchical nature between the Māori world view and the Pākehā world view is well documented as the source of the discourse of deficit both by early postcolonial writers such as Said, Fanon, and Memmi, and by contemporary indigenous theorists such as the Smiths and Bishop.

### **Accountability**

Here the concern is that the research institution is solely in charge of knowledge production and knowledge production processes. The question is who owns this research?

This research project accepts a dual accountability. In the first instance this thesis must be judged to be an original contribution to knowledge as determined within the management paradigm. As a product of Māori Research tradition this thesis has accountability to the researched in both its process and its outcomes beyond that of an academic product.

Given that this research is informed and guided by epistemologies from within “previously silenced groups” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 11) and given that the governance practice-theory nexus facilitates praxis, there is potentially both a motivation and a means by which this research could lead to innovation at the board table. This research, in terms of accountability then can be viewed as potential for transformation, not simply research for academic fulfilment.

Contact with participants during the research process and up until the time of submission (including during an extended period of suspension) has been maintained, welcomed and expected. At times contact has been with individual participants, at other times via a group such as Te Matawhānui. Researcher attendance at multiple Te Matawhānui hui has enabled feedback, both formal and informal not just to participating directors but also to all attendees. At the request of the attendees, the hui facilitator agreed to disseminate any publications/reports generated from this research.

For those directors not attending Te Matawhānui the principle *kanohi ki te kanohi*, where possible was observed. Transcripts were returned for participant review. While it was the researcher preference to hand deliver the scripts this was not possible in many cases given the geographical spread of participants, instead phone calls, posting and/or emailing scripts was done in many cases.

The extent of requested feedback varied amongst participants with some requesting a full copy of the thesis, others indicated a summary of the findings would suffice. Some participants, in requesting full thesis copies, were interested in compiling their own organisational/iwi/hapū data base of Māori research.

This study has not fully met the demands of a Kaupapa Methodology. Rather it is methodologically informed by a more general Māori research tradition and the qualitative research tradition. Ideally more participant collaboration where more hui and more shared *kōrero* would feature. This however was not possible due to



constraints on time, funding, and travel for both the researcher and the participants. Rather, this research process has been guided by Kaupapa Māori principles.

### **A Note on Ethics**

This research proposal was reviewed and approved by the Massey Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) Southern B application 07/08. Table 4.3 lists MUHEC compliance documents. In addition to Western ethical research standards, Māori research methodologies have already begun to influence the nature of research with Māori. Research and funding bodies such as the Health Research Council, the Massey Human Ethics Committee, and the Ministry of Health have at least begun to address this concern with increased scrutiny and challenge of research proposals. For example, this research proposal was required to demonstrate consultative efforts consistent with *some* Māori research tradition expectations. However, despite some accommodation, ethical review of Māori research remains centred on the western model. Researchers in the Māori research tradition have additional, at times incommensurable, ethical accountabilities that are not anticipated or accommodated by such committees. For example, the requirement that informed written consent be granted by any and all individuals in a cultural context where knowledge is a collective enterprise and where a speaker is accustomed to oral authority places both parties as mutual adversaries. Where there is an established rapport between the researcher and the speaker the mana of both parties is upheld. There were occasions where participants were uncomfortable or hōhā with the ethical demands, in particular the multiple formal consent forms. In one instance, a kaumatua did not provide written consent on the basis that he had already provided culturally appropriate (oral) consent; *“you don't need that”* was his comment. After asking twice for written consent the researcher chose to be silent on the matter. Pursuing the matter further would likely have caused insult. This research was guided by Kaupapa Māori principles. In particular the cultural value aroha ki te tangata espoused by Smith (1999) which is explicitly defined by Cram as respect for

participants by “allowing people to define their own space and meet on their own terms” (Cram, 2001, as cited in Smith, 2005, p.98). Further, insistence on written consent in this situation would be inappropriate but more importantly culturally insulting. Special permission was sought from MUHEC to enable inclusion of this participant’s korero.

**Table 4.3 Ethics Documentation and Participant Information**

Documentation	Included in Appendix
Approval of Ethics Application	A
Request for Access to Te Matawhānui	B
Information Sheet for Participants	C
Participant Consent Form	D
Introduction to Transcript	E
Authority for the Release of Tape Transcripts	F
Transcribers Confidentiality Agreement	G
Te Matawhānui Hui Introduction	H
Te Matawhānui Hui Follow Up	I

### **Methodological Details**

#### **Data**

While interviews formed the basis of data collection significant other information sources supplemented and/or contextualised interview data. For example DHB generated reports such as District Plans and Board minutes helped familiarise and identify and situate particular topics and people. Observation at DHB meetings and public forums also offered insight into board process although attendance was only possible during the public part of each meeting. Multiple DHB boards’ observation also provided insight into regional governance issues and into differing group dynamics. Of central importance was the opportunity to observe (and later present) at various Te Matawhānui hui (Refer to Table 4.5).

There were preliminary discussions with two Māori DHB directors and one Māori director for guidance. Two pilot interviews were conducted with two experienced Māori directors, one an established health researcher, the other a non-health director, both were manawhenua. Data from these sources was not included.

Fourteen Māori District Health Board directors were interviewed. Additionally, three Māori health managers and one kaumatua were interviewed. In total 16 interviews with 18 participants (two interviews were with two participants) were conducted and recorded. Participants were reassured their contributions would remain anonymous. In Aotearoa/NZ, given the population, it is sometimes possible to accurately speculate on an apparently anonymous identity. The Māori DHB director pool is small, as a result, no further participant information can be provided. Given the small sample size it is not possible to quantify the number of elected directors in the study; this could compromise the confidentiality of the participants.

### **Transcription**

Apart from four interviews the transcription task was contracted out. Transcribers were required to formally comply with ethics processes (Appendix F), agreeing to uphold confidentiality. At the time each interview was transcribed each transcript was checked against the audio recording for accuracy by the researcher.

### **Geography**

Directors from seven different DHBs were interviewed, three South Island and four north Island DHBs were represented.

### **Sampling**

The following sampling considerations were accounted for – geography, demography, tenure and experience. Both appointed and elected directors were interviewed. Given that there was legislative provision for two Māori DHB directors at each of the 21 DHBs there was a potential pool of 42 Māori directors. In practice however Māori representation on each DHB ranged from no representation to up to

four Māori directors (although this was rare) and this fluctuated during the term of the research. The 14 interviewees represented around 35% of the potential pool of directors.

### **Demography**

At the time of data collection there were 21 DHBs ranging in population size from about 30,000 to about 500,000 (Parliamentary Library, 2009). Two subsequently amalgamated. Directors were sought from large urban, from large rural, and from small urban DHBs.

### **Gender**

There was no gender strategy involved in participant selection. Apart from a strategy to involve multiple DHB regions, assisted by the Te Matawhānui hui, the selection process was a mix of self-selected directors and other directors who were approached by the researcher. Seven male and seven female directors were interviewed. The managers and the kaumatua were male. *Census of Women's Participation 2010* (New Zealand Human Rights Commission, 2010) reports female participation in DHB governance was 44% (p.10).

### **Experience**

Participating director experience ranged from professional director status to newly initiated directorships. Most directors participating held or had held multiple and varied roles as managers and directors not just in health but also in other sectors.

### **The interviews**

The central aim of the interview process was to ask Māori directors to reflect on their own experiences of governance within the unique legislative framework of the DHB. The semi-structured interview was chosen for two important reasons. Firstly it is epistemologically determined, and therefore culturally appropriate, and secondly it is consistent with emergent management governance research methodology. After the introduction of the research theme the discussion, as much as was possible, was

led by the participants themselves who recounted actual events. In doing so, participants were able to provide first-order data (Spencer, 1983). The significance of qualitative research, in particular first-order data in governance, is examined in the governance literature review.

Audio taped semi-structured interviews were conducted and each took around one hour with some up to two hours long. Some involved multiple participants although most were individual. The semi-structured nature of the interview provided guidance for some interviewees particularly as the interview began. Others were comfortable to determine the interview agenda themselves once the research was introduced. A list of questions was prepared but used as a guide only (Table 4.4). Once the research introduction took place each interviewee was advised of their participatory rights. This information was provided verbally and in writing. Their consent, in writing, was then requested. Transcripts were then sent back to participants for further consideration and approval.

The interviews were conducted in a variety of places, wherever was most convenient for the participant. Places included: restaurants over breakfasts and dinners, during a car journey, in various offices, and at one marae. In keeping with Kaupapa Māori principles, participants themselves determined not just the interview venue but also the interview duration and style. Interview length ranged from 45 minutes to just over two hours and was variable in style, as determined by the participants from formal to very relaxed. Formality included both taha Māori formality with a whaikōrero (formal speech) at the start of one interview, and taha Pākehā formality with a corporate-style handshake and a one-line introduction. During some interviews kaumatua and others were present and/or moved in and out of the interview process. As is tikanga, acknowledgements, greetings and conversations were always exchanged with those that moved in and out of the process. While the interview atmosphere was collegial in many cases, some participants' were kaumatua and kuia which signalled a different dyad – that of a kaiako/ākonga or

teacher/student dyad. As a result, some interview material reflects more general Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori kōrero (Māori philosophy and knowledge) and less director experience kōrero, as is consistent with Māori-centric data.

### **Interview questions**

This research is an attempt to identify and collate those issues that both enable and constrain Māori directorial activity on DHBs and follows on from prior research where directors themselves signalled concerns. The questions posed therefore were based on these concerns and attempted to more fully explore director's experiences.

*Table 4.4 Sample Set of Interview Questions*

---

Interview questions
Can you tell me the story of your appointment/election?
What's happening now that the latest round of reforms is settling in?
How does appointment versus election affect you?
How are directors balancing representation and advocacy?
How are accountabilities to the Minister managed?
What are the relationships between Māori and non-Māori directors?
What constrains and what enables effective Māori health governance?
What is good governance?
What are examples of good governance?

---

### **Observation**

Attendance at multiple DHB meetings and in different regions throughout the research process also provided context. DHB meetings tended to follow similar formats and cover similar agenda items however each of the regions had their own idiosyncrasies. Public attendance at DHB meetings fluctuated although during many of the meetings attended there were no members of the public present. Observation at Te Matawhanui hui took place in a different cultural context and is discussed as

an aspect of Māori research methodology in the following section. For specific attendance at meetings see Table 4.5 below

## Data summary

*Table 4.5 Summary of Data Sources*

<b>Interviewee data</b>		<b>Date and Place</b>
14 District Health Board Directors		Various national venues
1 Kaumatua		October, 2007-November, 2008
1 Senior DHB Advisor		
2 DHB Executives		
<b>Observation data</b>		
<b>Meeting attended</b>		<b>Date</b>
Te Matawhānui hui		September, 2007, April & November, 2008, April, 2009, April, 2012
DHB meetings	Midcentral	April, August, September, 2007 April, May, June, August, Sept, 2008
	Whanganui	September, October, 2008
	Taranaki	October, 2008
<b>Conference and Hui attended</b>		<b>Date and Place</b>
MCDHB conference Towards 2010		October, 2007 Palmerston North
Māori Health Responsiveness Hui		Aug, 2008 Kauwhata Marae, Manawatu
<b>Archival data</b>		
Ministry and DHB publications; District Annual Plans, Annual Reports, reviews, and newsletters, media generated reports.		

## Data Analysis

Directors (and others) spoke of their experiences in their respective organisations. The task of categorising and condensing these experiences in a manageable and meaningful way that provides some faithfulness to the speakers now falls on the shoulders of the researcher. Partly this is guided by cultural values (such as kanohi

ki te kanohi, and whakawhanauatanga) and partly by analytic conventions. In short, methodological and epistemological conventions guide issues of data management and data analysis.

Golden-Biddle and Locke (2007) suggest using a qualitative data management strategy where the first level of abstraction is theory/context interplay. In achieving this, the challenge is not only to remain methodologically and epistemologically consistent but also to offer some transparency as to how the data is organised so that the audience and the contributors can make independent evaluation as to the knowledge contribution this piece of research may make.

The theory/context interplay in this study provides for an a priori assumption generated from within the Māori research tradition. Specifically, this is tikanga based and relates to the Cultural Values espoused by Smith. In relation to the research question (*What is the experience of Māori directors in Western governance structures?*), the a priori assumption in this methodological setting or theory/context interplay is: *that Māori directors will experience some cultural incommensurability in a Western governance setting.*

Given that the potential for cultural incommensurability is a guiding assumption how then will data be further organised? As the research process unfolded, predictably, aspects of cultural incommensurability became salient and provided for conceptual or thematic groupings of data. Braun and Clarke (2006), in a comprehensive review of thematic analysis, describe a theme in the following way:

A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of *patterned* response or meaning within the data set. (p. 82)

Despite appearing natural these thematic groupings are constructed. In an attempt to be reflexive and in keeping with qualitative conventions this researcher is cautioned not to 'romanticise' data, in particular with the use of 'thematic' analysis:



[Data] can be misinterpreted to mean that themes 'reside' in the data, and if we just look hard enough they will 'emerge' like Venus on the half shell. If themes 'reside' anywhere, they reside in our heads from our thinking about our data and creating links as we understand them. (Ely, Vinz, Downing, & Anzul, 1997, p. 205-6, as cited in Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.80)

Alvesson (2003) reminds us that interviews are neither fully laden with meaning nor instrumental tools from which to extract the truth. He suggests researchers take a 'reflexive pragmatism' approach where interview data can be analysed in multiple ways because data can be generated via multiple interviewee motivations, and analysis can be affected by interviewer limitations.

*Pragmatism* here means a willingness to postpone some doubt and still use the material for the best possible purpose(s)..... There is an adaptation to the constraints and willingness to compromise between reflexive ideals and the idea to "deliver knowledge. Reflexive pragmatism calls for epistemological awareness rather than philosophical rigor. Jumping between paradigms is a very difficult sport, but it is not impossible to widen and vary one's horizon, looking self-critically at favored assumptions and lines of inquiry. In order to facilitate such a reflexive pragmatist approach, we need to have a fairly broad and multiangled theoretical understanding of the research interview.

(Alvesson, 2003, p. 25)

Alvesson's reflexive pragmatism provides the opportunity to both engage in and move beyond the neo-positivist, and the interpretive. For this study, post-colonial theory and critique provides analytic insight. Of note here is the question posed by Smith in relation to the apparent absence of indigenist theory in post-positivist traditions. Smith (1999) articulates some of this frustration and pain in the following way:

Our colonial experience traps us in the project of modernity. There can be no 'postmodern' for us until we have settled some business of the modern. ....we

are still being colonised (and know it) and we are still searching for justice. (p. 34)

Foundational KM scholar, G Smith (1997) states:

[Kaupapa Māori]...should not be misinterpreted as a rejection of Pākehā culture or a retrenchment to Māori culture; what is being advanced is the meaningful recovery and development of Māori language, knowledge and culture as well as Pākehā culture. It is not a one or other choice for Māori, [we] want access and success in both Māori and Pākehā cultural forms, however the cultural capital which is mostly unavailable and denied within the Pākehā dominant societal context, is that pertaining to Māori (p. 453, as cited in Penehira et al., 2003, p. 6)

In a less esoteric but useful sense, governance theory contributes an additional methodological framework, offering a data organising tool, specifically that of a stakeholder orientation (Freeman, 1984). This provides for a matrix of sorts where cultural values across stakeholder entities are examined.

Data, in summary, gathered with the a priori assumption of incommensurability has been filtered through a tikanga lens and organised into themes. These themes are in turn simply organised in relation to the various organisational actors, including stakeholders, in the governance domain. The utility of multiangled theoretical analysis, post-colonial theory and critique, is introduced.

Having theoretically considered critique of, and guidance in, data collection and thematic organisation of interview data, the next section details how the process unfolds empirically.

### **Themes and Data Analysis Process**

Collectively eleven hours and 13 minutes of interview time was recorded. Virtually every interview included general introductory comments and especially whakawhanaungatanga (discussion of ancestry) as well as tangential discussion.

These comments were set aside and not considered as part of the data. In general, responses that did not relate to the research question were excluded. Further, any responses that identified the speaker or the DHB, and/or a region where the place, name, or designation could not be made generic or disguised were also excluded. Interviewer content was excluded, so too were comments without content such as um, oh, and yeah, thus condensing responses into paragraphs of narrative. This first step reduced the data to 328 paragraphs in total where most responses were single paragraphs or less than paragraphs. Generous amounts of narrative were included in responses to assist with context. Quotes from participants are presented in italics. For each quote, the participant is coded numerically, followed by the time stamp for that interview. Where two participants were interviewed together, one is A1 and the other is A2.

These 328 paragraphs of data were pieces of narrative that described participants' experiences of DHB governance, and/or of their experiences of Te Ao Māori in relation to DHB governance. It was during this preliminary analysis that previously salient judgments regarding themes became operationalised. As Braun and Clarke (2006) propose: "[a] theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of *patterned* response or meaning within the data set" (p. 10). In particular, and guided by the a priori assumption, aspects of cultural incommensurability were salient. This thematic process was multi-staged and involved further reviewing and re-reviewing of the 328 paragraphs to eventually choose the best fit, or the best capture of data. Given the importance of transparency (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007) in this process all the stages of the thematic process are detailed below.

The primary challenge at this early stage was managing the tension between the theoretical and methodological underpinnings and the range of responses in the raw data. In other words, the challenge was how to be as inclusive as possible with the data but not so inclusive as to obscure any interpretative focus. In as far as is

possible, how to faithfully give voice to the participants while utilising the theory/context interplay (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007) is the research-reporting task.

The paradigmatically different governance and Māori-centred traditions created even more tension in relation to data analysis. While this tension may have been conceptually predictable, it was not until the empirical stage that it manifested in an obvious way. Alvesson (2003) encourages such a multi-theoretic approach. In his reflexive pragmatism approach, while acknowledging “jumping between paradigms is a very difficult sport” (p.25), he recommends it “to widen one’s horizon” (p. 29).

This paradigmatic tension became evident when two distinctive organising strategies materialised. The first strategy explored was one that categorised data into experiences with different organisational actors. This held promise that themes could be organised around the actors in the directors’ domain. Directors spoke of their relationships with, and responsibilities toward, various groups in their governance domain. While board process may appear to simply involve interaction amongst board members participants’ experiences of DHB governance also involves many organisational actors in their governance landscape. For this reason, stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) appeared to be a useful and obvious organising tool. The central assumption of stakeholder theory is the acknowledgement of the demands and accountabilities placed upon a director in the wider governance landscape. The theory therefore extends the number of actors beyond simply the shareholder model although it does not acknowledge the demands and accountabilities of fellow directors.

While this stakeholder approach to data categorisation was useful it offered only themes of organisational actors outside of the boardroom. Significant internal board experiences could not be captured using this framework. As a result, an additional organising theme was added to ensure board process would be captured. The

themes then became: The Ministry, The Executive Directors, The Providers, The Community Groups, The Consumers and Voters, and, The Fellow Board Members.

An attempt to manually code the 328 paragraphs of data into these organisational actor themes was started but it became apparent that this was a superficial organising strategy and much of the complexity of the interrelationships between, and within, the stakeholder (and the fellow director) groups were not being captured. For example, the interrelationships between Māori directors and Māori stakeholders were reported as different from the relationships between Māori directors and non-Māori stakeholders. This wasn't accommodated for when using stakeholder theory alone as an organising tool.

A concurrent, organising strategy, informed by Māori-centred theory, in particular Kaupapa Māori theory, held more promise of data capture. Management and organisation studies generally do not accommodate non-Western relationship complexities, despite the innovation of stakeholder theory as a “[blending] together [of] the central concepts of business with those of ethics” (Freeman, 1994, p. 409). Predominately Western ethical concepts (to a greater or lesser extent) in relation to the individual, and/or the nuclear family are accommodated. In contrast, a central assumption in Te Ao Māori is the assumption that the mana of one person (or one group) is not held by that person alone but rather is collectively held. Stakeholder theory does, in a limited way, contemplate a wider organisational audience although it cannot contemplate complex and embedded relationship principles such as Manaakitanga (caring and responsibility for others) and Whanautanga (responsibilities via relatedness). While it may seem obvious that Māori-centric data is more effectively filtered via Māori-centred analytic categories this was not entirely the case. The governance setting introduced multiple governance concerns consistent with those of non-Māori directors that also warranted capture.

Participants consistently reported experiences that located themselves in both their cultural nexus and in their professional nexus. Data patterns that reflect this dual

location were identified. One such example would be, in addition to a DHB governance role, a role as a manager or director in a culturally determined organisation such as an iwi. In addition, participants reported being constantly called upon, either directly or indirectly, to examine where they have come from, who they are at the board table, and to examine with whom they relate to either culturally and/or professionally. A theory /context interplay with a Kaupapa Māori data organising strategy more appropriately captured these relationship complexities.

Bearing in mind the complicity of the researcher in the social construction of knowledge, the theoretical and methodological lens, and the nature of the research position (the question, the assumption, and the objectives) a thematic analysis was constructed clustering around three Māori-centred themes. They are as follows: *No hea au?* (Where am I from), *Ko wai au?* (who am I) and *Ko wai ōku whanaunga?* (to whom am I connected?)

Three central themes are chosen. The first, *No hea au?* (Where am I from?), concerns the relationship with the Crown and clusters data about the appointment and election process. The second, *Ko wai au?* (Who am I?), concentrates on intra-board relationship data and is organised around role expectations. The third theme, *Ko wai ōku whanaunga?* (to whom am I connected) concentrates data about participants' cultural and professional nexus

While these themes are whakapapa related (thereby potentially calling to the fore deeply held spiritual beliefs) they are being used in a contemporary sense and have been employed as a tool to assist interpretation of contemporary (Colonial) Māori reality. While it is not a comfortable experience to use and adapt Te Marama o Te Ao Māori (understanding of the Māori world) into such an academic setting to not acknowledge Te Marama o Te Ao Māori is even more uncomfortable. To remain silenced and not challenge theory and practice is to reinforce and perpetuate colonial organisational hegemony, particularly in the case of this study which challenges the

realm of the managerial and corporate elite (Koenig & Gogel, 1981; Jesson, 1987; Westphal & Zajac, 1995, 1999; O'Higgins, 2002).

Faced with the knowledge of the data organisational shortfalls of stakeholder theory but wanting to maximise the data representation the opportunity to blend them both was explored. Attempts to blend both strategies in a matrix of the five stakeholder groups plus the fellow director group (six themes) across the three Kaupapa Māori themes resulted in 18 different cells. While comprehensive, the matrix proved too cumbersome and diluted the data to the point where it was difficult to see patterns. At this point stakeholder theory, as an organising strategy, was sublimated and used instead as a subtheme tool. The three themes informed by Kaupapa Māori became the central data organising themes and they provide the structure for the remainder of this chapter.

Since Māori directors also function and perform as non-Māori directors function and perform in Western governance settings it was no surprise that many responses were consistent with documented non-Māori directorial experiences. General governance literature documents a variety of concerns both agency and process related. NZ health governance research reveals specific DHB director concerns and provides somewhat of a benchmark that enables comparative analysis between Māori director experience and non-Māori director experience. The next step in the data analysis process then was to separate those responses that were more or less consistent with non-Māori directorial experiences. These were the first responses filtered and clustered together and these responses are referred to as Consistent Director Experiences. In total 78 paragraphs of data were coded into this theme (see Table 4.6).

The remaining 250 paragraphs of data were then manually coded into their respective themes and then collated into three separate documents entitled: No hea au? (Where am I from), Ko wai au? (Who am I) and Ko wai ōku whanaunga? (To

whom am I connected?). Sixty three paragraphs were coded into more than one theme, thus the total of coded paragraphs is greater than the original total.

*Table 4.6 Tabulated Word and Paragraph Count for Data Analysis*

Data	Word Count	Paragraph
Ko wai ōku whanaunga?	15, 083	129
Ko wai au?	11,431	112
No hea koe?	7,957	72
Director Consistency	8,192	78
Total	42,663	391
(Original Total)	(35, 686)	(328)

As stated participants' reported experiences that located themselves in both their cultural nexus and in their professional nexus. Participants reported being constantly called upon, either directly or indirectly, to examine where they have come from, who they are at the board table, and to whom do they relate either culturally and/or professionally. As a result each of the remaining three themes have been constructed and defined in the following ways.

The first theme: No hea au? (Where am I from?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of the appointment pathway to the DHB, and includes experiences and views of the alternative pathway, that of election. This theme also captures data relating to participants' experiences and views of the contribution to governance that they make given their respective experiences of poverty, marginalisation and disparity. The appointment data is essentially data relating to the (Ministry-mediated) relationship between the Crown and Māori (that is Te Tiriti). Alternatively and deliberately this theme is also termed grass roots with the pejorative implication that accompanies poverty, marginalisation, and disparity. The term was used often enough as to be synonymous with disparity. However,



participants also use the term with the positive implication of being in touch with the everyday reality of Māori life.

The second theme: *Ko wai au?* (Who am I?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their roles at the board table and how those experiences affect board process. This theme is also alternatively and deliberately termed the White Elephant utilising multiple idiomatic interpretations. First, meaning the elephant in the room (that is ignored), secondly meaning the overwhelmingly large creature that no one has a use for and in fact is a burden, (as in a white elephant stall) and thirdly, a comment on the visible majority status of fellow DHB directors.

The third theme: *Ko wai ōku whanaunga?* (To whom am I connected?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their cultural and/or professional nexuses. Alternatively and deliberately termed 'related interests' with the intention to mimic and challenge the ever-present conflict-of-interest discourse in governance.

**Tā te rangatira, tāna kai he kōrero (For a leader, their discussion is their sustenance)**

Participants offered their kōrero in good faith without necessarily knowing what the researcher may do with their contribution. The researcher then goes off to 'perform' various non-Māori tasks with their 'data'. The extent and the nature of focus on some of their statements and the putting together and the pulling apart of multiple kaikōrero in this way, while necessary, is without their involvement.

For this reason a note has to be made on the paradigmatic tension between Kaupapa Māori research principles and apparent Kaupapa Pākehā research principles (namely virtually all of the qualitative paradigm) regarding the 'deconstruction' of data. Kaupapa Māori has significantly and specifically guided this data management process. This data management process has deconstructed (in both the lay meaning and the critical meaning) Māori experiences and as such, is counter paradigmatic and risks academic and cultural challenge. However, for the purposes of this study

the promise of Kaupapa Māori research as a standalone epistemological approach does not deliver enough insight into the postcolonial organisational domain of a DHB. Conversely, to not use this epistemological approach is to commit the colonial transgression of researching the native with western tools (albeit with a native researcher) and risks generating and perpetuating the discourse of deficit identified by foundational scholars. Articulating this tension goes some way toward the management of it and, hopefully, an eventual resolution of it. This chapter proceeds with this tension in mind. As Penehira (M. Penehira, 2011) confirms:

Many have argued that the academic arena is treacherous ground in which to apply Indigenous analysis (Battiste, Bell, & Findlay, 2002; Witt, 2007; Castleden, Garvin, & Huu-ay-aht First Nation, 2008; Walker, 1990), and for a long time it has been. However, it could also be argued that there are many areas of academia in which it would now be considered treacherous for an Indigenous person to do otherwise. (p. 19)

While the three data subsets appear as independent of course they are not, they are constructed as such in order to intensify data to facilitate interpretation. Their boundaries do overlap and they can and do have other meanings in different contexts however, they have been 'appropriated' and defined here for the purposes of this study. There is also some implied linear order to them with the first being the appointment/election process, the second being board process, and the third being 'outside' of the board room or in the background. This constructed order helps give some sense of progression of experiences but has been created for the benefit of the researcher, and the reader. In fact the order is more circular where Related Interests, more or less, lead to appointment although not in a straightforward manner as will become evident. The following three chapters detail each of the themes with illustrative quotations and commentary. Generous pieces of narrative are deliberately offered in the interests of transparency and fidelity. These chapters present synthesised and collated participant kōrero in thematic groupings.

## Chapter Five: No Hea Au?

As stated, this study is a Māori-centred inquiry into health governance and asks directors themselves to reflect on their governance experiences. Existing governance research directs us to explore board process in order to generate primary data. Māori research traditions seek to generate Māori-centric data and direct Māori researchers to research with Māori using Māori research methodologies. Kaupapa Māori epistemology in particular points to a differing World view.

Golden-Biddle and Locke (2007), in discussing data management strategies tell us the theory/context interplay should be transparent and consistent. The previous paragraph summarises the theoretical approaches. The research question, the a priori assumption, and the research objectives collectively provide the context for the three results chapters:

*Table 5.1 Research Goals*

Thesis Title
A Māori-centred inquiry into health governance: Māori directors on District Health Boards
The Research Question
What is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards?
The A priori Research Assumption
That Māori directors will experience some incommensurability in a District Health Board setting
Research Objectives
To generate primary governance data that is Māori-centric To explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership heterogeneity

The methods chapter outlined how the data collection and analysis process for this thesis was considered, organised and planned. As previously mentioned, interview

data forms the basis of this study. The purpose of the results chapters is to document and report participants' experiences as recounted during their interviews by presenting the themes that were identified. Three central themes are chosen. The first, *No hea au?* (Where am I from?), concerns the relationship with the Crown and clusters data about the appointment and election process. It is presented in this chapter. The second, *Ko wai au?* (Who am I?), concentrates on intra-board relationship data and is organised around role expectations. This is presented in Chapter Six. The third theme, *Ko wai ōku whanaunga?* (to whom am I connected) concentrates data about participants' cultural and professional nexus and is presented in Chapter Seven.

### **The First Theme: no hea au? (Where am I from?)**

This first theme focuses on the appointment process and, as stated, captures data relating to participants' experiences of the appointment/election pathway to the DHB. Table 5.2 identifies the subthemes that will be discussed in this chapter. At first glance this title may appear limited. However the socio-political, historic and economic circumstances that led to the legislative imperative to appoint Māori to DHB governance profoundly complicate the entire appointment process. These processes are detailed in Chapter Three.

***Table 5.2 Theme One***

Theme	Subthemes
No hea au?	Legislation and appointment Tenure Election Grass roots as disparity

The data in this theme deals mostly with responses that relate to the stakeholder role of the Crown as mediated by the Ministry, and as determined by legislation. As stated, this theme is also termed Grass roots. Participants used the term in two ways. Both with the pejorative implication of poverty, marginalisation and disparity and with the positive implication of being in touch with reality, unlike, they believe, their non-Māori counterparts.

### **Legislation and appointment**

As stated (see Health Governance, Chapter Two), the NZPH&D Act provided for Māori representation. Thus, the phenomenon of the Māori DHB director is created by legislation. The Act was noted as a significant shift forward in public health. In this Act, the requirement for Māori representation at the DHB level, the entrenchment of the Treaty, and the requirement for consultation with Māori provided for potentially significant Māori voice. Participants generally spoke of the Act and subsequent policy in a positive tone, certainly comparatively with the past:

*In CHE days there was a very large separation by comparison. Now, absolutely we're right up against them [the Ministry]. So the CHE directors had a very different approach. From a Māori point of view there was absolutely a minimal understanding and drive towards Māori health. There was no understanding of the structural policy components that actually help shift change. Yes and it has structurally and policy wise I think it's been a significant shift, significant shift.... rubber meeting a road, has it really made a difference? Yes I think we could say that and I could support that by the fact that we have a much more permissive policy around, oh no I'll change that, a much more explicit policy around effecting improvement in health status for Māori, around reducing [inequalities]...(12 13:22)*

*[The shift to Primary care] has been a positive shift because in, and so go back to one of my earlier statements is that the benefit of the current Act is that there is an explicit emphasis around Māori participation and partnership, yeah the 3 p's I'm not sure how the protection bit gets in, maybe it's purely because we've got the structures and processes in place now which actually protect the Māori under the Treaty to participate and to advocate for the*

*things they believe and want. Ok so we do, so that's important. The other issue is going back like you say, this is from a structural policy point of view um, and the current Act also then gives more strength to the governance, to the boards to be bold about their directions. (12 38:27)*

Given the concern expressed over the political nature of Māori health funding, the legislation and the entrenchment of Treaty principles provides for some stability and continuity in recognition for Māori health funding but does it offset the political influences that come with changes in government?

*...So there is a kind of super theme and a desire I believe to be supportive of things around Māori and other issues like that. However when the crunch comes, when the bottom line gets pushed, and it comes down to winning votes, most of the votes are going to come from mainstream NZ, and then, well when you're really pushed, the Māori agenda in the end gets pushed out, we know that. We know for example as we lead up into an election for sure as the sun comes up and goes down, Māori are going to get bashed, they're an easy political football and that's what's going to happen, and it's happening right now... .Politically Māori, when the crunch comes I don't think they count. (13 8:28)*

All participants spoke of the importance of having Māori representation on the DHB, and in doing so, acknowledged the role of legislation in this requirement. At first reading, pt 3 s 29(4)(a-b) states a minimum of two Māori DHB Representatives are required. However, a closer look at the Act reveals that there is no absolute duty placed on the Minister but rather "the Minister must endeavour to ensure" Māori appointments to the board. There were instances in multiple DHBs where there were fewer than the two representatives assumed to be required by the Act.

*I was appointed two thirds of the way through an appointment term of three years in the last three year term. I'm talking in terms of the election process to fill a Māori seat that had essentially been empty for those two years. It hadn't been refilled. What happened was that when it came time to reappoint, one of the appointees that had been sitting on the board...So, one appointee; we had two appointees – two tangata whenua appointees to the board. One*

*appointee had resigned because he was moving [away] and the other appointee the Minister had decided not to reappoint, and we're not quite sure why that was... basically there were no representatives [on] the DHB for two years of a three year term... and I know that [the Chair] had been pushing that whole time to try and get Māori appointments put in place...(A1) (28 1:00)*

One participant questioned the notion of a minimum and the requirement of simply two representatives, pointing out the hazards of legislative prescription where the minimum becomes the expectation, or 'benchmark' and limits creative thinking processes:

*Yeah, well I've always seen it as a minimum of two. I must admit I haven't picked that up for a long time. That was kind of what, hard wired into the back of the somewhere, somehow....that again, of itself can be; that's why I think – it's a bit like when you ring fence money you know, you never ever get a chance to look outside of it and you know, what to say, why can't you have five [Māori]... appointed, you know, that's why I think where prescription; I have a philosophical bent against highly prescribed top down environment. What's to say five talented Māori couldn't be .... It just kind of sets... hard wires the mind set and then the bureaucrats start to tick the box. ... The consequences – you get all these unintended consequences going on and a literal interpretation going on, you know. (A1) (25 1.16)*

Lack of clarity about minimum representation aside, the Act was seen as a significantly positive step for Māori health. However, the selection, appointment and re-appointment process appeared to be an uneasy mix of, colloquially termed, the Minister and the marae interaction where there may have been consultation but not transparency. Multiple references and speculations were made regarding Ministry contact with iwi leadership (possibly considered consultation by the Ministry) but most of this contact was ad hoc, private and therefore not transparent. There did not appear to be a standard selection and appointment process. Concerns were

expressed regarding capacity given the relatively small pool of potential directors from which to select. Being Māori was a necessary but not sufficient requirement:

*The first time that I came up for consideration, we had the interview, [name] was quite enthusiastic that I was appointed to the board and I don't think it actually had anything to do with being Māori, I think I was the only one with any financial background at all, that was even being looked at. (A2) (25 20:06)*

The tension between supporting capacity development and placing inexperienced directors at risk was acknowledged as necessary to some extent and parallels the struggle with women on boards where experience is a requirement, and as such, proves a barrier to entry for the inexperienced who, of course, remain inexperienced (Hawarden & Stablein, 2008).

*Sometimes people have been appointed that struggle to contribute at governance level in this structure and I think some people have unfairly been put into situations [without enough] in terms of training, experience. I think to a certain degree that has been recognised by Te Kete Hauora from the Ministry in terms of some of the specific governance development that's gone on. I can see a soft edge about some kind of focus trying to bring some people on. Its capacity building stuff. The benefit is that some people who relish the opportunity to better...to take the opportunity that they are given to get there because it's always one of the big challenges...is how do you get your foot on the rung of the ladder? And so people have been afforded [opportunity] and some people take that... I think some people respond to that really well and some people really struggle ... (A1) (25 38:00)*

The point was also made that within this smaller pool of potential DHB directors only a subset may find public sector governance appealing. Entrepreneurs for example, may not be interested in public sector governance. Furthermore, the appointment process was clearly seen as a political process and as such the potential pool is even smaller.



*There are some very capable Māori directors that could foot it...[but] That is where the politics comes in. Sometimes if you have kind of got your colours nailed to mast politically, sometimes that discounts you. I think there are some very competent Māori directors around who could foot it immediately. (A1) (25 38:00)*

There were responses that expressed shortfalls in all stages of the appointment process, with nomination, with selection, with appointment, and with reappointment or non-reappointment. Iwi nominations of suitable candidates were seen as variable with some iwi more strategically oriented than others:

*Well, it's really difficult because, and I guess this is where it becomes interesting about which iwi are quite strategic and which iwi are still heading towards becoming strategic. Because the other issue we find in terms of any appointment across the board, whether it's to a DHB position or those, is actually finding the right person or actually putting a person up because there is no-one else to put up, and the problem with putting up a person when there is no-one else to put and if they don't perform, then it sort of taints; well, it taints that process for others who are on that board. And so that could be another barrier in terms of people taking seriously the appointment that iwi put forward because of the calibre of the person that they are putting forward. (A2) (28 22:00)*

The selection process was reported as complex with potential input from many different stakeholders and was experienced as exclusionary both by candidates, and stakeholders other than the Ministry. The consultation process was viewed as limited to whomsoever the Ministry decides should be consulted. While there are many instances of contractual (as in Memorandum of Understandings) arrangements between iwi and the Ministry via DHBs relevant non-iwi (or pan-iwi) Māori groups were not recognised and had no input into selection and/or advisory matters. Instances were recounted where two different professional Māori groups were felt to have legitimate contributions in both a selection and an advisory capacity however they were not recognised in a consultative capacity.

*I have to say that sitting in front of the other interview selection processes that some of them, you kind of thought that there is where it was left.... and it went in behind some closed curtains and came out the other side completely different. Sometimes things come forward from Wellington and sometimes things are bottom up. There is a local consideration, there is a bureaucratic consideration sometimes in front of that and after that and there is a political one after that as well and sometimes that's in front of it as well. It just depends somewhere in that loop, where it starts. But the outcome can be influenced by anyone of those things.*

*(A1) (25 15:11)*

*And... you don't know, because if you don't make it through the other side, you don't know if it's because there was somebody who was better or you personally have done something wrong. (A2) (25 15:11)*

Appointment and induction processes were experienced as inconsistent and untimely. The Ministry appear to have a wait and see approach to board appointments given that the board composition is not apparent until the post-election phase and participants spoke of being given little or no notice of appointment and suggested that delay potentially compromised any Māori director eventually appointed.

*I thought the Māori appointments took far too long at processing. We had a Pacific Island appointment, an Asian appointment straight away....And when we had orientation in Wellington, they were able to be there, but the Māori ones hadn't been appointed and I thought it was atrocious that you would have orientation for DHBs without the Māori appointments even being confirmed. They're behind the eight-ball... I think that if they said you don't have orientation until all the appointments are made it might make them hasten the Māori appointment process. I actually think that it's wrong that tangata whenua are not present at orientation because I believe they miss out on that, especially if they are new appointments – if they haven't been on the DHB before they miss out on that but as well as that, if it takes too long they miss out on the opportunity of a Chairmanship; they miss out you know... (A2) (28 17:27)*

*I got confirmed the day before that trip and got told that you were heading to Wellington the next day. That's what happened with my appointment and mine was what I would have considered an uncontroversial appointment because the iwi were happy with my performance. I have to say that I was really surprised about the process that they used for that too because when I got appointed I never got inducted to the board; I basically went to a board meeting and that was my induction to the board. (A1) (28 18:00)*

However, despite concerns over lack of capacity and concerns regarding the nomination, selection, and appointment processes, Ministerial appointments were highly regarded by this senior director:

*And my experiences have been that the appointed Māori membership to the board have been really excellent appointments.....in terms of my working with those appointments. So from [this DHB] point of view I have nothing but respect for the minister of the day and the current minister who have appointed my Māori, my Māori colleagues. (19 2:50)*

Once appointed to the board, and having served one term, directors are then evaluated with the view to reappointment. While this director's experience of appointment was relatively unproblematic they expressed confusion and concern that their reappointment process was somewhat secretive and casual:

*It was an interview over the phone but the questions were... I found them a little bit off-putting. "Is it true that you and [another MD] have lost the confidence of the iwi?" ...So when I put it to him, "Where did you get that from?" The comment back was, "Tittle tattle". Then the question was, "How do you get on with [another MD]?" I said, "I get on very well with [the other MD]... Why do you ask that question of me?" And then he shut it down, "Oh, no, no, well, thank you for that" (20 9:34)*

## **Tenure**

The length of director tenure was raised as problematic, especially given the long term nature of strategic implementation in public sector governance and, especially given the recent nature of DHB Māori representation i.e. the learning curve and the

absence of any possible shared knowledge pool over time. While director tenure issues may also be problematic for non-Māori, for Māori there may be compounding factors such as capacity issues and difficult intra-board processes to overcome as well. Māori DHB membership is relatively recent, both the organisational memory (of the collective board) and the experience of the director therefore will not be as established. Strategic implementation can also be protracted in the public sector. The three year tenure period was not seen as enough time to be effective by some.

*Our Kaupapa because we have a semi new group coming through with the new board members, hopefully the appointed quotient of board members won't change, in terms of Māori you know because otherwise you have to bring everyone up to speed yeah. But it's also an opportunity to reiterate the emphasis for the board and the strategic priority for the board around our population health need - Māori reducing inequalities yeah. And that does why we are you know, diverting, targeting funding in these, into these initiatives. (12 22:00)*

*What evidence do we gather at our DHB that tells us as we go along, how far have we got to go or have we arrived? And our GM'S are saying – we won't know until we do our next health and need assessment – every three years. And by the time that comes out, I won't be on the board, so then that takes some onus off of them. Another Māori who has just started who will be thinking, who will still be coming to grips with it before they can ask the same question. We've got this project at moment in attempts of improving the quality of data that we collect, so we do this whole thing around a training programme for the administrative staff on how to record ethnicity. This is one of our outputs for this financial year. (27 26:20)*

## **Election**

There was considerable data relating to how and why the election process is problematic for Māori and there was considerable data relating to intra-board tensions between an appointed and an elected director status. This theme explores the former i.e. the problematic data and delegates the latter to a different theme. The tensions relating to the appointed versus the elected status are more appropriately

explored in the next theme where the second theme; Ko wai au? (Who am I?), captures data relating to participants' experiences of their roles at the board table.

There was a consistent preference for election expressed by many participants for multiple reasons. However, overwhelmingly, the election process was viewed as exclusionary for Māori. Becoming an elected DHB director is seen as much harder for Māori.

*I wish we could get there by elections. Our people just don't vote. To a Pākehā person they are taking a big risk if they don't know your name. (27 43: 52)*

*we have [a name], he puts himself forward, kaumatua, respected leader [of the iwi]but the majority of voters are not Māori so you are history before you start.....(9 19:07)*

*the voting process ...because it is all of [the rohe] you know there were not many people voted outside of [this city] because that's the highest populated area...so a lot of the appointees are from the rural areas....the other thing too...you have to have money...back to this election...too....being Māori and making yourself known you know I invested [money] for campaigning, for posters, for electoral things... and I was an independent and....you know there a lot of barriers around that for getting true representation for rural communities and for other people of different ethnic cultures yeah...it is a flawed process. (5 3:20)*

*... we had 21 people standing.... for the seven positions, 21 standing for the seven positions and despite the fact that what generally happens is if you're the first seven on the list you have a higher chance than the rest. The Māori were placed high but they still managed not to get in. (A1) (28 10:00)*

The electioneering process relies on considerable self-promotion, whereas humility not hubris is a key concept in Te Ao Māori where Kaua e mahaki (don't show off) is a central value (Smith, 1999). The whakatauākī; Kāore te kūmera e kōrero mō tōna reka (the kūmera does not speak of its own sweetness) reminds us that mana tangata is a collective, and reciprocal attribute. This does not inhibit the self-promotion

necessary for election success but rather highlights potential discomfort Māori may experience when contemplating and/or pursuing the election pathway to the DHB.

*when I first [started] campaigning that's how you had to go if you were to be successful, so I joined lots of groups, and I got in there ...so I just used to be there and networking .... you know I hate saying I'm doing this and I'm doing this and this and this... but, if you are not out there and people don't know who you are they're not likely to vote for you. (11 22:00)*

The voting turnout for local body elections is notoriously low and for Māori even lower. Barnett et al. (2009), taking a proportional view of representation, report that despite an improvement in Māori Elected representation, (2.5% to 7.5% from 2001 to 2004) Māori remain underrepresented.

The electoral forms themselves are confusing.

*[I stood]...to get women elected on...It's a DHB where only men get elected on. The first time, they were all white men....And I got on the radio and said how disappointed I was with the general public they had allowed all white men to be elected onto the first DHB and got a lot of talk back starting on that. But there were Māori women appointments made of course, and then the next time one woman got elected on, but she was elected on with all men. The appointment process helps to balance it, but it still doesn't balance it and so a friend and I both said... a friend and I both said, "Okay, we'll stand and see if we can get women elected on." But I realised it's the non-Māori vote that's got us there, not the Māori vote...Because they're the majority. I know Māori voted for me, but I know that I'm there because of the non-Māori vote. I also think that a lot of Māori are not really strategic in voting, because of the STV they don't just vote for the two of us, they vote for a whole lot; they might of placed us 1 and 2 (I don't know) but if they did, but then as they number more they are actually helping Pākehā men to get back in. (A2) (28 10:00)*

While election was preferred, yet appointment was deemed necessary, the dual pathways were seen to be counterproductive (or non-compatible) in some ways. For example, an instance where a Māori candidate who was substantially supported (but

not successfully enough) at election yet was not subsequently approached for appointment was recalled. In addition concerns were expressed regarding the value of a vote for Māori given the requirement to appoint.

*It is almost as if in this last round people have twigged on to that ...so why waste your vote on a Māori when 2 are going to get appointed anyway that was the [public group] yesterday that were talking about that you know...oh there were no Māori on the DHB...oh well they get to anyway.....(11 23:46)*

This was of particular concern where elected Māori were usurped or co-opted to fulfil the legislated requirement. The Ministry used elected Māori to displace potential appointed Māori.

*My winning election created a little bit of friction. Lucky I have good relationships with mana whenua in the area because my election reduced the Māori appointment by one. They got excited thinking well, they had three Māori now; we'll have the two appointed ones...plus me, but of course when I got in they then took away one of those appointed; they said, "Well okay we got one so we only need to appoint one more," ...and that was quite controversial because they made up which two they were going to ask possibly to be appointments or to put forward and then it became contestable between those two. And the appointment didn't take place for so long. Of course it did [set Māori against Māori]. Even some mana whenua were writing to the Minister because of the one they wanted to be appointed. So, that created a little bit of tension but it wasn't aimed at me; it was aimed at the board for allowing that to happen. (A2) (28 15:25)*

*...we actually had a Chairperson who had been crying out to make sure that there was iwi representation. Now, what had happened when I was appointed, there was actually another Māori, a person of Māori descent who had been elected, and so she had actually been placed also into that Māori... or deemed to be a Māori appointee, appointed to the Māori position as an elected person if that makes sense? And so he had been trying, so we still ended up with one less. (A1) (28 4:51)*

The dual pathways for Māori can also be counterproductive for those Māori who have been elected and it can, and does have consequences for intra-board relationships. (refer to the second theme)

*I love it that there are other Māori board members you know but you know like I always get put down about being... you know because when we introduce ourselves you know we have people come in and we go around the table and other board members go well I'm an elected board member and then I go well I'm an elected board member too so Kia ora, then at the end you know and then the others go around and then the Chairperson will go, there is no difference between an elected board member and a you know another board member. And I go no. that's right but I got elected, I spent a lot of time and money and everything else...(11 53:00)*

One further consideration in favour of the election pathway is that for Māori it is potentially the opportunity to break free of the discourse of deficit (Bishop & Glynn, 1999) that the appointment process inevitably reinforces.

*I'm not saying; I understand the intent and I don't think the STV was delivered. I mean it was again, another intent, and for all the reasons I appreciate the affirmative action position. I am just wondering whether there is going to come a time when our own talents and abilities go over and above that and I'm not sure how far away that is from reality but... Well, I just kind of; as I say, it just constrains the thinking and it narrows it down; 'If we get that then the Minister is going to be happy,' you know, that kind of; it's just taking the discussion to another level. It can hold us in there, you know. It's that argument, as you say; you take that deficit, the gap perspective you'll never look beyond and say well, "Why should we; why do we want to say we only want to reach the life expectancy of non-Māori.? You know? (A1) (25 1.18:03)*

### **Grass roots as disparity**

Many participants identified themselves as having come from the grass roots, or had experience with the grass roots or used similar terminology such as coming from the



ground up. While the term has many potential metaphorical meanings (political, economic, or geographical) it was used in conjunction with statements about disparity, poverty, marginalisation, and rurality. The term was used in a pejorative sense; grass roots became synonymous with disparity.

*there's a bit of that disconnect you know sort of not really understanding. You know for me it's from the freezing works, from you know fighting, well working, going to [university], it's always you know... still there you know and all that sort of stuff, so for me I feel as if my feet are on the ground, when I was talking about these issues. (22/3 16:07)*

*...yes I think I have the opportunity sometimes you may call it a conflict...by working in the sector and developing it from grassroots up and then supporting it as it comes through and then at the board level when the questions are asked being able to articulate very clearly how this fits into the business of the board (5 36:39)*

Furthermore, disparity in health was seen as part of a bigger picture of disparity:

*We've got kids at [a rural town] who haven't dental [care]...Yes, exactly...rotting to the gums. So how can these kids learn at school when their gums are swollen and sore? (19 19:50)*

*Well I understand Māori health disparity, I understand the Treaty ...you know...so those are my principals I bring that Māori welfare..., [Māori] wellbeing and health is not good and I know that... that's not all part of the health system there are other ...employment education all those other factors ..all those other factors since colonisation that bring us up to this time and place...but for me it is ensuring that the resources that come through DHBs are spread equitably across to ensure Māori health needs ...it's not like some of the people at the conference were saying, like the Dr today earlier this morning ... Jansen you know we can't treat everyone the same because the disparity...[the health of Māori] is actually different to*

*that of non-Māori... so you need to be giving more resources to those ones to bring them up to an equal footing then you can start saying now we will have equal distribution...( 5 7:55)*

*Like in oral health, it's a specific area... that is one of the particular areas that we are focusing on now but if we were to get the pūtea based on ...ah...our population base we would get significantly less than what we need ...ah ...because we've ...like our under 5s you know...with their oral health problems are 5X higher than in [a more urban region] where there is access to the Dentists, therapists etc so you know...that sort of population based funding formula doesn't take that type of issue ...you know you are starting from further back than other areas.... (7/8 14:31)*

*two damning statistics here are diabetes mortality and the onset of potentially serious diseases up here for non-Māori against Māori it's 15 years...[life expectancy difference] (7/8 10:55)*

*Well you know... this is what the data tells us. You know we have a 14 year life expectancy gap between Māori and non-Māori...You know if the reverse was true, there would be all sorts of targeted programmes to meet the non-Māori equation....(12 21:37)*

*I understand the barriers that people have for accessing care... you know whether it is through distance whether it is through lack of resources or telephones, cars ...at the board level there are board members who don't ...who have no idea of the concept of lifestyles that I see because some are middle class, some are wealthy. (5 13:32)*

One director hypothesised that the grass-roots status of marginalisation has been inherited and is intergenerational, manifesting as a contemporary lack of agency, not just in health but in other spheres:

*Yeah and I have still got a bit, a lot to learn but I'm quite confident in that area and that's often the thing that holds Māori back, you know they haven't got that...[confidence]...Yeah I mean look at a lower level at school trustees, I mean I look at [our] High School, most of the*

*schools in [this town], 30 to 40% population of the schools is Māori. We can't even get one member you know and so and it's one of the reasons is just the lack of confidence really.*

*...I can't really pin it down to anything other than if you take schools generally they didn't have good experience at school, oh I've got another theory on that, they don't this is and I could be wrong, this is only my opinion, they don't actually appreciate the role of parents in the kids' education...Māori parents don't actually understand their role with educating their kids. I mean it certainly happened in my generation where you know my parents would have seen that it's the schools role to educate the kids, they don't realise that the support that they can offer how much they can contribute (24 58:31)*

Another offered a more specific explanation for contemporary lack of agency in health care for Māori:

*It's often that people don't understand the treatment options that are available to them. Often all they have ever seen is that family who have had poor treatment and had poor outcomes and so they think there is no point to them. Little do they realise, so often they are not even offered the best levels of treatment and that is why the outcome is so poor. (27 30:35)*

While the barriers to health care access were acknowledged the urgent need for Māori to (re)develop a sense of agency in their own health care is proposed:

*The other half [of what I do] is removing barriers to our people getting access to services. Now the barriers are to... both internal/systemic, as you know, but they are also personal or generic to Māori and so at some stage Māori have got to take responsibility for their own health just as everybody else does. And so I see that as being a two way process.... Clearing away barriers but also motivating people to step up. ... the did not attends, the do not listens, the do not goes until it's too late. The too whakamā to go... Yeah, the no transport. The system that says you have to have an appointment every six months rather than everything at once. And that takes recognition of the fact that you may be a young mother, with three kids and no transport (17 18:37)*

There was added concern that, even with the shift out to primary care, PHOs were still not grass roots enough, and that those in the health sector that were reaching the grass roots did not have the importance of their work recognised:

*iwi provider nurses working out on the grass roots rather than in the primary care sector is, that's how it should be, that's how it's going to work....and I said so, then I brought it back to [the board], ok so this is the research, these are the results from the surveys, this is how it's going to work so what about paying the nurses that work out in that area the same as the nurses that are working in the secondary sector services you know because they don't, there's huge disparities there...No. Because it's like they're just like... that's money you know but for me it's not money it's people and well-being. And those nurses that are working out there with their expertise are not getting valued and paid for what they should be getting paid. But they're expected to change...[to turn] the whole illness around...(11 41:39)*

*...we present too late...I think you know personally I think more could be done to support Māori providers.... in resourcing them...(24 1:17)*

*there's probably a lot of other initiatives out there and PHOs are doing a lot in that area as well, but I just sometimes think they get the ones that would respond anyway, the harder to reach ones and that's not a... you know there's Māori but I bet there's a lot of a lower socio-economic... that are not being reached so and I just think, although I am a director of the PHO, you know it's still a major organisation and even they struggle with that concept. (24 1:07:20)*

In contrast to the dominant responses of disparity and grass roots, two directors discussed a positive health problem for Māori – that of the changing demographics and the potential problems with aged care for Māori:

*The thing to [watch] is that with our ageing population...I think we are suddenly getting caught in the same things that non-Māori were. That we have got parents in the social structures that we have now got, our social structure isn't the same [anymore](A1), it's really hard to look after them and for the most part, they don't won't to be looked after,*

*they're busy people. Their children (that is us) snapping around their heels, trying to make sure that they eat properly; they are not in the least bit interested. So, suddenly we are faced with exactly the same dilemma that non-Māori have been faced with. (A2) We have got same personal challenges as a family, like my mum, her mauri is her independence. (A1) (25:47:00)*

In summary, this chapter has examined data related to the first theme No hea au? (Where am I from?) The theme was organised around the four following subthemes; Legislation and Appointment, Tenure, Election, and Grass Roots. Overall this theme primarily captures data relating to the process around appointment and explores the Crown's legislated relationship with Māori as mediated by the Ministry. While the legislative move to appoint Māori was viewed positively the implementation of appointments was inconsistent. At times there were no appointments at all.

Nomination, selection, induction and reappointment processes were not transparent and were variable, generating confusion and allegations of tokenism.

Participants consistently reported themselves as having come from the grass roots and noted the importance of grass roots representation in relation to Māori health and disparity. The three year tenure was seen as too short by many participants for multiple reasons. The learning curve many directors felt they had experienced and the long term nature of public sector strategic implementation were examples.

Experiences of the election process were also captured and found to be particularly problematic. The cultural and financial difficulties of campaigning in conjunction with low Māori voter turnout were explored. In particular the Ministry's move to substitute elected Māori for Māori appointments was met with surprise and umbrage.

Discussion of this theme and the other themes that interconnect are more fully developed in Chapter Eight. The next chapter presents and examines data relating to the second theme Ko wai au? (Who am I?).

## Chapter Six: Ko Wai Au?

The second theme (ko wai au? – Who am I?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their roles at the board table and how these experiences affected board process. Responses in this theme are organised as a series of roles, as is consistent with governance process research (Spencer, 1983; Johnson et al., 1996; Daily et al., 2003b). At any one time in their governance activity Māori directors appear to address multiple simultaneous role demands as do non-Māori directors. However, Māori DHB directors face additional demands; they negotiate with their Māori representative role (as defined by their presence on the board) and they negotiate and navigate their iwi role (as manawhenua or not) and they negotiate and negotiate their professional role as a DHB director (as participants in a Western governance setting). At times these roles conflicted, sometimes this conflict was resolved, and at times it was not. Choices between roles were made.

**Table 6.1 Theme Two**

Theme	Subthemes
Ko wai au?	The role of the sole advocate for Māori (ill) health and the elephant in the room.
	The role of supporter and protector of all Māori in health
	The role of walking Treaty workshop, social engineer and race relations conciliator;
	The role of the second class director
	The role of the token director, pea te tahi, e rua, etahi, kore rānei? (perhaps one, two, some, or none?)
	The role of translator, Kei waenganui (in between)
	The role of the de-indigenised director, and the Ministerial directive
	The role of the connected director

Many directors consistently reported that struggle, hostility, and frustration characterised their board processes. This was attributed to a variety of reasons; differing status between elected and appointed, stereotypical assumptions, and general discomfort with what was perceived as preferential funding or the elephant in the room. Generally, participants reported that their boards were reluctant, at best, and resistant, at worst, to collectively engage in Māori health discussion. Some directors reported comfortable intra-board processes although non-Māori engagement with Māori health was still a missing feature.

Governance researchers (Spencer, 1983; Forbes & Milliken, 1999) have previously used the notion of a directorial role as an effective way to explore director activity. This has provided guidance in the organisation of data in this theme. Here, reported experiences of intra-board activity have been clustered around a series of suggested roles, as given in Table 6.1. These roles are examined next.

**The role of the sole advocate for Māori (ill) health and the elephant in the room.**

Participants generally report being typecast or locked in to this role. Non-Māori directors deferred matters of Māori health to Māori directors almost exclusively. This was experienced as a distancing on the part of non-Māori from any or all of the responsibility for Māori (ill) health. This is reported to lead to isolation in board processes and frustration with fellow board members. Participants reported Māori issues as invisible or, as the elephant in the room. Māori directors themselves were responsible for making Māori health visible. There is evidence that increased dialogue, whilst confrontational initially, leads to increased trust amongst members. However, Māori directors report that they unilaterally initiate this dialogue.

*I think that one thing that you've got to be careful of, especially in a big Metropolitan area (I don't know if it would apply; it might do), is that everything Treaty isn't dumped on the Māori representation. You know, like it's not our problem; it's actually their problem. You know, Treaty issues are not our problem. We didn't breach the treaty but everything Treaty*

*seems to be dumped on to any Māori representative. You know and I don't know why, that crazy thinking. And I just turn around and say, "Why are you getting me to do this? This isn't my problem; this is your problem. (A2) (28 1:20:00)*

Participants also report that they are in a conundrum where they feel they do always speak on Māori issues because others do not.

*My standard line these days, right, is that, okay you now don't look at me every time some...[Māori issue comes up], although you know as I mentioned earlier, I tend up to speak up for Māori things,"(23:53:00)*

*What would help facilitate would be everyone fully comprehending the agenda or the Kaupapa around ah reducing health inequalities, around understanding and recognising that if we are going to shorten a 14 year age gap, life expectancy age gap, then we have to do something serious, and one of the problems we have as a DHB and as a funder is that most of our funding is you know 98% of our funding is fixed. And so we only have stuff at the margins, yeah in terms of our discretionary stuff, because the rest of it is all contracted you know it's all one or three year contracts, it's very hard...(12 36:59)*

*Yeah, my other reason is that my constant message to the board is that Māori health is everybody's business. Like Paparangi, we'd recognise [everybody benefits]. (22/3 9:05)*

*If it's sticky, the Chair will go around and make sure everyone has articulated ... been able to articulate a view. The invitation is always there, it is pretty open. But mostly all the sticky stuff he will [be directive]. Even the Māori stuff, if some of them have an opinion they will offer it, but most of them don't. (27 48:57)*

*I think one of the other things I tried, and I don't know if it was very successful but I can remember early on you know, oh the Māori policy issue and eyes went [rolled] straight to my fellow director and straight to me, and I just went.... It was a bit like financials you know; the financial accounts – the accountant will look after that and we'll take our; we won't worry about that bit. I said 'Ah, ah, Māori health is an issue for the board', it's not [in*



*reality]; and that's the other constraining point, that tendency to go that way and leave all the weight to sit on the shoulders of one or two. (A1) (25 1:19:34)*

Directors report struggle to make Māori health an overt intra-board process. Once they do manage to do so, they report struggling to reject being ascribed the status of a beneficiary or recipient:

*[Our job is] fighting to get that elephant trumpeting and it is really difficult. Remember that one million dollars that we got every year for 3 years – they said, Oh look there's 3 million dollars – and I said "Oh no its 1 million dollars for the total worst statistically based people and you are giving us a million dollars." It's like here... we're giving you a million dollars aren't you lucky and I said "no we are not lucky" Sometimes I can see my fellow board members go "oh here s/he goes again".( A2) (25 52:00)*

*[perhaps] There is a white elephant in the room, that [Māori health]. It's always the one that got everybody uncomfortable for all of the reasons; some people just rank... out rightly think... and say what the hell is their focus on Māori health... I would say there are some directors, a lot of managers. Nobody would put; oh, absolutely. Nobody would put that out there publically; it's a dangerous place to go and put that out in public but you know it. (A1) (25 51:30)*

*There are some people that don't believe that Māori health is [an issue]that it is a racist based policy, why target a group?... favouritism etc, [these tensions] are just sitting in the background they are not getting on to the table and you are weaving your way through this to get a decision. (A1) (25 53:06)*

Speculation over the unwillingness of non-Māori to engage in matters of Māori health at the board table was made. Attributions ranged from simple ignorance and confusion over Māori health matters that may risk offence to possible impression management motives where commentary is withheld due to a (perceived) lack of confidence:

*It's funny though, because in the last 2 meetings when I've taken a really hard line on it [a Māori provider issue], it's amazing the number of pieces of paper that are getting slipped to me from various members. [from my Pākehā colleagues] It's like "carry on girl, keep going". (27 17:50)*

Although in some cases there is no doubt that reputation management was thought to be the motive:

*There's a whole lot of internal iwi stuff happening in our area, where one of the providers, because they have an alliance with the Chair of our Trust board, our Iwi Authority, our CEO and our Chair of our board have been directed by the Chair of the Iwi Authority to do all their consultation through this provider and so I am sitting at the board saying – no that's not the iwi, that's a provider you are discussing and we have a responsibility to have a Treaty relationship with the iwi and that is a provider is not the iwi. We spent almost 10 months debating the issue (me, the Chair and CEO) the rest of the board Members are saying nothing, they just sit there. ...With the Chair, its good, the CEO and I have two really good goes (in front of the board) and I am not afraid of him at all. I have had an out of board where I have had to go before the Chair and CEO to talk.... I was called in to speak with them about what I knew. They don't know the stuff, and they don't want to know either, they don't know what is happening in our iwi, they don't want to get stuck in it, they are scared. I told our CEO quite clearly; until this is sorted out you can come back to our meeting every month and report this stuff. My Pākehā colleagues on the board, they know the people I am talking about, a lot of them are familiar with them and they know how they operate. And they are the same as [my Māori director colleague, they want] just to keep themselves safe and keep their reputations, yea it's all sitting on me. (27 17:50)*

Some participants reported some shared kōrero and support amongst non-Māori directors regarding Māori health although many pointed out this was the result of repeated approaches and challenges. Considerable effort was expended on the part of Māori at the board table to create even the most emergent bicultural environment.

Many considered this as a worthwhile endeavour and reported positive outcomes with an improved level of trust as a result.

*Now there is one guy here on the board who people thought was very red-necked and was always challenging anything to do with Māori. Why should we do that? And other people got their backs up. They didn't listen to him. He was asking because he didn't know and he wanted to know so that he could fit it into the programme. Now, his method of asking was quite forceful, blunt but what they're now saying is that this guy is one of our biggest advocates. Why? Because we stepped up on our side, we created a framework he's saying that's what I've been looking for, for six years. Now he chairs [a subcommittee]. Now that you've done that I can approve that from [the subcommittee] point of view and we will just push him. You've got to go through that. It takes time. Well the other side of it too is that you've got to learn that you can't bash someone to make them listen. You actually have to sit there; you actually have to fight a few fights with them. You have to win a few; you have to lose a few. And then when you've got through that storming stage... (17 40:30)*

Emergent non-Māori discussants of Māori health are supported and encouraged:

*And I said to her that was a good question when she raised it, so in my mind that was exactly what you're saying and because she comes from a community base that genuinely wants to know as opposed to all the ulterior motives behind that question. (20 21:39)*

Other non-Māori perhaps have more confidence with Māori issues through governance experience:

*We've got a couple of long term, long term members – Pākehā men, one is the Deputy Chair; they speak on Māori issues. (A2) (28 35:19)*

In contrast, one participant was clearly able to enjoy legitimate contributions to their governance role that were independent of being Māori and did not have concerns about being typecast simply as the contributor to Māori health:

*...if you're talking about processes as such and good governance and things like that then I do speak and often the others would defer to that or they would concur. (17 30:00)*

Another took some time to break out of the sole Māori health role, at the same time recognising the demands of both the general directorial role and the Māori health role combined:

*It took me a while to realise the fact that I did have financial and governance skills. That was a little bit difficult but then having said that... it's not enough to sit there and just be the Māori representative, you have really got to work hard. It's all very well to get on the board, that's the [start]. (A2) (25 37:00)*

### **The role of supporter and protector of all Māori in health**

Participants reported tendencies to defend and protect Māori stakeholders and Māori management at the board table when conflict (potential or realised) arose. Sometimes this would manifest as simply a reluctance to engage rather than overt support. This was due mainly to the inability of the board to address Māori matters in a culturally meaningful and appropriate way and due to the tendency to (perceived) increased scrutiny of Māori financial activity. There are concerns (realised and anticipated) that Māori challenges to other Māori would be potentially misunderstood by non-Māori. In addition, Māori directors' report being aware of the institutional barriers and struggles Māori management face that non-Māori do not appear to be aware of. Cultural values such as Manāki ki te tangata (support for others), Aroha ki te tangata, (respect for people) and Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata, (don't trample on the mana of a person) (Smith, 1999) guide the interactions that engender the support and protection participants offer to Māori stakeholders and Māori management.

*I won't [challenge Māori performance] do it at the board table unless it needs to be brought up because the last thing they need is a Māori at board table who should be advocating Māori health gains to be putting down Māori in front of Pākehā colleagues. So, if I have an issue with Māori, I will either go directly to the health provider as a community member not as a board member or I will go and see the GM Māori Health and have a go at him. I can't*

*support Māori bashing by Māori in those areas, because all you're doing is; we have an element on our board where they will be rubbing their hands together and smiling with glee.... (A1) (28 24:33)*

Others report developing their own culturally appropriate paths for the resolution of intra-Māori conflict, and/or Māori stakeholder issues where possible:

*I don't want to take away anything that is already built up you know. Hard fought for, so I have to be very careful for what I ask for across the table and that really frustrates me.*

*Because you know when you talk to Māori you just want to say, what the hell's going on you know, give me the..., instead you ask them a question and they just go round the bloody thing and they don't even answer it... And then there's times when I want to ask a question and I'll think ohhh nah.... I don't because I don't want to give the Pākehā board members any little thing that they can make a huge issue out of you know, I might want to be asking a you know... so I suppose this time I need to build this relationship with[ name] so that I can just go and see him (11 31:30)*

*Around the board table I am pro-active but if there is an issue of concern or if there's an issue of a Māori on the risk register, it is usually dealt with at the Māori Advisory committee. That would have happened [with the high profile child abuse death] of course, but I wasn't on the board. That would have been a board issue because of the media and attention as well. But most things that are to do with service provision are dealt with at the Māori Advisory level or they go and see the general manager. Where there is friction between manawhenua and anything else I just go straight to the general manager of Māori Health...And hold meetings outside the committee environment ...[the rest of the board] they don't want to know about it [tensions amongst Māori]. They wouldn't want to know about it; they expect it to not be there. You don't want them to know that there are factions. Like you say, they'll say, "Oh this is good; they're fighting amongst themselves." No, a lot of the other board members aren't [a source of support].(A1) (28 30:31)*

Māori directors know the DHB governance domain is not a culturally conducive space to discuss Māori matters and avoid doing so where they can. One participant

recounts being asked at the board table to evaluate a kaumatua appointment. Rather than responding with a [unfavourable] judgement the question was deflected by pointing out that the board was not responsible for the appointment:

*The Chairman asked me publically, [name] are you ok with that? Do you think [this kaumatua] is a good choice?...and I looked at him and I said, it's nothing to do with this board Mr Chairman. Because he is on the payroll, it's a position where the CEO has chosen who he wants, it's not a board one, the board can't interfere with that, he's an employee (15 1:04:44)*

One other expressed clearly the lack of a culturally conducive space in their governance domain:

*...I am using, starting to use words like cultural safety, cultural competency and so on and so on alright and, it's, I mean somewhere along the line, some of us will find with [kaumatua] help, we're going to be able to talk about these things, but again you're dead right, when you come back to the way board meetings are structured, there is no place, there's no room to have these rarely to what I consider important discussions... (22/3 54:15)*

Participants spoke of (unaddressed) institutional barriers faced by a Māori executive on DHB:

*I think s/he struggled to carve out a place at the executive team level. S/he's confronting challenges all the time because of the Māori Health portfolio and the impact that s/he is [having]...running up against racism. (A1) (25 31:00)*

Directors reported being supported by Māori management and Māori management report being more effectively supported by Māori directors than non-Māori directors.

*...for me has been multiple firstly one of the sense of support because the issues I raise in my executive management role as [...]. So from my point of view I feel that when I'm putting contentious issues or difficult issues, difficult challenges... the reducing equalities argument....that are related to Māori health, that are related to Māori funding and planning.*

*That are related to Māori service design and service development that are related to Māori accountability measures, then I do have a sense of support from those Māori board members.*  
(12 7:09)

In contrast, one participant described a culturally sophisticated environment for Māori management, and for Māori directors as a consequence:

*We've got some great initiatives that ...Just fantastic, not just the Māori unit, you know, across the board. Even in the hospital and just right across the board and I give kudos to previous, obviously boards or Chairs or CEOs, whoever because the culture for Māori and Pacific Island in management is just absolutely fabulous.*(A2) (28 37:00)

Also in contrast, one participant challenged any sense of victimisation Māori may express whether at the board table or generally:

*I'm very mindful and conscious of not letting people put the victim mentality on us or us wearing it. Us as in Māori, we do have to take accountability for the good and bad that happened to us. Run with the good and fight the bad! And that goes back to my understanding of rangatiratanga. Rangatiratanga is never given it is always seized. And you want it... go get it.* (17 56:34)

*[If you are whakamā] Well then get over yourself. I mean you don't have to go out tomorrow and stand on a soap box and proclaim 'rangatiratanga' but if you take a little more control of your own life on a daily basis. If you stop smoking that's 'rangatiratanga'. If you recognise that you bash your kids then you're actually contributing to the social ills of this country as well as your own family and you can stop yourself because you can. That's 'rangatiratanga'! That's grassroots rangatiratanga. And every individual has the ability to self-create.* (17 59:11)

*Well we need role models. Role models are helpful but at the end of the day it comes back to a choice about what you will do and people need to understand that actually does come back to them and their choices they make. And they are accountable for those choices and when they understand that then they'll start to make better choices. Or at least they start to wear the*

*consequences of their poor choices rather than blaming other people. So that's my bug bear... I'm supported in that attitude by some Māori and other Māori they don't want to have a bar of it because to accept that is to accept that they take responsibility for the things that go wrong in their life. And there's a lot of blame mentality out there. They would rather not blame themselves. It's always someone else's fault. But that's a general thing across society now. (17 59:48)*

### **The role of walking Treaty workshop, social engineer and race relations conciliator:**

Participants felt their non-Māori counterparts held many misunderstandings about Māori. The lack of historical perspective and the lack of contemporary understanding of the role of the Crown in the colonisation process were consistently discussed. Many felt knowledge about Te Tiriti was considered a good place to start to gain some more appropriate understanding. In addition the terms of engagement of most Māori on DHBs are Treaty and legislation based. It is reasonable to assume therefore that Māori directors not only engage Treaty sentiment in intra-board processes but importantly look to the Treaty to provide guidance for Māori/Pākehā relations. However, despite the involvement and consent of both parties in the Treaty, collective lack of Treaty knowledge at the board table frustrated Māori directors. It was clear that participants held different views of the significance of the Treaty from those views held by their non-Māori counterparts. The lack of bicultural competencies and recognition surprised and frustrated some:

*And a lot of people don't see the Treaty as anything but a Māori issue. They don't.... They can't see how it actually affects anybody except Māori because they see it in the sense of the Treaty settlements. They see it as our ... Cash cow...(A1) (28 1:20:37)*

*We're just one down from the bloody ministry for God's sake, you know they should have a real understanding [of the TOW]. To be able to intelligently at least debate right...?... Because you know despite the comments about the Treaty, you know the discussion really is*



*pretty shallow...And then from that an appreciation of their local territory in terms of Māori. What happens to the blanket stereo types?... they should you know.[better] (22/3 39:39)*

Participants see the differing Māori/Pākehā views of the Treaty in a wider professional context not just as a DHB governance phenomenon but rather as a demonstration of a general national phenomenon.

*I've talked to Māori accountants and Māori lawyers and it's not just a matter of being an accountant or a lawyer, there's this other overlay that goes with it where you are almost a walking Treaty workshop yourself. (A2) (25 57:41)*

Treaty education was seen as a way to convey a more appropriate and functional understanding of historical and contemporary Māori/Pākehā relations. Furthermore, an independent Treaty educator would fulfil a role that directors themselves felt they needed to step into by default thereby excusing them of this potentially inflammatory and demanding task.

*I'd really love to do a [survey], to be a bit more educated in terms of my fellow board members, I'm talking about my Pākehā board members to really truly have a better understanding of the Treaty, cos we're talking about governance here right and we're talking about, we're talking about um Government bodies here. (22/3 39:39)*

*Look our board certainly needs to... they all claim to have been along to the Treaty Workshops and all this sort of stuff... I can remember putting them on the spot and saying, well okay, and they all put their hand up and I said, I don't mean none of these two hour affairs, as far as I'm concerned, the real ones got to be at least three days and so on and so on, few hands came down and so on and so on, but there's a, in my opinion... it's an on-going educational programme and I'm hoping that we can get another workshop sorted out where the whole board does it. I'm looking at that for next year, I'm discussing that with.. actually, I've got a meeting this Friday with the CEO. I was gonna make it more specific to [our rohe, our iwi] here, so that it's localised, so that they can relate to it better. (22/3 4:24)*

*I would like to suggest that this board, us Māori included that we all attend a Treaty of Waitangi workshop ... I think the Chairperson said no that it wouldn't be appropriate....Nah, and they wouldn't [go to a Treaty Workshop], they have lived in [this area] all of their lives and why would or should they go and do one of those. (11 49:20)*

*For me it's about acknowledging the Māori population as being the Treaty partner and as such, numbers don't mean that much to me. I mean if you had 1,000 European and you had 10 Māori and if you're in a partnership role, then you're in a partnership role...( 15 3:40)*

One participant felt that a kaumatua position would offer support for Māori board members by taking over the role of the social engineer':

*certainly I consider it a win that I've only just, I say I only just because it's taken me a year to do this, that they've got kaumatua positions now in the DHB that is a, it's a 4/10<sup>th</sup> position but paid right, now I'm getting this bloody concrete.....yes with the option of actually increasing the time. Ah in terms of reference if you like, that they provide cultural advice to the Chair, to the board, to the CEO. What I'm really after is a cultural audit for the whole outfit, that's my aim. To do that ... I need a kaumatua, you know and if ever we needed one, we need it here, as far as I'm concerned. **But I believe that we need to, got to start at the board. Got no question in my mind about this, no question at all** (22/3 1:15)  
(emphasis added)*

In order to progress at the board table Māori directors felt some responsibility to challenge and change prevailing attitudes and assumptions about Māori health that potentially Treaty education may be able to achieve.

*I think one of the things that I think the extra bit that's outside of the job description is that we're; I don't know if it's the right term but we're involved in social engineering as well, you know, the attitude towards...That's probably not the correct way to say it but you know what I mean...We're trying to work with people on the job and influence the attitudes and behaviour and values and principles and they're huge things to get in. (A1) (25 51:30)*

*Our Kaupapa because we have a semi new group coming through with the new board members, hopefully the appointed quotient of board members won't change, in terms of Māori you know because otherwise you have to bring everyone up to speed yeah. But it's also an opportunity to reiterate the emphasis for the board and the strategic priority for the board around our population health need - Māori reducing inequalities yeah. And that does why we are you know, diverting, targeting funding in these, into these initiatives. (12 22:00)*

The reluctance to accept responsibility for Māori health was said to be deep seated historically, economically, and parochially; one participant pointed out that each rohe (district) has its own colonial story that persists into today:

*Around the corner, you know...[we had] land wars starting over here in 1863. I mean we've got our own rich history there. It doesn't take long and that part of our own experience as the land owners were part of land that was confiscated. I mean our own stories and I think when you can engage in a factual way and that's not always easy because there are plenty of farmers around here who will say, "Nah, you were just a bunch of rebels, rabble rousers - troublemakers." If you can't get past that kind of debate then, you know, that's probably got more potency in [this rohe] than the Treaty of Waitangi.(A1) (25 57:46)*

One participant philosophically viewed Māori/Pākehā race relations as a work in progress:

*That's part of our societal challenge isn't it? It's symptomatic of where society sits in its relationship with Māori...I take the view, like in my father's day and my grandfather's day, drink driving was kind of accepted but you know today that's [unacceptable] I mean this might be an extreme example but today there's no way. And in the same way non-Māori can't say that they don't have the opportunities and understand the reasons why Māori should be pronounced correctly. There's no reason to hide or to be ignorant. [support] is not as inaccessible as people make it out to be if the motivation and the desire is there and you see it for I mean, so there is no reason why people can't find out other than ignorance or laziness. ...(A1) (25 1:31:37).*

One participant recounted an incident where a Treaty workshop transformed a fellow board member from an antagonist to a champion:

*We have one person on our board who was a doctor who did not believe any of the statistics that we were putting up as far as Māori health goes. "No," he said, "that can't be right; no, that's not right." "No," he said, "that's not right; those statistics, where did you get those from?" I said, "Oh, I made them up! Where do you think I got them from?" Anyhow, he went on to this Treaty workshop...He went on this Treaty workshop. "You know, it's really ... it's a bit like my [European] in-laws, scratch them a little bit and out comes the clearances, so scratch [him] a little bit," and man, he was like, "What you guys need to do," he said, "don't sit around, grab it!" He said, "That's how it's going to work. You can't sit there, you gotta take it! Take the thing". So he was asking good questions and all the rest of it, so I think, for him it was like, "Oh I didn't know that." So, that was kind of before morning tea, "Well, I didn't know that," to the end of the day where, you know, he was ... "Oh, that's marvellous!" (A2) (25 55:09)*

### **The role of the second class appointed director**

The previous theme (No hea au?) documented the problematic pathways both appointed and elected directors face. This theme explores the ways in which the status of appointed was experienced at the board table. While this tension is reported to be also present amongst non-Māori DHB directors (Barnett et al., 2009) it is likely more complex in nature for Māori because appointments were Treaty and policy based. As a result, race, ethnicity, and the colonisation debates are evoked.

It has already been noted that a Māori DHB director is more likely to be appointed as opposed to elected, and most likely to be familiar first hand with poverty, marginalisation, and disparity. Even when Māori are elected they displace a potential appointed Māori and occupy a Māori representative position. Considerable intra-board discussion was reported between appointed and elected board members regarding possible differences in status and representation. There was frustration

and tension expressed between non-Māori directors and appointed Māori directors about the political nature of appointments, Māori directors also expressed frustration at the political nature of elected candidates.

There was some disappointment and surprise expressed by directors when elected Māori were slotted-in and potential Māori appointees were displaced. This disrupted the electoral process, resulting in a disincentive not only for Māori to stand for election but also for the voting public to vote for Māori. It also caused considerable discontent amongst manawhenua.

*They got excited thinking well, they had three Māori now; we'll have the two appointed ones...plus me, but of course when I got in they then took away one of those appointed; they said, "Well okay we got one so we only need to appoint one more," ...and that was quite controversial(A2) (28 15:25)*

While the aim of appointing is to provide for complementary skills and diversity at the board table the two pathways to the boards (elected or appointed) do not complement each other and in fact generate differential director status. Furthermore, the strategy to de-stigmatise appointees by the claim that all directors are equal led to a sense of lack of recognition of effort on the part of those elected Māori. Māori are predominately appointed compared to elected.

*There are board members that have been appointed,[they] really feel a sense of confidence in their role and not that they're second rate citizens, second rate directors rather at the board table because when a person challenges an appointee and says 'I don't have to listen to you', I'm elected, you're appointed.... He got the shock of his life when I called him out and the way I did it, straight up. To the extent [that] it turned it into a real joke. It was his [Pākehā] colleagues who burst out laughing. The rest joined in but they quickly saw the point, instantly. Don't come masquerading here because in actual fact you know, a rabbit with a blue tail running across the paddock in [this district] would get voted in....The point being,*

*that when you are appointed you go through a huge scrutiny that elected membership never goes through..... And he got the message and behaved himself. (19 23:00)*

*... after the meeting, one of my Pākehā DHB members said I must say to you, that you have actually, what did he say, you need to ah rescind or take back what you said because you don't actually stand here as a Māori DHB member...because you were elected. And I said, actually I am Māori..... (11 3:19)*

In addition to attempts to confine and typecast Māori director roles, other non-Māori board members revealed their attributions to Māori (ill) health. Participants report incidents of stereotyping where inaccurate assumptions about Māori were generalised:

*We have got one board member, I actually like him, he said things like (about Māori)... oh some of its genetic, you know that old genetic stuff about why we are all sick, which is a load of crap. He used to be the boss of ICU. The other one he said – kind of eluded that we don't .... Fate, that whole thing about us and fate, you know destiny to die, you know how our people say we get ill and get diagnosed, no we won't do the treatment – he said that at one of our board meetings - no, no..... I said to him, that's actually not quite so! (27 30:35)*

Some inaccurate assumptions were more contemporary and tended to oversimplify Māori representation and identity:

*Trying to explain to [the board members] the difference between [a local Māori entity] and the [iwi] right. They still insist of wanting to go [iwi], the concept of it all...[was too hard]. I mean this is pretty basic. Well I don't see this as being too difficult... No no. I mean you get around that I mean I will be.....along to the board meeting right and get him to say, right "I'm [iwi], and this is [the local Māori entity] (22/3 26:35)*

**The role of the token director, pea tētahi, e rua, ētahi, kore rānei? (perhaps one, two, some, or none?)**

There was considerable discussion around the expectation that had been raised for two Māori directors on each DHB. Most DHBs at one point or another did not have

two. There was a question raised over the partnership principle in relation to the prescribed two representatives, particularly when the two were often not provided for. This was disconcerting for many participants given the legislative clause.

*It was unusual identifying as the only Māori on the [DHB], however, I didn't feel uncomfortable as such, but I do believe that the system could have made a better effort in ensuring manawhenua were definitely represented on there. (15 1: 50)*

One participant directly confronted the tokenism issue by ticking more than one box account:

*We all have different experiences, and different reasons [as directors]. I know that when I was appointed [to a senior position on the board] somebody said oh well that's one of the two Māori representatives and I went Ah ah, that's not..... For a whole a lot of reasons anyway, that was just an interesting interpretation quite early on in the Act. They were kind of saying, well you have covered two bases in one stroke, well it's a sign of saying it's a tick in the box and you can cover both bases. (A1) (25 15:11)*

One director felt excluded from the CEO's field of vision and attributed this to a passive resistance to Māori input:

*Our Chair is really good at getting that sense amongst us, we are quite fortunate to have a really good Chair. I think our CEO is a dork! He's bloody arrogant. He never talks to me. He talks to other directors. He doesn't talk to me socially, but why? He doesn't engage with me at all. No hello, not even when we are all standing around having cups of tea or having lunch, he doesn't talk to me. He talks to [my male Māori colleague]. I think, he thinks as long as he fits in tight with [that Māori director], he doesn't need to worry about me. But I think he should of clicked he needs to worry about me. Which kind of pisses me off - We review the CEO, but I think he's doing an okay job as a CEO but I don't like him personally. I find him really patronizing. (27 33:48)...*

While tokenism was recognised, more Māori directors were preferable:

*Yes well, that would be nice, but not just for putting a brown face there, you know, specific skills and things like that. I do feel quite sorry for Māori directors who are the only ones, the only one on that particular board. I think that is quite difficult because I think it's really hard to get traction and unless you are really quite assertive you know, you can get lost ...every board meeting would be a struggle. (A2) (25 1:15:26)*

The inconsistencies in numbers of directors appointed only further fuel the assumption of tokenism particularly in conjunction with the Ministry-directed selection processes.

*Basically you are there only because you are Māori,(A1) and we all have different experiences, and different reasons, politics. (A2) (25 12:00)*

Further fuelling assumptions of tokenism one participant spoke of being under pressure, as the single Māori director. He was approached privately by the CEO and the Chair and asked to sign off on the Māori Health Plan. He resisted because there had been no budget assigned to it, his concern was for implementation. The same DHB had a Māori health manager but again, with no budget.

*I said there is no budget. It's such a Māori issue, it's a partnership issue, you want to do a memorandum of agreement, you want to get a hold of and bring the Māori community in because we've got the worst stats of all, yet we got no budget. (15 30:22)*

Given how little cultural competency non-Māori board members are reported to have boards with single Māori appointments can be culturally isolating for Māori. Participants spoke of being supported by other Māori directors. Having other Māori on the board, particularly experienced Māori directors, provided for a tuakana – taina (senior and junior) dyad which offers a culturally compatible leadership relationship.

*I took a lot from what he'd ask...[I] could understand the reasoning behind some of his questions and they focused me in those particular areas as well .... I don't ask a lot of financial questions because I understand financial reports and can get [information] from*



*reading myself so I find it difficult to put myself back into a layman's understanding no...he was a very experienced in that area...(7/8 2:35)*

The practice of tikanga seemed inconsistent at times or non-existent. Other experiences that reinforced assumptions of tokenism were the Māori director (management) who partially fulfilled tikanga expectations, and who held a position without funding responsibility:

*The Māori director never had, never had a budget he is called the Māori director...His role is to do the karakia at each board meeting and sit there and present a report...and the other board members used to say the same...oh he says karakia he makes sure you feel safe once a month...yeah, that's right, see they don't even close with a karakia. (15 1:01)*

Further examples of inconsistent or absent tikanga practice include the induction process:

*But I was surprised that despite tangata whenua involvement apparently in the Ministry, the process of induction wasn't what I expected. I didn't see a powhiri; I didn't see anything that led me to believe that...Well no, that a whole new team; because every board was new; they had new people on it, like they were all new teams that they were celebrating the New Zealand heritage and it made me wonder if that was the attitude in terms of an induction around not actually following Māori protocols. How can you believe that, you know, that's blasé in that situation; how can you believe that ingrained in the things that we want to achieve as better Māori health outcomes. ...I was just surprised because I just thought, "Oh." I was waiting for the; I didn't expect the 'Wah hoo!' but I expected something. But I think that's because people are arriving at different times, but this is a typical thing about; yeah, I have an issue about the cultural use as show but something that's ingrained. It seems to me it's not ingrained. (A1) (28 18:00)*

There were concerns expressed over the collection and reliability of data relating to ethnicity and outcome monitoring. Concerns ranged from whether it is being done at all to whether it is being done in a meaningful way. There was specific concern over the use of one monitoring tool:

*The “Heat Tool” [Health Equity Assessment Tool(Signal, Martin, Cram, & Robson, 2008) – a ‘rapid’ questionnaire, used in a multidisciplinary setting specifically designed to expose inequity] that’s a tool that they use. Every business that comes to us has to have the Heat Tool, this is how we access our providers – might be internal, our provider arm or external to ensure that every investment we make is going to make a difference for Māori. It gets applied but the depth of its application to each project, there’s no consistency and they are not reporting back against [it]. Well, it means that every investment we make, should make a difference, but I am cynical about whether it really does, because I am not sure about any consistency in the application of the tool and whether there is a lot of science in the application. (27 22:21)*

### **The role of the translator, Kei waenganui – (being in-between)**

Participants spoke of being the translator between the marae and the boardroom. There were experiences where the inability to fully fulfil expectations of both were recounted. Directors spoke of dual accountabilities, both cultural accountabilities and professional accountabilities and how, at times these accountabilities conflicted. Professional expectations were privileged over cultural expectations where there was conflict or incommensurability. Sometimes the dual expectations were met either via board intervention or by individual creativity and/or resistance, at times cultural expectations were not met.

Multiple participants reported board members, in particular the chairs, rely on Māori directors to speak for Māori networks, to translate, or at times simplify Māori affairs into a non-Māori context either for the chair themselves, or for the board.

With regard to translation to the board some spoke specifically about a (often unsolicited) direct role with their Chair that involved translating contemporary Te Ao Māori to a non-Māori chair. Many spoke of positive and supportive relationships with their Chair where their role was to translate Te Ao Māori to their non-Māori Chair. Many report mutual respect and trust with their respective Chairs.

*we've only just finished a board evaluation to cover almost the first year that we have been together as a board and it was very complimentary. I know that in terms of issues Māori; before, if [the Chair] is going to raise something at the table he will come and consult with me first. So, he'll talk with me. He'll draw me to the side to talk about issues (A1) (28 33:00)*

*In my review of [the Chair], that's what I said, I appreciate his goodwill and his view in being supportive of, and reducing equalities, but just because he is ignorant of Māori iwi structure and networks in our area that he is vulnerable. He comes from a commercial background where he has never really had any interface, yeah, but he is learning. (27 48:57)*

Others point out that for some chairs the complexity and the diversity of Māori is yet to be discovered:

*We are still weighing up [the Chair] to be honest. I think it is different from what he has been used to, I don't think he has been used to mana whenua urban Māori to this extent before. The Māori population [here] is big. He says the right things and I think he says the right things and I think he means well but finding that hesitant and just resolving some things.... I think it is just unknown territory at the moment to be honest.... There are so many Māori political dynamics taking place and I think the Chair isn't on board with all those things yet. (A1) (28 30:31)*

*So, [the Chair] does come to me and he does ask if I would open all those meetings... he'll ask me to do that. He'll ask me, he'll come and get me to bless the kai. So, I think that he is spiritually conscious of those types of things himself. I mean I think that it would be a wonderful gesture if he asked someone else, or if somebody else is doing it. I'd feel quite pleased that that's happening so that he doesn't just rely totally on me. (20 39:50)*

Others looked to their Chair for specific cultural recognition:

*What I would do is I would grab [the Chair's] attention and say, "There's a Kaumatua in here that I believe deserves to be acknowledged". Because every now and then someone will come in, the meeting is under way and you see them and oh, you acknowledge them, [the Chair would] either do it or generally... and just stop the meeting... (20 41:41)*

One participant recognised and compensated for a newly appointed chair:

*I think it is just unknown territory [for the Chair]at the moment to be honest...There are so many Māori political dynamics taking place and I think the Chair isn't on board with all those things yet. (A2) (28 30:31)*

### **Kāore e kitea he kanohi (a face not seen)**

Governance practice precludes a central cultural value, that of he kanohi kitea (a face that is seen). Comments from participants regarding the inability to practice this cultural imperative included the concern that without hui (where faces are seen) the needs and wishes of stakeholders are not being directly heard. Issues of representation, although conflicting for most DHB directors (Barnett et al., 2009) was specifically raised in a cultural context by participants in relation to he kanohi ki te kanohi.

*As a board, as a Māori board member that I would like more of an interaction with the kaunihera, and ... kaunihera is like the kuia/kaumatua . So the elders, so the Māori elders that meet on a regular basis to discuss any issues and that, and so I've actually been asking this for a long long time. But it's not forth-coming, so a response to my question was a huge political spiel from our Chairperson around how it works and how great it works ...but as a Māori DHB member I want to have, because I feel isolated from them you know ... I got the impression that really we don't have any business being connected there, to the people on the street. (11 4:37)*

One participant spoke of their refusal to e-mail a document because of the importance of he kanohi kitea . After being refused a funding request, s/he self-funded a journey to hand-deliver the document.

*See they said to me, just give us your email [name] and we'll email it to you and I said no, in a document which is taken a lot of blood sweat and tacks to put together, it's not something that I say, just email me a copy, I have to come there and I have to front you and say thank you. That's what I want to do. (15 39:50)*

**Kāore e mihi, kāore e manākitanga (without an acknowledgement there is no respect)**

DHBs fulfil their statutory requirement for public input in a number of different ways, for some there is an invitation to members of the public to attend a part of a DHB meeting, others provide public fora. While open to the public some can be observation only meaning manuhiri (visitors) are neither permitted to speak nor acknowledged and, following the public component, visitors are instructed to leave. This is counter intuitive for those who are familiar with tikanga and a potentially difficult arrangement for Māori directors and Māori public attendees alike. To neither acknowledge nor permit guests to speak is to diminish the mana of the guest. Directors spoke of a sophisticated yet subtle ability to fulfil cultural expectations under such circumstances:

*...sitting in a Pākehā forum in the DHB and I was sitting there with the other Māori director and he is brought up and understands all the Māori, he's very Māori, we're sitting there in this Pākehā forum and we're so... and so at that point in time we were in a Western kind of mode... context, the way we were talking and operating was Western, and then these people walked into the room, one of them was his uncle, who was the senior Kaumatua of [rohe] now as soon as he walked in the room everything changed for him and I, so suddenly we were the boys and this old man walks in with his walking stick and sits down and doesn't say anything, but suddenly, immediately the world shifted for us and we were the boys no one noticed, you see what I mean, no one noticed, the conversation went ahead, I knew and he knew, we all knew and no one knew what happened, no one else knew what happened, .(13 34:56)*

*And, and also what happens around this, Māori, here's another thing around Māori governance, when your operating in a DHB right, it's around tikanga, it's around when do we do the Māori tikanga stuff, for example. Opening a meeting right, opening a meeting, now here's an example, so we go in, we'll be in the room, sitting down, all the board in there, all the committee and all the Māori's are looking each other about who's going to do what, or*

*are we going to do it, and for example, I'll look to [fellow Māori director], he will look to me and he's got that look in his eye, which basically, he doesn't say anything but it's like, it's you, and I know then, nothings been said, and I know that I have to do it, so I'll do it, or at the end people are looking around you know, and so that's the invisible...[sign] (13 36:42)*

Māori directors themselves are placed in the position of translating board activity to Māori networks. Many spoke of cultural accountabilities beyond their professional accountabilities. In particular at a whānau and hapū level:

*If you are on the DHB they will expect that you will resolve whatever the issue is. I mean what I do is make sure that the complaints and the issues go where they have got to go because you have still got to follow through the process, and if I notice that there is a theme, then I will raise it at the board as a theme of concern and hand it over to the CEO with the agreement of the board, for him to actually investigate whether that's a trend, a potential risk, risky trend. But the expectation of what you can do in terms of resolving those issues and the reality of what you can do is quite different.(A1) (28 45:19)*

One participant was clear that, for them, there was little or no conflict with accountabilities:

*I can and have always been able to separate the fact that I make general guidance, I don't make specific rules...and also having said that I am also aware that I don't knee jerk to one off situations. So I might have something wrong with me potentially, but where I hear of something that impacts on an individual, while I'm sorry for that individual if the process was right and something went wrong, let's look at it from a process point of view. Let's not react; knee jerk to fix a single situation that 99% of the time was all right....can we solve it for 100% of the people? And should we therefore try at the margins because if one slips through the gap we beat ourselves up? Personally? Sometimes. Professionally, as board members can't, you lose the big picture. We don't want to hear that but that's reality. But that's something that our politicians need to learn. They cannot solve an individual problem if they tried because every time you do you lose the big picture and you're no good to us (17 30:20)*

Because participants stand both in the boardroom and in the marae they also extend manākitanga to non-Māori in a Māori context:

*The credibility to do that leadership role and advocacy for Māori cultural competencies by the board, now you know like when they go to the Marae or when they go to a powhiri, whakatau whatever, it's their role, the Māori representatives to ensure that there is a cultural safety net around, around them. Now that cultural safety net can be around cultural competencies, so when you're looking at you know, aspects of cultural competencies that make up the big picture, well then you can say like, well this is a powhiri blah blah and this is the waiata that we learnt, this is the reason why we sing this waiata ...and not doing and not singing "E hara i te mea" all the time, you know or "Te Aroha", but then you know and then it says here [pointing] a koha, this is why we give a koha, so don't turn up to a Marae without a koha. You know, you can give them your gold card and your pin number, give it to them, so...(21:59)*

### **The role of the de-indigenised director and the Ministerial directive**

Many participants discussed using a deliberate strategy of de-indigenisation or race neutrality as a means to address race-based funding allegations. Directors reported using legislative and policy guidelines as the rationale for preferential funding for Māori health. There was consensus that legislation and policy were direct, clear, and supportive. Policy proved an effective tool to deflect (actual and potential) claims of race-based funding and to orient strategy and funding.

*I just believe that ultimately there is fairness in the system and I don't go down the road of getting... of race base funding...because...I sort of break it down to – ok if Hep B is the thing we are concentrating on now or for prevention, for detection and we screen 10 people and 8/10 might be Māori...then obviously the pūtea should find its way to those 8 because they are the ones diagnosed at the end of the day I believe it will get to them because we have the worst results... (7/8 6:12)*

Legislation and policy provided the support necessary to obviate race issues:

*Because you know [these towns] are supposed to be red-neck towns. And I have never accepted that. There is a difference between red-necked and not knowing. And for them for these board members it was “well the Act said we must”. So therefore we will. There wasn’t a question after that. (17 38:50)*

*...there is a reasonable policy around Māori health ...I think we are a sector in a country that is loaded with good quality strategy. (A1) (26 45:00)*

*I think we could say that and I could support that by the fact that we have a much more permissive policy around, oh no I’ll change that, a much more explicit policy around effecting improvement in health status for Māori, around reducing [inequalities]...(12 13:22)*

### **The Ministerial directive and representation**

The Minister, and the Ministry, unlike the Māori DHB director have many degrees of separation from the marae where accountability is on a he kanohi ki te kanohi basis:

*It’s all very well, [for the Minister to say you represent me] it’s not the Minister up at the pa, is it? – it’s us, you know not the Minister out there in the blimmin kitchens there, it’s us isn’t it...(A2) (25 23:58)*

It would appear that the underlying premise of the Act, accountability to the Minister, is somewhat conflated by the community rhetoric within the Act. Just as the entrenchment of Treaty principles in the Act, in particular that of partnership is somewhat at odds with the notion of Māori proportional representation especially where inconsistent, and unpredictable numbers of Māori are appointed (or displaced as elected for appointed).

Given these contradictions and inconsistencies representation and accountability were significantly discussed amongst participants. Issues of representation and accountability, although also conflicting for other DHB directors (Barnett et al., 2009), were repeatedly raised by Māori directors in relation to specific representation of, and accountability to, Māori stakeholders. While many expressed that their



representation of Māori was an obvious expectation, many also expressed representation expectations and accountabilities as complex and wider reaching than simply Māori health issues. However, despite this complexity the statement given by the Minister at one induction process clarified any doubt over accountabilities:

*...at the induction the Minister said basically that that you're here to basically listen to what I tell you to, that's what they say and everyone is looking around and people say NO I've been voted on by... And you know and so that's loud and clear, loud and clear that's what is stated. (11 20:26)*

Despite being told by the Minister that they are singularly accountably to him, and despite being typecast as Māori health directors, participants were inclusive in their approach to representation:

*...for Māori health, you are there lobbying for your communities collectively...not sometimes that really whakapapa part but for the whanaungatanga people of [rohe], you move yourself from that ..the whānau, hapū, iwi, to the collective region... (5 4:56)*

Most directors made sense of their role as representatives for their entire community - Māori, Pākehā, and others. Furthermore, participants did not consider that this wider reaching representation in any way compromised their role in Māori health advances; rather the opposite:

*I was not appointed there just to look at Māori health. I was appointed for the whole of the district and that's the view point that one needs to have at the table. And from a Māori perspective it's a very important view point because the way to draw your colleagues attention to health deficit is by understanding the full gambit of health in your area and your district, so that if you have a case to make on behalf of Māori health that case is well made in the light of what else is going down in the district that then can give weighting to your debate around the lack of funding allocation to address the deficit for Māori health. But you have to understand the whole part of it if you are going to deal with Māori health in particular. Or in our case, we now have Pacific Island population and we need to understand*

*you know what that means for Pacific Island people. We've got Vietnamese in our area and you know each of those parts needs to be seen and weighted against the whole part of health for the whole of [the district]. (19 8:20)*

*...at the beginning of my appointment I always said that I was there for the whole of [region] because you know I have my feet in both camps...[Pākehā and Māori]Yes, I am there for everyone's benefit ... (7/8 6:12)*

*I've been appointed as one of the two Māori appointees so I obviously have an interest or a responsibility to ensure that we have a say. That Māori are heard. I also understand the rules around being on a board, that you don't represent one section of the community that you represent all the community. (17 34:00)*

Furthermore, Māori directors support mainstream health services because most Māori use mainstream services. Māori providers have limited capacity to service Māori in primary care and no capacity with aspects of secondary care. For Māori directors the funding position for Māori health is not straightforward:

*I have a couple of views. One of which is that in order to be fair... that the expenditure specifically Māori should match the population ratio within the population group. Or, because of the disparities apparent within Māori health that they should spend more than the proportion in order to bring those, to close the gaps on those disparities. But I also temper that with, there is mainstream funding that Māori can tap into as well (17 15:43)*

In addition, not all Māori would choose Māori health provision, nor have it available to them so there is merit in investing in mainstream services. Despite the best intentions one director came to accept the limitation of health funding:

*Even in the short time that I have been on the board that my initial belief around the way things should operate; I've always believed that it should be by Māori for Māori but the reality...I've had a reality dose of what is realistic and for me the big issue [here] is the access ...Māori and non-Māori... most Māori, where I am, belong to non-Māori PHOs. That's right but the other thing is and because of the access issues... They are happy to get anybody*

*and as long as anybody sits down with them and deals with those issues that they have right in front of them whatever the health issue is that they're presenting with, they're just happy – they don't care who's doing it as long as they get what they want. The reality dose for me is any service that focuses on increasing the access of Māori will help and benefit the whole of [our area] because if there is a good service whether it is Māori or Pākehā who service the Māori well, then they are going to service the Pākehā well as well. The ethic of the way that Māori service Māori is universal... Because it's based on respect, a value of respect. (A1) (28 52:00)*

Although one director was clear about their sole role as an advocate for Māori health:

*My purpose for being there is, I break it down to keep it real simple, is that right my reason is for Māori health, you know. That's my main [purpose]... otherwise I don't want to be there. I have to be able to try to influence by whatever way I can at the governance level. (22/3 7:26) I suppose it's an individual thing, I just don't, you know you get in there and you do your best basically and, I'm passionate about health.(22/3 12:06)*

While there is acceptance as to the direct accountabilities to the Minister fundamental accountability conflict was expressed. Provision for Māori representation on DHBs is not the same as ensuring Māori are being heard nor is it the same as being accountable to Māori. One director articulates this fundamental conflict:

*Because it's a funny process you actually are...even when you are running as a candidate you are voted in by your community and yet you get into the board you are actually aligned to the Ministry of Health you know you are actually there on behalf of the Ministry... strategic plans, you know ...to the Health & Disability Act and so sometimes when I go in you go in there thinking I'm going to be a voice for your community its actually not that way ...( 5 2:19)*

Although the elected/appointed pathways may lead to perceived differences in accountabilities the Ministry has made it clear that all DHB directors are accountable

to the Minister. One director explores their rationale for representation and accountability issues:

*...whether or not there are different accountabilities yeah, I think there are that there is an expectation that you will do your very best for Māori over and above anything else. But then is that not the same for any kind of representative. I notice that members of our board are quite geographically patriotic, at the expense of the whole region they will go for that one... and I guess that anybody that gets on board is supposedly representing a group; they will do the same thing. However, I have not been chosen by that group that I am supposedly representing – I was chosen by bureaucrats in Wellington. Yes, I think it does [have different implications]. What I may feel is a responsibility that I have....it is a personal thing as opposed to a group of people who have put me there and said okay off you go, now this is what we are looking for – I need to keep that in mind all the time. (A2) (25 43:58)*

In summary, this chapter has examined data related to the second theme Ko wai au? (Who am I?). Participants consistently reported that frustration and, at times, hostility featured in intra-board relations. While generally struggle and isolation were reported consequences of such interactions, many also reported overcoming initial hostilities by confrontation and challenge. The lack of cultural and historical perspective and insight into Treaty processes was reported to be a constant frustration for Māori directors.

The highly politicised and sensitive nature of Māori health and Māori health funding was experienced as problematic for Māori directors mostly because their non-Māori counterparts did not engage in Māori health issues. Participants reported struggling to make Māori health a topic of board discussion; the term the elephant-in-the-room illustrates this sentiment. Further, because virtually only Māori participated in Māori health discussion, others reported struggling to make a legitimate governance contribution independent of their role as a Māori representative, concerned that they

were being typecast as having a single agenda. Māori health was generally reported to be seen as the sole responsibility of the Māori directors.

This theme utilised ascribed directorial roles, as is consistent with governance theory. Each of the eight roles, organised as subthemes, were explored. In asking the question *ko wai au?* (or reframing the question as *who do they think I am?*) responses were able to be productively categorised into the various role expectations participants reported called upon to fulfill. The use of ascribed roles as an organising strategy has brought into focus many problematic (mis)understandings and assumptions about Māori and reveals the multiple additional demands faced by participants. Governance literature suggests directors negotiate multiple demands and roles at any one time. In utilising ascribed roles as an organising strategy for this theme it is apparent that Māori directors in this study experience multiple additional demands and role expectations because they are Māori. Paradoxically, in order to avoid overt and covert negative race-based sentiment Māori directors report a deliberate de-indigenising strategy where they suspend their identity as a negotiating and legitimising tool and instead claim adherence to policy guidelines as their motivation.

Discussion of this theme and the other themes that interconnect are more fully developed in Chapter Eight. The next chapter presents and examines data relating to the third theme *Ko wai oku whanaunga?* (To whom am I related?)

## Chapter Seven: Ko Wai Oku Whanaunga?

The third theme, Ko wai ōku whanaunga? (To whom am I related?) captures data relating to participants' experiences of their cultural and/or professional connections and how these connections affect their intra-board processes. Māori directors spoke consistently of the complexity of their formal and informal relationships in both their cultural nexus and their professional nexus in relation to their directorships. This theme is about the *interconnections* between Māori directors and Māori stakeholders and is organised around the subthemes listed in below in Table 7.1.

*Table 7.1 Theme Three*

Theme	Subthemes
Ko wai ōku whanaunga?	Iwi relationship arrangements Professional Māori networks Conflicted or related interests? Synergistic relations Cultural relations The translator; kei wanganui Cultural distance and isolation

### **Iwi relationship arrangements**

Iwi consultation and liaison on the part of the Ministry is an obligatory feature of the nomination and selection processes for most Māori DHB directors given most are appointed. As noted this process can be problematic for iwi and for nominees (and no doubt for the Ministry). Some directors reported to be unclear themselves about the process and reported that others, such as their respective chairs and iwi groups, to be also unclear of process and outcomes regarding the appointment process. Despite appearing consultative the process was experienced as unilateral and Ministry controlled as is probably characteristic of general statutory board appointment processes. The appointment pathway to the board is a political not a

cultural process, yet it involves cultural processes: Given Māori are involved, and Treaty discourse is evoked in the legislation bicultural processes are required.

*It's a political process, it's hard, it's harsh, it's unforgiving, and even [in my role] I have a certain level of influence and a certain level of disclosure, but there was still a big percentage of blind spots. People used to ask me how influential are you in terms of getting the outcomes that you are looking for and I'd say as long as Wellington is happy. A1 (25 16:41)*

The selection and accountability process while consultative in terms of the solicitation of iwi views was not considered collaborative and was not always transparent:

*I know that our Runanga wrote a letter to the Minister even after they appointed me; it was about the process. Because they had put forward a name but had no response about why that person hadn't been appointed (I knew why she hadn't been appointed). (A1) (28 15:00)*

Māori stakeholders were reported to be out of the loop not just with process but also with potential nominees. Ministry consultative processes fragment Māori stakeholder groups and cause tension. In this example tension, generated by the Ministry, was dealt with openly and directly by the nominee himself, and collectively resolved:

*Because my original nomination came from [iwi], when I first got appointed I then took it to the Runanga as their management and then well, to my horror, to my surprise there was some challenges to the [Runanga Management] going on the board... and how come we didn't know?... they felt, well the comment was, 'What if we wanted somebody else to be on there?' And he's our CEO and so I just had to friggin get up and I said, "Well, (I could see it getting unraveled on me by the public) I said, hang on a minute, the process was done confidentially but ...the nomination came through my own people". Then luckily for me... the old fella... fella, he was there and goes, "Oh well", he said "that's all I wanted to hear. If [that iwi] has supported him who are we to say that it can't go through? Finished!" And he stopped it. (20 47:47)*

Formal iwi relationship arrangements were reported as an important feature for participants. Each DHB negotiates and agrees its own iwi relationship mechanism. Often this takes the form of a specially constituted group(s) representing local iwi. For the purposes of the thesis they will be referred to as Iwi Relationship Boards (IRBs). There were variable responses regarding formal iwi liaison via this mechanism ranging from the provision of passive input to more directive input:

*In all the documentation and if you ask the Chair of the board, it's seen as a partnership but from yeah it's probably also fair to say more Advisory. It's hard to know what more you can do.....to influence the decision making, you know to say well look we're a part of this and this is what we should have... We don't have to sort of demand like that but you know, at the end of the day, the board they're probably in terms of authority, they're you know they are the authority. You take away the Minister and the Ministry at this level yeah. We can only provide advice at the end of the day, the board will decide. (24 33:07)*

In contrast one participant spoke with confidence regarding the extent to which the IRB has influence at the DHB table:

*I think the local [iwi liason] group is represented ... at least one person from each of the iwi is used in that forum and [it has] done extremely well in terms of influencing policy. I think [they] have got a good handle on that, they have got some very articulate people and operational. They are very skillful in terms of being able to, they know the rules of the board so they know how to work with the game of it and they also know how to give it a public profile so it is not uncommon for them to get the headlines in the local media and use that to exert some kind of political pressure. (25 6:52)*

Not all IRB/DHB relationships were harmonious or even strategic. One participant reported that there was conflict between one Māori director and their iwi advisory group, conflict that confused fellow board members and caused considerable intra-board disharmony:



*There's a whole lot of internal iwi stuff happening in our area, where one of the providers, because they have an alliance with the Chair of our Trust Board, our Iwi Authority, our CEO and our Chair of our board have been directed by the Chair of the Iwi Authority to do all their consultation through this provider and so I am sitting at the board saying – no that's not the iwi, that's a provider you are discussing and we have a responsibility to have a Treaty relationship with the iwi and that is a provider is not the iwi. We spent almost 10 months debating the issue (me, the Chair and CEO) the rest of the board Members are saying nothing, they just sit there. So I am challenging them about that. So, this particular provider, Māori provider, has an agenda of its own, that they are trying to sell as the iwi agenda and it's not. ... they are just not iwi. They are Māori. We should be having a direct relationship with the Iwi Authority and its management, not another Māori health provider.*  
(27 17:50)

IRB are reported to provide considerable support however, some felt that provision for iwi only was an over simplification in terms of representing Māori interests. One participant, involved in management of a pan-Māori organisation (multi-iwi), spoke of the difficulty expressing Māori views that were independent of local iwi:

*...the system and the Crown, they strongly push the [local iwi] issue on us...they are very clever at manipulating the system to keep us divided...we're looking at division and control and isolation* (15 1:14)

### **Professional Māori networks – culturally interconnected not related**

This sub theme deals with professional relationships Māori directors have with Māori stakeholders outside the IRBs. That is non-iwi based relationships. Non iwi professional Māori input is problematic because the Crown has institutionalised iwi as the Treaty partner, not Māori. Collectives of Māori professionals then that are able to provide useful input into Māori health dialogue and governance struggle for legitimacy. Participants expressed frustration at the lack of recognition of particular groups on the part of the Ministry. For example, one participant wanted to give specific consideration to an ad hoc group of Māori clinicians:

*I recently got into trouble in terms of conflict of interest in terms of advocating for [local group]. Now this is... a, no it's not a legal, it's not a legal body it's a collective of the health representatives of all the runanga,... this was set up primarily to advocate and support a person to sit on the health board, set up in 2001.... it was set up purposely, our terms of reference centred around governance, we consider that we should have direct input into the board. Oh look I could spend the next hour talking about the scraps, letters that went between the two groups, between [the local group] and the board here ... look we got, we got pushed around and shoved around and not listened too... (22/3 10:43)*

Māori professional groups provide considerable support for Māori DHB directors. Te Matawhānui, for example, specifically provides for professional support and liaison with considerable, appropriate cultural accommodation:

*They are a lovely bunch aye ...you know When you go around you know...the issues for each [DHB] you know like [X] and...[X]the rest of us would be [surprised]...you would be thinking thank God we are not like that ... so there was that real arohanui...you know.... it really was...and .. I think that is one of the special things with Te Matawhānui to myself you know...like with [name] from [another DHB]...you know we've shared things. (7/8 7:58)*

In contrast, the assumption that all professional Māori have the same views is overly simplistic:

*I think we had 3 Māori perspectives [on the board], it is not a panacea, and it's a double edged sword in my view. I think it can become a bit of an exercise with the bureaucracy to put a bum on a seat. It's so politically charged, it's like any government appointment and then you have got the layer of Māori politics on top of that (A1) (25 15:11)*

### **Conflicted interest or related interests?**

Participants report tension between the conflict of interest expectations of their DHB and their related interest's expectations which form the basis of their appointment. Māori DHB directors are chosen on the basis of their whakapapa connection to the DHB rohe.

*And the other tension that arises is really with dealing with Māori health is the conflict of interest issue. Because, you know they're involved with all the different groups. But if everyone left the room you wouldn't have a quorum...whereas Māori health is of interest to all Māori. Whereas [a Pākehā] seems to have a job here and that's their job; whereas Māori, they may have a job there but they have networks and inroads and whānau across the board. It is quite hard if you are dealing with this group over here because you expand out into that line...And you rely on more community groups as well. It's more complicated where the parameters are [whereas a Pākehā may say] "I own this business, and I want a shareholder in this business," and ... very clear. Whereas Māori interests are right across the board.(A2) (28 44:14)*

*No no I've got some real...[question's].. and it's actually seated around whanaungatanga in terms of some of the questions I been, all the stuff we have to declare you know. I don't know how many whānau I've got working for the DHB right. (22/3 25:53)*

*...I know that at CPHAC... because [MD] was a [manager in] an iwi provider, a big one. A number of the items on CPHAC...[s/he] was having to declare conflicts of interest... you know.... her and another [CPHAC Māori Committee member] had to put in too because s/he was[rununga management].. so both of them were declaring large lists [of conflicts] (20 14:12)*

Many view the connectedness as inevitable and obvious. For example:

*because the reach was right across the whole region, there are only going to be certain numbers of Māori people within the health arena and we had them. I think there were some outside, but even so they still had links.(A1) Then I pop up and I'm the 4<sup>th</sup> and they just couldn't have it.(A2) It was all about perception. We [provider] were a medium sized organisation with reasonable spread of influence. Loading a DHB board with our representatives, kind of put us on the back foot continuously in terms of defending that perception of conflict of interests. In fact, I went a period of several years of having to foot that directly, either through hui, media and that kind of dissipated over time. (A1) (25 21:47)*

## Synergistic relations

Many Māori directors held formal roles in the Māori health sector network and/or iwi organisations and this was viewed favourably and considered of obvious benefit. With some participants dual roles helped implement DHB Māori health strategy, with others duality provided unique insight into their organisational interfaces. For others it provided the opportunity to further support and safeguard Māori health services.

*I also have the benefit of having...being here where I am... I sit on the Advisory board for [Iwi Māori Health Organisation] in [another city] so that's the [one iwi organisation] in comparison to the [other iwi organisation] so I bring in perspectives from [the two iwi groups] as well from the [two organisations]. I am also involved in [another provider] which is our own Māori health provider ....I draw on a number of experiences...I also do my own reading...a bit of reading... I live and breathe it here....so... (7/8 4:16)*

*Sure, I currently sit for a one year period [as] the chair of [another organisation] so I sit there and I have both responsibilities and my sole aim and this is the aim that I have talked to the members of the DHB as well...[my sole aim is] to enact, is to imbed in processes that will do two things for [this organisation]. First of all, so that we can take an oversight of every organisation that is involved in health...[an oversight] of their Māori plan. So that somehow a mechanism for feeding in their plan to us and we give a report back, we give feedback on it for both the DHB provider right down to NGO's, be they Māori or non-Māori. Because everyone is required to have a Māori health plan. But in order to assist that we also have developed, (just about finished) Just doing the final consultation; A district-wide Māori health framework. And this is a snapshot of where we are now and where we want to be in 30 years' time. No plans to get there but the framework, where we are now and where we want to be in 30 years' time. And we will give that to every organisation within this [rohe] that is involved in Māori health and say here's the first three pages of your strategic plan. You fill in the details about how you are going to achieve from within your contract. (17:29:00)*

Participants spoke of support for Māori providers for multiple reasons. Some felt Māori providers were vulnerable to additional scrutiny; others were emergent and therefore vulnerable:

*One of the things that I would probably say about the whole environment, it's so contrived... You can't diddle it or work it, its heavily scrutinised, and especially Māori. But that is not unique to the DHB part. I think the whole Māori sector whether it is an economic development, wherever public funds go into a Māori part of any sector...[scrutiny] absolutely, we wear it. It's on our audit and risk hazard as a standing item as a political risk.*  
(A1) (25 21:47)

Additional and valuable governance insight was possible having had dual roles:

*One of the things that I have found, even though I was a [previous] manager of a health provider I wasn't really that involved in what was happening at a governance level and I didn't know about the Iwi Māori Council, I knew it existed, but I didn't know who sat on it and what has been fascinating is that the Iwi Relationship Board, to me it has been hijacked by providers. So what we thought was a structure that was going to give access to iwi, I don't think gives us the quality relationship. It's not really the right vehicle I believe. I'd prefer if we had representatives from the iwi that came off their governance boards. Not through providers.* (27 19:12)

However, one participant deliberately chose to avoid any such dual representation:

*I have chosen not to participate (in iwi governance) and that is because [a family member] is the [an executive on their board]... so I don't like all that family stuff getting all mixed, governance and management. [They] don't need that pressure.* (27 8:45)

Many Māori directors are also directly involved with Māori providers. Many believed Māori providers were pivotal in Māori health provision and that they held much promise. They, as DHB directors, expressed their role as supporters of Māori providers as an important role:

*So, you know having that ability but in a wider scale to challenge it. If somebody's saying, 'Something's not right here,' doing something about it. I think there's too much; there's probably too much; I think providers; oh, well that's a fact, money – the reality is, money goes where providers are. It actually doesn't go where need is and so, it's just trying to get greater influence at that level I think.... that's not the end of the journey though; that's only a step... That's why we are still restless about where the next part of the journey goes to. This is where the innovation is occurring. Of all of the parts of the sector some people in main stream health will say that the Māori health sector is innovating... Yeah, dynamic, prepared to have a go. (A1) (25 1:46:3)*

Dual DHB directorships and PHO directorships in the Māori health sector, while presenting strategic challenges, offers unique insight and analysis:

*There's more to be gained. We're sitting here in partnership with the PHO; we have got two values in this organisation. We've got a group of providers who want to innovate and change the world and over here you've got a bunch of general practitioners who want to hold on to what they have already got and between the two... (1:43:23). I mean to be honest some of it was pretty rough; don't let the organisation get too browned up... Very conservative; general practice. (A2) The stand alone model - the grumpy old men that run, you know, grey haired... Yeah and... government... (A1) (1:46:30)*

Māori provider support was unequivocal amongst participants. There was an aligned sense of purpose and unity expressed by participants' in relation to Māori providers. The capability to deliver culturally effective health provision via non-Māori providers was questioned. Māori providers were also seen as an essential link in the Māori hauora (well-being) sequence:

*Because it is about Māori determination ...you know....and it's actually about giving the fair share of the resources for Māori to do what they need to do for themselves. And it's actually...providing opportunities for self-development, Māori workforce development, provider development, growth ....because you need to invest in that because if you are going to use the [Whare Tapu Wha] model there are no other models of health care that will actually*

*give a whole picture they're too busy following the medical model... so it is all about strengthening the Māori workforce ( 5 35:40)*

One instance was recalled where a Māori-provider presentation added value to board processes and understanding with cultural creativity:

*It was quite a different presentation, it was like a little bit of theatre really, which was very good yeah it was very different. Yeah, a different way of presenting the message... more props and all that sort of thing, it was about watering the garden and a growing a tree and how the tree develops and... Oh yeah the board, they were just blown away yeah yeah no they were very impressed. it was just a novel way to do a presentation and it just captured the audience. ...this one makes Māori unique, the ability to be able to do that, you know just to get away from the standard presentation where you just stand up you know, yeah, it just captured you know the board. You know they just sat and watched and you know they, if you asked any of them they could tell you now about it – it would be hard to forget. (24 40:51)*

Many participants reported that Māori providers faced additional scrutiny. This scrutiny was viewed as omnipresent and damaging:

*Māori know that.... we always say this right, so a year out from the election Māori providers around the country, Māori managers, Māori directors, that weekly expression is, you baton down the hatches, because you know that as you go into the election Māori are going to be a target, whether it's around governance it's always around Māori providers, always, going in and finding out...The additional scrutiny on the performance of Māori because we become an easy target. ...(13 8:28:00)*

*Absolutely, we wear it. It's on our audit and risk hazard as a standing item as a political risk. I think it's almost always. I think other than cases like Health Care NZ, the lab in Auckland, those situations arise rarely at a governance level because they tend to be dealt with more at an operational level, they are a planning and funding decision. I think the non-*

*fiduciary issues are the ones that are the biggest issue.... That's patronizing, it's a colonial perspective. (A1) (25 24:25)*

*When papers came to be moved by the board they have already been well investigated well operationalised, well consulted on, I would hope... so really...the boards role is to pass it. So you know that's what I said to my other colleagues when it gets to this table our role is to move it, second it and pass it so that those resources of Māori health provider funding...actually goes back to Māori health organisations ...because what I found at board level quite often was that anything that looked like a Māori provider on it was actually...they were the ones that pulled it apart and said you know...have they been monitored?...are they meeting this?...and I know from working in Māori health you are audited, you are monitored...you know. So you think the scrutiny for Māori providers is more intense? (interviewer)Yes it's more intense...yes I do especially from a board level (5 9:40)*

While one participant did not share this view:

*So why does the government do that? Well for a couple of reasons, the main one being because it's their money and they will be looked upon poorly in the court of public judgment if they are [not] seen to be looking after the tax payer's money. So they do that. Do Māori organisations deserve this level of scrutiny? In fact yes they do! Some deserve it in a big way, some don't and that's a shame but it's you know, if you go on for 150 years without being allowed to make decisions when you finally are, you'll make some dumb ones. And we're no different to them in fact; Māori gotta get over the fact that we're not Māori anymore. We're in fact Māori-Europeans. So we will make a lot of the same mistakes our European ancestors made to get to the point where they are now. Because we are operating in a Western system and because we're just as bad as they are. We're self-interested too! We're not noble; we're no more noble than they are. There are individuals within our race that are as noble as individuals in their race. But we have ratbags, as many ratbags in proportion in our race as they have in theirs. (17 46:21)*



*If in fact [additional scrutiny of Māori providers] it's true, then there is an issue we need to deal with. If in fact it's not, then the issue is training the Māori providers so they don't get so precious. That scrutiny is positive! And should be expected and if it's no more or no less than any other provider is getting then shut up and take it. We have a responsibility to go back and train our own people too. Not accept that we're gonna get done over just because we're Māori because I don't accept that. And I will robustly argue with anybody who takes that point of view. (17 48:00)*

### **Cultural relations**

Māori directors reported being embedded in two cultures that are at times at odds with each other. They report that their participation in a Western governance setting requires them to know and act in a Western manner not to know and act in a Māori manner. However, at the same time they are expected to bring to the non-Māori board their Māori understandings.

*Yeah, because when I was talking before about the difference between governing in an iwi structure; the thing that I had forgotten to mention about the iwi structure is that there is quite a good; there can be a graying between the governance and the management in an operation. And it's quite easy for Māori in that structure to go like this, really easy; you know, you slide through and slide back. Whereas when you go to govern on this type of an organisation, they wanted this big fat line that goes across and never the twain shall meet in any sense. (A1) (28 45:19)*

While iwi and Māori governance was widely acknowledged as different from that of DHB governance by participants, not all iwi and Māori governance experiences were positive. Māori directors have expectations of their iwi and Māori organisations in terms of Western governance that can compromise their cultural relationships. Many spoke of the personal difficulties experienced when governance goes wrong. Navigating and managing related interests in governance is not without problems and challenging of cultural values:

*They were the only ones that knew what was right. It got too big for them. So ego, inexperience, pride. Now, should it have happened much earlier? Yes it should have, before it got to that point. But it didn't and so now in our iwi trust we're trying to install good procedures so it will not happen again. Now if they happen to be white procedures, Pākehā ones which are tried and true to the government's level. Then I don't have a problem with that. I think it's hard to challenge your own family. But you're a Māori, I'm a Māori I could challenge some of your view points and have no problem doing it. But if you were my aunty and we were sitting around the table I would have difficulty with that. And I do as the chair of our iwi trust I do!...That's vulnerability...It's huge... and that your kaumatua are always right. That's crap!... And so we are trying to... we get hammered because we are trying to protect the organisation and grow it forward and get told we are not Māori's anymore. (17 53:05)*

*So what did we do? We established postal voting and you can't do proxy voting at the meeting. Well it's always going to be, it's a postal vote or it's a drop it in the ballot box. It's not done by show of hands and you can't do proxies. Why? So that if people can see that aunty's doing this they don't have to feel they have to vote for her. It gives you the ability to have a secret ballot. Well how do you feel if you are the son or daughter of this aunty, you know what she's doing but if it's a vote taken at the meeting and you don't put your hand up... And she knows. But this way she doesn't know, you can remove her. So we like that. A lot of people don't because they actually have to think ahead now. Now they have to think before the meeting because for postal votes you have to have it in the week before. Good process huh? Demanding, but it's a good process and its safe for the organisation and it's safe for the people (17 54:43)*

*I've been working with Māori governance for a long time now here, since I've been back home anyway, since ah Dec 1992, and... Māori governance has a lot to learn still.. in many ways, some of, I think the critical thing is about understanding the business that they are in and what they are there for. Well you know just, see a community Trust, we had to close down a local up in a [rural town] a community Māori NGO, just wasn't cutting it... Health, mental*

*health, you know great group of well-intended kaumatua and kuia predominantly consumers of services but no understanding of what their purpose was... running a trust and being part of a governance and being that... and you know.... (12 25:26)*

Importantly one participant saw failure in some governance procedures as a step toward governance success:

*And then they were audited. The health and social services were audited and found that they had misspent a large amount of the DHB's money. I was on the board of the DHB at the time, it was a very difficult situation...people knew I was related to both. Well they failed on audit. Audit highlighted a problem. The DHB went through a process of audit went through remedial action the provider had to pay the money back. They did so. They had to separate themselves out and establish good governance and management...And they stayed solvent and three years afterwards they are one of the leading providers in the area with a good relationship with the DHB. The DHB worked with them positively and it came into the paper and the DHB and the provider themselves made comments about processes weren't followed, they have been corrected, monies have been repaid and processes are now followed. End of story, no story here! The DHB did that. (17 51:60)*

### **The translator - Kei Wanganui**

*It's all very well for the Minister [to say you represent me] it's not the Minister up at the pa, is it? – It's us, you know not the Minister out there in the blimmin kitchens there, it's us isn't it?(A2) (28 23:58)*

Generally Māori directors reported functioning and performing in both the board room and on the marae. These settings were discussed as very different. At times, they reported being in the middle – kei waenganui, as a translator and this has been considered in the previous section as one of the roles participants occupy. In this section the focus on kei waenganui is with their related interests outside of the boardroom rather than with their intra-board processes. Māori DHB directors are required to function and perform in both settings and at times both occur at once.

Sometimes the DHB goes to the marae:

*The credibility to do that leadership role and advocacy for Māori cultural competencies by the board, now you know like when they go to the Marae or when they go to a powhiri, whakatau whatever, it's their role, the Māori representatives to ensure that there is a cultural safety net around, around them. Now that cultural safety net can be around cultural competencies, so when you're looking at you know, aspects of cultural competencies that make up the big picture, well then you can say like, well this is a powhiri blah blah and this is the waiata that we learnt, this is the reason why we sing this waiata ...and not doing and not singing "E hara i te mea" all the time, you know or "Te Aroha", but then you know and then it says here [pointing] a koha, this is why we give a koha, so don't turn up to a Marae without a koha. You know, you can give them your gold card and your pin number, give it to them, so... [laughter](21 1:59)*

Sometimes the marae goes to the DHB:

*...so we are in the board meeting right, and the board meeting is going on, we're in the middle of the session, and then a group of Māori walk in, there's the whole thing...it's this group of Māori say 5 or 6 Māori walk in the door, and immediately I'll look to [the other Māori director] and he will look to me, he might just nod which immediately says to me stand. (13 36:42)*

*...sitting in a Pākehā forum in the DHB and I was sitting there with the other Māori director and he is brought up and understands all the Māori, he's very Māori, we're sitting there in this Pākehā forum and we're so, and so at that point in time we were in a Western kind of mode of context, the way we were talking and operating was Western, and then these people walked into the room, one of them was his uncle, who was the senior Kaumatua of [rohe] now as soon as he walked in the room everything changed for him and I, so suddenly we were the boys and this old man walks in with his walking stick and sits down and doesn't say anything, but suddenly, immediately the world shifted for us and we were the boys no one noticed, you see what I mean, no one noticed, the conversation went ahead, I knew and he*

*knew, we all knew and no one knew what happened, no one else knew what happened, .(13  
34:56)*

The ability to translate, while demanding, was seen as a significant asset:

*... what I have said to[Pākehā on the DHB], there is a difference between a good education  
and transformation. You have tried to transform me and you have tried to change me into  
you and I am not you. What I do have though is your knowledge and so I can come into your  
board rooms and run the hell of, run you off your bloody legs, but you can't come onto my  
Marae and do the same thing, so where does that leave us? .... I'm streets ahead of you. (9  
55:35)*

*I think the nice balance is we can foot it both worlds, yeah, you know. Get out to the Pa, get  
up the back and stay ... (A1) (1.6:27)*

### **Cultural distance and isolation**

Participants report being acutely aware of the cultural distance between non-Māori  
DHB board members and Māori experiences of health and feel more involvement  
with all stakeholders would benefit the board:

*We have a lot of our board meetings in [city] I would like to see them on a monthly basis go to  
different regions so public are welcome... get the feedback from the people...we are quite.....  
protected.. we have been out to areas where we have been trying to solve community issues  
...yes but where I think if we make a progression on a monthly basis ...so you start being  
more accessible and you know people can come... but then you might have to extend their  
time a bit more and listen more to what people may have to say....the format could be changed  
but you know I think we are sometimes too insulated away from our...within our meeting  
process you know even though it is open and it is [the main city] there is only one lady who  
will turn up to our meetings... you know it may not make any difference with going around  
but I think it's worth it ... because I think this is an ideal opportunity for...when you are in  
those areas to get ..you actually will get the Cancer Society or the iwi provider hey.... come in*

*and do a 20minute presentation to the board about what you do...you know I just think it will just bring more understanding and depth of experience for the board members. (5 22:58)*

Another suggested a kaumatua position may reduce the cultural distance:

*Ah certainly I consider it a win that I've only just, I say I only because it's taken me a year to do this, that they've got kaumatua positions now in the DHB that is a, it's a 4/10<sup>th</sup> position but paid right, now I'm getting this bloody concrete.....yes with the option of actually increasing the time. Ah in terms of reference if you like, that they provide cultural advice to the Chair, to the board, to the CEO. What I'm really after is a cultural audit for the whole outfit, that's my aim. To do that ... I need a kaumatua, you know and if ever we needed one, we need it here, as far as I'm concerned. But I believe that we need to, got to start at the board. Got no question in my mind about this, no question at all (22/3 1:15)*

The importance of tūrangawaewae (a place to stand and belong) was seen as support for directors:

*I think a lot of loneliness for Māori [directors]... I heard from some of the meetings I've been to outside of [my district]. Ah..Is because perhaps, perhaps some of our Māori board members are really not that locked in, in their home areas. If you're locked in, in your home area to what's going down for health then you are far better equipped to deal with it at the board level. And also from a national perspective. But I have from time to time come across members who are actually not totally involved in their home area. You know totally involved in a way that gives them a sense of overwhelming confidence. (19 10:50)*

Māori directors report accountability and responsibility to Māori stakeholders via multiple Māori networks such as marae, hapū, and iwi networks. They report that their stakeholders have high expectations of them in their DHB role however the directors express frustration with their limited ability to affect change.

*If you are on the DHB they will expect that you will resolve whatever the issue is. I mean what I do is make sure that the complaints and the issues go where they have got to go because you have still got to follow through the process, and if I notice that there is a theme,*

*then I will raise it at the board as a theme of concern and hand it over to the CEO with the agreement of the board, for him to actually investigate whether that's a trend, a potential risk, risky trend. But the expectation of what you can do in terms of resolving those issues and the reality of what you can do is quite different.(A1) (28 45:19)*

*.. I think their expectations; not only is the expectation that we kind of influence the behaviour and values of tauīwi, but you've also got the expectations that the community put on you and your own whānau.... that you get results. You know, you've got to deliver. We want to see something tangible. So, there's that extra burden. I feel more comfortable with that now than I used to when I was younger ... but I think that all that extra loadings that we carry is; the more your profile becomes visible the more expectation goes with it. (A1) (25 1:07:57)*

*"Part of my accountability every month I will give you a DHB report in my reports on other things, okay?", so that's what I did, so every month I included my monthly report as part of my runanga management.... So, if there were any matters that I felt that the iwi should know about that quickly need to be made aware of... well...I don't take for granted that my position on there as an iwi rep appointed by the Minister or that we're responsible directly to him, I don't take for one minute that that's a 'given', that's in my opinion. And I mean, there are times I know just after the board meeting and after the papers are public that I will ring [Kuia] ... and say, "Aunty, it's a board meeting today...So, I talk to them..., and I try to get there first [before they see it in the paper] (20 51:52)*

### **Māori health and hauora Māori – wellness**

*So you know, we're not asking for the moon....You heard that korero, hinga te he tete kura, haere mai he tete kura ... that punga tree, that punga tree is a metaphoric illustration of the whānau, the hapu and the iwi. You have the newborns in the middle, you have the bigger ones outside nurturing it. You have your mate, this and all the way down the trunk of these trees..... is the whakapapa to that tree all the way back to Papatūānuku.. It's a metaphoric illustration of wellness and that's what we want back, is our wellness and, when you talk*

*about management, do you think of those kaumatua, those rangatira, those ariki, Arikinui, that's all part and parcel of what we would call governance. .. their tikanga is still here. It hasn't died yet. They're trying to repress and they will continue to try and repress it because we get that, I get that. Oh those days [may be gone but] the values are not gone. And this is where education has to take place. They will go for a formal certificate, degree or whatever, in the absence of what is really theirs and this is the sort of thing that is making them angry. (9 1:00)*

Several directors reported that their Māori health governance concerns are well beyond short term planning, beyond personal accountability and reputation, and beyond simply the jurisdiction of the DHB.

*.... our governance people who are installed in governance positions, they have to have this sort of thing clear.... I remember using the term wellness one time and the nurse said, no no Matua, it's well-being. I said no, I'm using the wairua, I'm using a wairua definition not the medical term. (9 1:01:16)*

Some spoke of the importance and the responsibility placed upon them:

*The issue about the weight, the weight, the burden of responsibility on the governance, that falls on those directors that represent the Māori people. (13 30:00)*

*[I feel a] huge sense of responsibility in terms of trying to improve health standards of Māori. I get hoha...sometimes I think I need to ask a non-Māori question, because I don't want them to think I am a one issue person. (27 45:17)*

*From the very first moment that I was asked "would I be interested in accepting the role?" I felt that health; ... it is the wealth of our people from a Māori perspective. And I dare say from anyone's perspective health is the wealth of our people. (19 14:50)*

For Māori directors Māori health matters are intergenerational and their accountabilities extend into future generations:



*It is a trick, it is a big organisation and it's a complex one and I think that's where the challenge of governance is and a specific challenge for us for Māori because our goals are long term. (A1) And we actually quite happy to wait and put everything in place, as to opposed to "oh we have only got 12 months" and then the results will show, just a financial year we will still be there after the end of it. We are strategic in our thinking. There is this really overriding fear that 2 or 3 generations down, "oh that was your grandmother's decision"... Whereas the CEO here might make a mistake and things might not be quite right, but you know what, in a couple of years he will actually be gone and nobody will remember him. But as for us, its forever. (A2) It's an interesting way of how accountability gets exercised in our own community. (A1) (25 30:07)*

Another participant attempts to put into perspective the role a DHB may have in matters of Māori health:

*Well I do remember [a] DHB Manager of theirs was sent to talk to me about our relationship and he came out swinging you know. I think he was a little bit negative. He said to me "look we're a District Health board, we administer, we've got [thousands] employees and we administer over a [millions] dollars' worth of health assets. So what has [this iwi] got to offer this relationship?" I said, "we have got [hundreds of thousands] Māoris requiring health care so your [thousands of employees] doesn't sound much to me and they're not Māori most of them and by the way, [since] you're talking about money, the Government can't even give back what they took off [our iwi] because [that asset that you took from us] alone is worth a trillion dollars. And I said so.. so your millions don't sound a hell of a lot to me." I said "what I have is the problem and a solution. What you have [are] the resources and no idea how to solve the problem, so this is why you and I are talking". (09 54:00)*

Not only were Māori health targets reported to be harder to measure because they were intergenerational, but also questions were raised about measurement generally:

*Yes, we were talking about qualifications and frameworks and competencies and that and so this whole group of us Māori and you get that 1, 2,3 4, 5 all that kind of stuff, and we were talking about how do you put the Māori stuff in, and so we talked about paradox, so that if*

*you're going to put the Māori stuff into box 1, 2, 3, 4 5 paradoxically what you do in setting out those competencies in a linear fashion, is you completely undermine the Māori way of doing things, so the paradox is instead of setting up a framework that enhances the Māori....*  
(13 23:45)

### **Raruraru (trouble) - inter and intra iwi conflict**

Many participants expressed being aware of conflict of one kind or another amongst their Māori networks and responses to this conflict varied. Some were pragmatic about it, others were frustrated. The most important and consistent response however was the view that the conflicts were the business of Māori themselves to resolve.

*These sorts of dynamics have gone on for years and I can't be bothered with that. I just think get it over and done with and I'd rather; you know I don't even want to know about all the baggage of the past. I actually don't want to know about that because I think that's happened; we've got to look at now and where we are going to go to. (A1) (28 31:27)*

Much of the conflict centred on issues of inter and intra iwi status:

*And we do have some tensions; we do have some tensions of Ahi ka mana whenua and waka mana whenua – the perceptions. That's why I instructed that we have a whole day of planning so we can look at the structure where they both...no – the Māori Advisory Committee. So that the tensions are gone; the tensions then have become personalised and it's not at all helpful if personalities are going across the table instead of looking at what we are meant to be doing for the Māori community. .(A1) (28 30:31)*

*There's some members on our group that always thought that [local iwi] has the right to sit there on that Chair, but it's my understanding of the Act, is for Māori, not necessarily tangata whenuu... (22/3 8:23)*

Generally participants felt that such conflict was best left to Māori themselves to resolve:

*[The rest of the board] they don't want to know about it [tensions amongst Māori]. They wouldn't want to know about it; they expect it to not be there. You don't want them to know that there are factions. Like you say, they'll say, "Oh this is good; they're fighting amongst themselves (A1) (28 30:31)*

*It's not excusing him [the Chair] from his responsibilities; I really don't know what he could do about some of it. You know, these are Māori issues – he is a good man. (A2) (28 30:31)*

In summary, this chapter has examined data related to the third theme Ko wai oku whanaunga? (To whom am I related?). The following subthemes were explored; Iwi relationship arrangements, Professional Māori networks, Conflicted or related interests, Synergistic relations, Cultural relations, The translator –kei waenganui, and Cultural distance and isolation.

Participants report experiences of their cultural and/or professional networks in relation to their directorial role. This theme attempted to explore the complexity of these formal and informal relationships in participants' respective cultural and professional nexuses. Many of the relationships between Māori and between Māori and the Crown are determined by greater colonial discourses and are more fully discussed in Chapter Eight.

Participants spoke of the tension experienced between cultural accountabilities and professional accountabilities although these were not always seen as mutually exclusive. However, they were sometimes seen by others as conflicting.

Resource dependency theory informs us of the many beneficial ways in which a connected director may bring resources to the table. Since Māori directors also function and perform as non-Māori directors function and perform presumably comparable benefits of connection are also recognised. However, this recognition does not appear to be afforded to Māori directors, who generally report experiencing increased scrutiny of their cultural and professional networks in relation to

directorial processes. In contrast, some directors report little or no recognition of their professional networks where they are culturally connected but not related.

Discussion of this theme and the other themes that interconnect are more fully developed in Chapter Eight, the next chapter.

## Chapter Eight: Discussion

The sharing of this land, while acceptable to our ancestors, was negotiated under a constitutional code known as the Treaty of Waitangi (Mead, 1999).

However, this contract did not ensure adequate health provision to Māori and remains, to this day, reinterpreted in ways that are not necessarily compatible with a Māori world view or useful to Māori health. (Reid & Cram, 2005, p. 34)

### Theme Summary

The purpose of the results chapters is to organise and report data in an effective and meaningful way. Themes and meanings of themes were constructed within the interplay of context and theory. The social (and therefore political) nature of knowledge production is recognised and confronted. Considerable process detail and generous illustrative quotations provide transparency.

Thematic organising, clustering around three Māori-centred themes and subsequent subthemes, facilitated preliminary analysis. Table 8.1 summarises this thematic organisation:

*Table 8.1 Thematic Summary of Results*

Themes	Subthemes
No hea au?	Legislation and appointment
	Tenure
	Election
	Grass roots as disparity
Ko wai au?	The role of the sole advocate for Māori (ill) health and the elephant in the room.
	The role of supporter and protector of all Māori in health
	The role of walking Treaty workshop, social engineer and race relations conciliator;
	The role of the second class director
	The role of the token director, pea te tahi, e rua, etahi, kore rānei?
	The role of the translator; kei waenganui (in between)

	The role of the de-indigenised director, and the Ministerial directive
	The role of the connected director
Ko wai ōku whanaunga?	Iwi relationship arrangements
	Professional Māori networks
	Conflicted or related interests?
	Synergistic relations
	Cultural relations
	The translator; kei wanganui
	Cultural distance and isolation

Participants have offered rich and unique primary data allowing considerable insight into the experiences of Māori directors on District Health Boards. The three themes provide a useful way to conceptualise director experience and facilitate analysis. The thematic analysis was useful because it enabled a deconstruction of the directorial experience. Now, in this discussion chapter, a synthesis and reconstruction of directorial experience is explored.

### **What are the experiences of Māori directors on District Health Boards?**

The motivation to pursue this study was to explore the governance experiences of Māori directors in Western governance settings. Arguably all governance settings are Western in that all are determined in fundamental ways by (Western) law although some governance settings accommodate bicultural processes more than others (Panoho & Stablein, 2012). DHB settings clearly do not. Also clear is that, without specific provision in the NZPH&D Act for appointment, Māori representation on DHBs was much less likely because election has proved to be, thus far, an ineffective way to facilitate Māori representation on a DHB (Gauld, 2005).

What is apparent in this study is that bicultural awareness is emergent. Participants report variable cultural recognition and support in their respective intra-board processes. While some non-Māori colleagues were felt to be receptive to Māori directors' concerns, others were not. Many instances were reported where, after challenge and confrontation by Māori, support and recognition was forthcoming.

Collectively participants report Māori DHB directorial representation introduced a different voice and it is clear that this different voice generated intra-board process challenge. All participants felt, despite improvements in Māori health being difficult to measure, that their presence at the board table offered positive governance contribution.

The empirical nature of this study, in combination with existing theoretical approaches has allowed for fresh insights that arise out of the entire study, rather than applying to a single theme. Three discussion points in particular will be developed. First, prior to this study the nature of the legislation was presumed to be relatively straight forward. Participants' experiences in light of postcolonial theoretical interpretations require a reconsideration of this assumption. For example, the place of anger as a vector for legislative change is one of these insights. Second, the research objective to explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership is discussed with a postcolonial lens. Third, while the place at the DHB table for the Māori director has emerged from an historical place of anger, struggle and resistance their presence now offers a governance opportunity that non-Māori at the DHB table have yet to fully embrace and comprehend. Using the tools of postcolonial theory and critique the gaze is then turned toward the coloniser and the deficit in Pākehā knowledge is examined before transformative possibilities are proposed.

The interaction between the theoretical underpinnings of this study prior to data collection with the thematic analysis based on participants' views has invited previously unforeseen connections with additional literatures. These additional literatures have offered tools with which to interpret, articulate, and understand new theoretical/empirical interplay with implications for governance practice. Thus, in this chapter additional literature is introduced.

## **Reconsidering Health Governance and Legislation**

Māori directors function and perform as non-Māori directors' function and perform. General governance literature in both the management and the health management paradigm therefore, informs and supplements this discussion of (Māori) director experiences.

Participants' experiences resonate with management governance literature in a number of ways: concerns with information asymmetry, management capture, lack of control over strategic implementation, director homophily, limited fiscal freedom, conflicts of interest concerns and so on. For the purposes of this discussion these experiences are categorised broadly into either agency or non-agency concerns. Agency concerns, in particular public sector accountability, will be discussed in the following Health Governance section. For example, agency concerns such as demand conflicts, representing Māori (and others) on the one hand and representing the Minister on the other, features. The intention to democratise health governance (Gauld, 2005) has not been reflected with DHB autonomy. These consistent governance experiences are discussed in relation to health governance. Given the call to generate more first-order board process data the utility of a health governance approach is questioned. Sullivan (2009) offers a PCT critique of public sector management and indigenous participation.

### **Health governance, NPM and agency**

As previously stated, the introduction of NPM doctrine into the NZ health sector brought with it specific governance accountabilities, accountabilities more in line with those of the corporate sector. Despite the introduction of private sector management principles, health management research has not benefitted from extant corporate governance research. Governance researchers in management offer multi-theoretic challenges to corporate governance research. In particular these scholars propose that director efficacy or performance cannot be adequately inferred by second order data such as input/output measurements. Instead they propose that



intra-board processes, or the black box, be a focal point of study. While both share agency orientations, management governance research invites a broader sociological engagement, hence intra-board processes are researched. Participants' experiences of intra-board process reported in this study can enrich our understanding of health governance.

Some of the negative experiences that participants reported can in part be explained by the limited engagement of health governance research with management governance research, instead aligning essentially with the economic and legal paradigm. Health governance, in the uncritical adoption of economic constructs, infers director efficacy or performance from input/output models:

NPM governance models were characterised as maintaining accountability through strong agency relationships and corporatized and quasi-market models with organisational efficiency the goal. (Barnett et al., 2009, p. 119)

Barnett et al. (2009) however, do point out that increasingly complex and increasingly diverse (p. 119) public sector governance goals are currently not being met by NPM governance goals. Health sector governance does not adequately accommodate these changes (Gauld, 2005). This has created additional governance tensions for DHB directors. Particularly given the goals of the Labour-led government in the formation of the DHBs were to "improve population health, [and also] to increase public participation in the health system by devolving decision-making to the local level and democratising governance" (Gauld, 2005, p. 346). Provision for election of board members offered a potentially significant opportunity to facilitate community input. However, given poor voter turnout to date, it was unlikely that the opportunity would be realised. Participants in this study report election, in particular for Māori, as an ineffective means of representation. Gauld (2005), in a comprehensive report on DHB elections concludes:

Enabling people to vote in board elections may not be the most effective way to democratise healthcare. If election of DHB members is to continue, further changes to the electoral system are required. (p. 345)

In addition to limits to democratisation via election, DHB directors face additional limits to democratisation as Crown Entities. Despite the Labour government wish to democratise governance, DHB directors are restricted in their governance domain by public sector regulatory mechanisms. Participants report frustration and disappointment in attempting to meet conflicting demands between the public participation goal and the regulatory demands of a Crown Entity where directors are, effectively, representatives of the Minister (Gauld, 2005). Māori DHB directors acutely experience conflict with accountability because the distribution and allocation of public resources toward Māori health is inextricably and simultaneously entwined with neo-colonial forces of benevolence and resentment. Commentators on Māori health point out:

...power relationships in society are [as these are] critical foundations for health. With Māori health there are additional power considerations such as ethnicity, indigeneity, and colonisation. (Reid & Cram, 2005, p. 33)

Reid and Cram point to the underlying forces, those of colonisation, that have so problematically positioned contemporary Māori health, therefore by representation, so problematically positioned Māori DHB directors with regard to accountability.

Sullivan (2009) points to the ways in which neo-colonial forces perpetuate the problematisation of public sector accountability for the colonised. Sullivan argues that NPM introduces “an understanding of public sector accountability as a linear and hierarchical process” (p. 57) displacing or denying the opportunity for other accountabilities such as accountabilities to the community. DHB participants in this study reflect this; they report that despite the democratising rhetoric, the Minister makes it clear that their accountability is unequivocally to the government. Sullivan (2009) suggests the ways in which the differentially constructed identities of the

indigenous complicate and contradict already inadequate linear and hierarchical accountabilities. In the construction of the colonised as the Other, and in the positioning of the colonised within public administration (specifically governance positions in the case of this thesis) multiple, simultaneous and conflicting identities are constructed. Sullivan (2009), using government policy informed by development theory, summarises three such politically created identities of the indigenous as those of: the individual, the disadvantaged minority member, and the culturally distinct polity member. Participants in this study repeatedly reported the multiple and conflicting roles they were called upon to enact at the board table. Discussion of identity follows in the intra-board process section below.

In providing for community and specifically for Māori representation on DHBs the NZPH&D Act further signalled a democratisation of health governance. The direct accountability to the Minister for the implementation of centrally determined policy whilst at the same time localising health funding, presented participants with incommensurate governance demands.

The (NPM) democratisation of health governance can be contrasted with (or is perhaps mirrored by) corporate attempts to integrate social responsibility by increased recognition of stakeholders. Both Sullivan (2009) in his critique of limiting indigenous stakeholder identities, and Banerjee (2007), in his notion of stakeholder colonialism (p. 33) remind us that it is the state that determines stakeholder identity and therefore legitimacy, not the colonised themselves. This study in multiple ways illustrates the ways in which the neo-colonial construction of identity affects Māori stakeholder legitimacy.

### **Legislation and the historiographical revolution**

*But in this working group he said that I have a lot of respect for you and for some of the others that he was now working with. And I said ‘...but John if the government hadn’t legislated to put two Māori in there you wouldn’t have that respect because you wouldn’t*

*have had this exposure. And he had to stop and realise that that was so. So when you're initially against us, why are we doing this? To legislate this for Māori.... two people on to this board and that doesn't feel right from an equity point of view? Into the system, when you get into the system you start to realise... hang on there is another world view, these guys make a lot of sense and if we combine the two we actually might make some solutions for everyone not just Māori and that's where he's got to now. Why? Because the government legislated to put two Māori on that board 'cause if we hadn't got there he wouldn't have had the opportunity to hear it. And he had to hear it several times. (17 41:00)*

As stated above, without specific potential provision in the NZPH&D Act Māori representation on DHBs was much less likely. Election has proved ineffective (Gauld, 2005) for Māori, and is viewed as problematic, as is clear from participants' views.

**The token director, pea tētahi, e rua, ētahi, kore rānei? (Perhaps one, two, some or none?).** Despite, at first reading, the clause specifying a minimum representation of two Māori directors on each DHB appearing as a quota, many DHBs had only one Māori representative and some had none. This contributed to a sense of frustration, tokenism and of powerlessness expressed by many participants over the entire selection and appointment process. In several cases frustrations were compounded by a lack of transparency with the selection and appointment process. Contrary to what was generally accepted by Māori directors themselves and by other DHB directors, including chairs, representation of Māori on DHBs was at the behest of the Minister and was not an absolute duty on the part of the government. The inclusion of the phrase best endeavours (to appoint) may imply, where appointments were not made, that there were not enough competent Māori available.

It is not possible to adequately frame participants' experiences of frustration, powerlessness and tokenism without also adequately framing the socio-political (historical) antecedents of such legislative moves. Veracini (2001) isolates a period which he describes as the historiographical revolution in the portrayal of NZ history:

In the rapid social and political change which engulfed New Zealand from the late 1960s and which peaked in the 1980s the most prominent and immediate factor stimulating historical research and history rewriting has been the political and public attention paid to race relations; in particular to what is sometimes referred to as the 'Waitangi process', the overall process of legal, social, ethical and constitutional upgrading of the Treaty of Waitangi. (p. 128)

By the end of the 1980s, Veracini (2001) claims historians had begun re-writing the colonial discourses of benevolent colonisers rescuing a savage (but otherwise amenable) Māori race, writing instead a "fully-fledged historical revisionist interpretation [that was] ready to fill the gap that recent rejections of traditional historical images had created" (p. 131). Historians, in this revisionist interpretation, this time portrayed not only Māori civilisation but also portrayed colonial malevolence. The Waitangi process served, and continues to serve, as a conduit for significant Māori empowerment and legislative change, such as, of course, the NZPH&D Act. In this study the Waitangi process and subsequent legislative changes were reported to have determined directors' rules of engagement at the board table and is a pivotal feature of Māori/Pākehā relations and therefore intra-board process.

Some legal historians concede that the political influence Māori have asserted is significant, for example:

The persons who are now represented in the collectivity of the state and its activities are not just individual men and women. There are also, to mention a few, 'Māori', 'iwi', 'whānau' and hapū. It was the neo-liberal turn in governmental policies which, combined with Māori persistence in their teams of action and milieus of existence, largely brought this about. (Sharp, 1997, p. 318)

Other, indigenous politico-legal commentators question both generally and specifically whether state sector legislative progress with Māori/Pākehā relations is

adequate (Jackson, 1995; Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Tauri, 1999). Tauri (1999/2005), in tracking the “indigenization of government policy, legislation, and service delivery in New Zealand” during the 1980s concludes:

The token nature of the government’s sensitisation program is reflected in the fact that the state’s bicultural experiment to date has largely concentrated on types of “cultural sensitivity” exercises but made no substantive organisational accommodation. (p. 315)

Tauri (2005) contends that only superficial Māori cultural practice and philosophy is adopted by the state and that this undermines any professed attempt to offer true autonomy or control. In other words, Māori were co-opted to simply participate in Pākehā processes. The inability of the NZPH&D Act to consistently provide for Māori DHB representation fuels allegations of tokenism. Māori DHB appointments are still firmly in the hands of the Minister despite legislative provision for Māori DHB representation. Further, the lack of cultural accommodation at the board table belies any notion of biculturalism, a state sector and Treaty expectation, and instead supports Tauri’s (2005) claim of the co-option of Māori into Pākehā processes.

### **Anger as a legislative vector**

While the importance of the legislative move to potentially appoint Māori to DHBs should never be diminished, nor too should it be considered adequate.

Epistemologically, postcolonial theory and critique and Kaupapa Māori inform us that legislative moves to address colonial injustices are still within the confines of a colonial relationship, until such time that real concessions to domination are accessible. Walker (1990) in *Ka whawhai tonu matou (struggling without end)* and in *Nga Tau Tohetohe (years of anger)* (1987) articulates Māori struggle for socio-political recognition as an unfolding process of resistance and resilience. Lane West-Newman (2004) specifically addresses the existence and potential of anger as a driving legislative force:

Law is the focal point for the engagement of anger in the politics of decolonisation. Once a significant mechanism for colonisation, it now mediates possibilities of material decolonisation...Because the majority do not easily give up their material and intellectual dominance, this is a process of contestation; and in that process the two sides approach law very differently. (p. 191)

Other commentators point out that little has been conceded to Māori without (on-going) struggle, protest and anger. Maaka and Fleras (2005) point out that, despite increased recognition over time, legal recognition has always been reactive, not proactive:

Relationships continue to be framed within the discourse and structures of nineteenth-century colonialism- albeit with a more human face – with the supremacy of the Crown sovereignty and veto power put firmly in place. Government policy tends to remain stuck around perceptions of indigenous peoples as a ‘problem people’ with ‘needs’ requiring solutions (Humpage and Fleras, 2001). (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 284)

Although Māori participants report the legislative move to appoint Māori directors to DHBs was a significant and positive move, most also reported frustration with the lack of transparency and certainty in the process. Some reported offence at the notion of proportional membership, particularly in relation to the Treaty partnership principle.

Part 3 s 29(4) of the Act states:

In making appointments to a board the minister must endeavour to ensure that –

- (a) Māori membership of the board is proportional to the number of Māori in the DHB’s resident population (as estimated by Statistics New Zealand);
- and

(b) in any event, there are at least 2 Māori members of the board

We see that there is no absolute duty on the part of the Minister to appoint Māori. The Act therefore is limited in terms of consistent and stable provision for Māori representation at the DHB table. If, and when, it occurs, it is at the behest of the Minister. As will be apparent, the Treaty proves useful in terms of engagement once Māori are at the table, and also provides for clear policy expectations and goals. However, despite entrenchment of the principles, the Treaty does not guarantee representation at the DHB table thereby calling into question the principle of partnership. Further, Māori control only those aspects of the selection and appointment process that the Minister may allow. While consultation with Māori stakeholders is part of the process it appears to be consultation *to* and not consultation *with*, resonating with multiple theoretical constructs of colonial patronage found in KM and PCT.

Participants' reports of the process indicate clearly that there was confusion and uncertainty over appointments amongst Māori and iwi stakeholders, and indeed amongst the directors themselves. In addition, in some districts, there was lack of clarity over who could speak for which Māori group. Bishop (1999), in keeping with Kaupapa Māori constructs, conceptualises in his "spiral discourse" construct (p.172), a method of consultation that facilitates not simply participation, but also collaboration. This is tikanga (the polite and right way) and considered more in keeping with a Māori interpretation of consultation where cultural values such as *kanohi ki te kanohi* (face to face), *aroha ki te tangata* (respect for people) and *manaaki ki te tangata* (sharing, hosting and generosity) are upheld. Kaupapa Māori constructs, initially situated within the education field in response to mono-cultural pedagogy is now a widely applied methodology amongst Māori researchers in multiple fields. Tikanga has much to offer non-Māori in engagement with Māori on Māori terms. In the appointment of Māori to DHBs a more considered consultation process is necessary.



The government's insistence on iwi as the only viable Treaty partner, while convenient for government (Panoaho and Stablein, 2012) locks in a colonial understanding of Māori identity (Barcham, 2002). This disempowers non-iwi Māori alliances and does not appropriately reflect the contemporary reality of Māori affiliation other than simply an iwi focus.

There was considerable participant discussion centring on election, selection and appointment. Generally participants' expressed a preference for election with the sense that somehow it would provide a different director status however this was not viewed as realistic for Māori. The expense of campaigning, the cultural dissonance evoked by the hubris necessary to be out there and be seen, the rurality of Māori voters, the overall lack of public interest in voting, and the underlying concerns of racism all serve as disincentives for Māori to stand.

As we have seen legislative measures to *potentially* appoint Māori to DHBs do not guarantee Māori representation on DHBs. Various theoretical analyses of Aotearoa/NZ colonial and neo-colonial history offer insight into the limitations of legislative ability to redistribute colonial power in relation to Māori stakeholders, such as the objective to enable Maori participation in DHB governance. The NZPH&D Act pt 3 s 23(d-f) does not extend to adequate consultation over director appointments.

### **Intra-board Processes**

This discussion centres on stereotyping, representation, political correctness, and, institutional racism. Māori directors arrive at the DHB table from within an already colonially determined, problematic identity and are placed in a double bind.

Participants spoke of their grass roots origins and of how that starkly contrasted with the origins of their non-Māori counterparts. The transformational opportunity to view this as intellectual and experiential capital, as a powerful governance resource, and a strategic instrument is not captured. Instead, identity is mired in what KM terms as a discourse of deficit. The lack of recognition of this potential

governance contribution is similar to the PCT construct of ambivalence (Bhabha, 1994) making such a contribution value-laden and contradictory. Ghandi (1998), in her critical introduction to PCT, with the assistance of Memmi, articulates this contradiction:

Memmi's political pessimism delivers an account of postcoloniality as a historical condition marked by the visible apparatus of freedom and the concealed persistence of unfreedom. (p. 6-7)

Primarily, participants reported experiencing struggle, hostility, and frustration with intra-board processes. In particular, participants reported being typecast in numerous ways. Such assumptions demonstrate how an ambivalent/contradictory relationship can come about and be perpetuated. The double bind of apparent freedom, implied by the seat at the board table, and the concealed unfreedom, implied by the imposition of multiple stereotypical roles, constrains Māori director contribution.

Māori DHB directors simultaneously experience multiple role expectations, as all directors are reported to do. However, non-Māori DHB directors do not face the same accountability complexity (Sullivan, 2009) or the vestiges of colonial power imbalance (Reid & Cram, 2005, p. 33) experienced by Māori. Embodied in the roles ascribed to Māori DHB directors lay the conundrum:

Facing the challenges of intergenerational social dysfunction is not of course the sole preserve of Māori directors; however it is true that Māori directors can generally only expect to operate in such contexts because it is only in such contexts that they appear to be explicitly invited to participate! (Modlik, 2004, p. 22)

Participants consistently reported isolation and marginalisation at the board table, at best the result of minority status, or at worst, the result of overt hostility centred mostly on allegations of race-based funding. Some directors were called upon to

justify their preferential presence at the board table by fellow non-Māori members, the implication being that Māori were somehow privileged and received preferential treatment. The directors themselves reported being faced with stereotypical expectations of incompetency; such assumptions are supported by independent research, as this DHB CEO comment illustrates:

I'm holding out for STV because I think that it will actually improve things. I believe Māori will be represented through STV [election] so that it will free up appointed positions to be more closely targeted to skill needs. (CEO 5, as quoted in Barnett & Clayden, 2007, p. 45)

Participants in this study had varying directorial experience ranging from novice to thoroughly experienced. While there are concerns about directorial capacity amongst Māori and non-Māori alike there is no evidence that Māori DHB directors categorically lack targeted skills. Can it be that only non-Māori appointees have the targeted skills? This researcher, during a public DHB meeting, observed a non-Māori elected DHB member fall asleep; is this grounds for categorisation? Further, there is evidence that election is a not a viable mode of community representation and especially so for Māori (Gauld, 2005).

### **The burden of representation**

Participants report experiencing numerous stereotypical expectations at the board table. While one could argue this is inevitable for anyone in a representative role. Shohat and Stam (1994) point out that it is characteristic of a minority group, not a dominant group. The authors deconstruct the racial stereotyping process by first discussing representation:

The hair-trigger sensitivity about racial stereotypes derives partly from what has been labelled the “burden of representation”. The connotations of “representation” are at once religious, esthetic, political, and semiotic. (p. 182)

They then describe how Memmi's "mark of the plural" intensifies representation for the colonised (p.183):

Project[ing] colonised people as "all the same", any negative behaviour by any member of the oppressed community is instantly generalized as typical, as pointing to a perpetual backsliding toward some presumed negative essence. (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 183)

The burden of representation then plays out differently for the dominant or rather, representation does not become a burden: "Representations of dominant groups, on the one hand, are seen not as allegorical but as "naturally" diverse, examples of the ungeneralizable variety of life itself" (p. 183).

Negative stereotypes of governance competency, such as those above are often softened with politically correct notions of capacity building. With regard to the currency of targeted governance skills PCT scholars challenge the notion of capacity building within bureaucratic and managerialist approaches choosing instead to reframe the problem as capacity sharing. Tedmanson (2012) advocates:

greater critical reflexivity on the 'whiteness' of managerialist and self-determination discourses and greater respect for the depth of wisdom, strategic capacity and cross cultural ability of Aboriginal managers and Anangu communities. (p. 250)

The political correctness (PC) phenomenon simply reinforces difference by silencing debate:

PC, as Michael Denning has pointed out, suggests a desire for a kind of standard etiquette or protocol to regulate relations between communities lacking sustained social connection, an impersonal code administering diplomacy between disparate enclaves...it is premised then, on distance and a lack of intimacy (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 341).

Given Denning's definition political correctness can be considered a cause, an indicator, and, a consequence of social distance. Political correctness then, in a governance setting, would not be conducive to collaborative tasks and can isolate and exaggerate a minority position. Reports of isolation were prevalent amongst participants. Even with the best of intentions and the least discriminatory of boards Māori DHB directors' still report isolation. Generally Māori health was not openly discussed and participants speculated on a number of reasons for this. Speculation ranged from a nervousness, or reluctance to engage for fear of offence through to a conscious choice to reject any involvement, the former representing Denning's political correctness (as cited in Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 342) and the latter representing possible subterfuge (Nkomo, 1992, p. 488).

Māori directors are additionally burdened by attempting to address disparate health needs whilst in an isolated and marginalised position within their own board. This reluctance on the part of non-Māori board members to engage in Māori health discussion and the consequential isolation experienced by Māori board members represents a significant governance process loss. The capacity building rhetoric in reinforcing a discourse of deficit also represents a significant governance process loss (Tedmonson, 2012). The immediate and only implication of building Pākehā capacity is one of a deficit in (Western) organisational practice.

In keeping with Tedmanson's critique of Western management discourses the currency of Western governance skills is privileged at the DHB board table. Virtually no investigation and/or accommodation of the contribution a Māori world view may make to governance processes takes place in the DHB boardroom. For example, participants report some of their Pākehā counterparts enjoy and appreciate marae experience; however they do not report that such experiences provide for any "greater critical reflexivity" (Tedmanson, 2012, p. 249) nor any changes in their counterparts' governance practice. The assumption here is that the marae is the place

for Māori to operate as Māori, and the place where Pākehā can appreciate and enjoy Māori experience but the boardroom is not the place for Māori to be Māori.

Institutional racism is also a force at play in the public health boardroom and indeed one that participants' report as ubiquitous. In a discursive examination, "Media, racism, and public health policy," Nairn et al. (2006) discuss the colonial vestiges of institutional racism. In doing so they draw on Walker's view of the invisible nature of institutional racism to Pākehā:

Walker noted that members of the dominant [Pākehā] group were often unaware of its [racism's] origins or its function in maintaining a structure of Pākehā domination and Māori subordination (Walker, 1986, p. 94, as cited in Nairn et al., 2006, p. 184)

The term race-based funding was used by participants to reflect back what they considered to be a prevailing covert and overt discourse. Considerable division, debate and opposition to the term of race is documented within academia across multiple disciplines and is critiqued locally (Smith, 1999) and particularly within health (Campbell, 2005; Durie, 2011; C. P. Jones, 2001). Academics use ethnicity instead which is considered more socially acceptable however that term is also associated with the fervently rejected biological underpinning (Campbell, 2005). Instead the term indigenous although also problematic, is often used. Whatever the term, race or ethnic or indigenous, the silencing of the issue by non-Māori further negates the Māori DHB director's governance process potential by not engaging them in their unique and relevant cultural (but not singular resource) competence.

To complicate matters further, or rather to further illustrate the silencing of race and of colonisation, the NZPH&D Act pt 1 s 3(3) states: "To avoid any doubt, nothing in this Act – (a) entitles a person to preferential access to services on the basis of race." The next paragraph, s 3(b) indicates that s 73 of the Human Rights Act 1993 is to be observed. Section 73 (1)(a-b) of the Human Right Act permits preferential access (to health services) in cases of discrimination and/or need. The Act does little to guide

DHB directors in the highly contentious matter of colonisation and health other than to embed the loosely interpreted and retrospectively embellished Treaty Principles, to *potentially* provide for Māori DHB representation, and to require consultation and adherence to Māori health policy. Connecting the causal dots of colonisation and poor health for the benefit of the non-Māori DHB director has been left to the Māori directors themselves. In failing to democratise health governance (Gauld, 2005) the Act has also failed to decolonise health governance.

Regardless of the academic and legal debate around race, ethnicity, and indigeneity discourses, it is how in the context of the board room that these discourses are experienced by participants themselves that matter. McCormack (2012) addresses this matter of practicality:

While the status of indigeneity as a principle capable of generating testable hypotheses is a conceptual problem for social scientists, indigenous peoples in their day-to-day activities are faced with the requirement to negotiate the minefield between theory and practice in a context where disjunctions between the present, the past and the future are the real bases of confrontation. (p. 419)

Virtually all participants reported struggles with the legitimacy of either their place on the board and/or struggles with the legitimacy of the Māori health focus. Without exception, Māori directors initiated confrontation/discussion/kōrero on these matters. Many reported overcoming these difficulties and upon reflection, accepted the process as worthwhile. However for some the confrontations were not satisfactorily resolved and were reported to have been at a cost to intra-board interpersonal trust and thus intra-board process.

### **The Pākehā deficit – unsettling the settlers, decolonising health governance**

It is sometimes more revealing, then, to analyze the stereotyper than to deconstruct the stereotype (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 21)

In keeping with the binary construction but instead gazing back from the position of the Other one could argue that there is a deficit in Pākehā knowledge, competency, and skill in matters of colonial history and of matters Māori. Māori are bicultural, Pākehā generally are not (Campbell, 2005). Participants reported that their non-Māori counterparts held many misunderstandings about Māori and about colonial history and the implications for Māori health. Māori directors report being repeatedly called upon to attempt to address this knowledge deficit, to connect the causal dots of colonisation and poor health for the benefit of their Pākehā counterparts, and in the interests of improved board processes.

In short, the burden placed upon Māori DHB directors to engage with non-Māori DHB directors in matters of health governance were reported as additionally demanding due to varying deficits in non-Māori bicultural competence and skills and due to a deficit in a postcolonial understanding of contemporary health in Aotearoa/NZ.

This research has been informed by Kaupapa Māori guidelines. In many useful ways Kaupapa Māori epistemology and methodologies challenge researchers to re-evaluate their position from within the academy in a way that reconstructs the binary, to gaze back sometimes with indignation or at the very least with suspicion toward the coloniser, rejecting and resenting their on-going benevolence/malevolence. While this confrontation is a pivotal step in the decolonising process it does not provide for post decolonisation possibilities. Instead this decolonisation stage simply reinforces the hero/scoundrel dichotomy by essentialising the characteristics of either/both groups. Spivak's strategic essentialism aside, essentialism risks remaining (neo) colonially constrained by perceived immutable boundaries. In a discussion about fiscal scrutiny of Māori providers one participant challenges essentialism, in this case, as cultural romanticism:

*We are operating in a Western system and because... we're just as bad as they are. We're self-interested too! We're not noble; we're no more noble than they are. There are individuals*



*within our race that are as noble as individuals in their race. But we have ratbags, as many ratbags in proportion in our race as they have in theirs. (17 46:21)*

### **Moving on from the 'Us and Them' Re-Inscribing DHB Intra-Board Process**

A culture of openness and constructive dialogue in an environment of trust and mutual respect is also a prerequisite for an effective board. The chairman has a central role to play in fostering these conditions through their own actions and through engagement with the members of the board. (Higgs, 2003, p. 33)

All participants spoke of their problematic yet essential place at the board table. Many spoke of a sense of privilege and of honour to be entrusted by Māori to speak for Māori at the DHB governance level. The importance of the legislative recognition of the Treaty and of policy cannot be underestimated despite their terms of engagement at the board table being at the Minister's behest. Appointment inconsistency on the part of the Minister aside, Māori directors have arrived at the board table and are there to stay. The onus is on all board members to engender and facilitate trust, or to at least improve the terms of engagement with each other. This is not just the responsibility of Māori board members. Higgs (2003) speaks to the pivotal role of the chair in "fostering these conditions" (p. 33) as a facilitator and leader. A useful step in fostering these conditions is to generate discussion in the hope of engendering a more critically reflexive atmosphere (Tedmanson, 2012). In doing so binary and hierarchical relations can be disrupted with the potential for a transformative reconstruction. Currently, in Aotearoa/NZ there are multiple sites in health where two world views complement, or at the very least, sit beside each other without antagonism. These sites function as "catalysts for transformation" (Durie, 2011, p. 343):

Working between two bodies of knowledge - science and indigenous knowledge – recognises that neither indigenous knowledge nor science alone

provides a universal answer...The challenge is not to dismiss either knowledge base, nor to explain one according to the tenets of the other. (p. 344)

DHBs are potentially powerful catalysts for transformation. Given that this transformational potential is not yet evident, how are directors to proceed? Can there be a shared belief system and/or is a shared belief system useful or possible? Bhabha (1990) cautions against universalism, against a belief that all cultures can be understood within a central set of assumptions suggesting some incommensurability is inevitable (p. 209). Proposing instead a “cultural translation” (p. 210) that functions in a third space where two cultures operate in a new way enabling “other positions to emerge” (p. 211). However, this position is not without controversy given that the:

act of cultural translation denies the essentialism of a prior given original or originary culture, then we see that all forms of culture are in a state of hybridity...The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (p. 211)

This is not an abandonment of identity nor an historical amnesia but simply a place where a different relationship between board members can be facilitated. Such a third space in a DHB context could mitigate the “burden of representation” (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 182) by offering most importantly, a more culturally conducive space from which Māori can operate. Many participants spoke of distrust and cultural distance due to experiences of racism. Many experienced intra-board process as oppressively monocultural:

*The way the board meetings are structured, there is no place, there's no room to have these rarely to [have] what I consider important discussions. (22/3 54:15)*

Reid and Cram (2005) speak to the significance of formally reclaiming the name of New Zealand as Aotearoa to become Aotearoa/New Zealand as an identity counter-story, a challenge to the monocultural, signalling more than one:

One is called Aotearoa where Māori are tangata whenua and our ways of being, doing and knowing are normal and accepted. The second country is called New Zealand where a Pākehā majority control who and what is normal and Māori are often portrayed as different, difficult or 'radical'. (p. 34)

Māori participants report that they make significant contributions toward social engineering or consciousness raising, citing themselves as '*walking Treaty workshops*' (A2) (25 57:41). The contentious nature of the race-based funding debate led participants to a strategic re-orientation of relationships toward Treaty discourse and toward legislative and policy imperatives and away from Māori identity as a referent. The adoption of a Treaty-based relationship, while pragmatic and strategic, dichotomises intra-board identities. Because the on-going Waitangi process is forged within a context of anger and contestation, a Treaty-based relationship at the board table is inevitably imbued with, at best ambivalence, and at worst interpersonal threat.

The adoption of a Treaty based relationship is a just and appropriate position for Māori. However, because it dichotomises intra-board identities, it unintentionally serves as a barrier to governance process. Considerable Māori strategic and cultural capital is unavailable to the board because board processes do not recognise non-Western contributions. Māori directors stand firm in their place at the board table, demonstrating resilience and considerable goodwill. Many participants reported having positive influence on intra-board process through initiating intervention and challenge.

Non-Māori DHB directors have multiple opportunities to address their bicultural deficit. McCormack (2012) suggests the government also have a role in enabling Māori:

I conceptualise indigeneity as process, as deeply enmeshed in property struggles and as both constrained and enabled by the prevailing political economy. (p. 419)

The empirical findings in this study point to an important role non-Māori directors may have in enabling Māori—one of facilitation of discussion and shared meaning amongst all board members. Generally, and in particular for culturally important issues (such as developing trust), Māori privilege face-to-face discussion (kei te kōrero kanohi ki te kanohi). In exploration of discursive processes of hui, Bishop and Glynn (1999) identify a “spiral of discourse” (p. 28) as a process whereby collaboration is achieved through multiple narratives, where all present collectively contribute. In such a process they suggest connectedness, engagement, and involvement be considered (p. 174). An adaption of this construct to a governance setting holds possibilities of a creation of a third space, one where previously imposed identities are re inscribed, one where “ a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” (Bhabha, 1990, p. 211) is formed.

# Chapter Nine: Conclusion

## The Research Question and the Research Objectives

The guiding question in this thesis: What is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards?

### Research objectives

- 1) To generate primary governance data that is Māori-centric
- 2) To explore the sources of intra-board tension inherent in board membership heterogeneity

### The Study Background

Multiple factors coincided in the genesis of this study. Existing health disparities face increasing Māori challenge and provide for increasing Māori presence in the health sector. The DHB setting, bounded by the legislative move, offered a relatively new set of governance, health, and intra-board dynamics. The Act established District Health Boards and provided for, amongst other requirements, and for the first time, Māori representation in District Health Board governance. Given the size and nature of the reforms introduced by the Act, extensive research was conducted in the subsequent years following the reforms. While this research revealed directors' general concerns it was a Māori subset of researchers that signalled Māori directors' significant concerns.

On the theoretical side the emergence of a postcolonial critique of management and organisation studies in combination with the development of a Māori research tradition collectively provided the tools necessary to generate Māori-centric data. Tensions within and between these approaches were articulated.

### The Study Foreground

The founding violence construct articulates both the colonial and neo-colonial damage endured by Māori. Te Tiriti o Waitangi takes a central place in Aotearoa/NZ

Māori/Pākehā relations, and occupies a central place at the DHB board table for Māori directors.

Health governance and management governance literature and practice do not adequately theorise director activity, rather director activity is inferred from second or third order data such as input and output variables. The health governance discussion, NPM governance goals, and participant reports have brought to light inherent limitations to governance accountability.

Current management governance literature suggests the missing piece of the governance theory (Kuhnian) puzzle is that of primary data on intra-board process. The main directorial roles of the monitor, the strategist, and the advice giver, while generally agreed upon, oversimplify board interaction and do not capture intra-board process. In particular, they do not capture interrelationships between heterogeneous or diverse board members.

The theory/data interplay in this study facilitated a set of discussion-led themes that were consistent with both a Māori world view and Māori lived experiences.

Culturally, themes such as *no hea au?*, *ko wai au?*, and *ko wai ōku whanaunga?* represent omnipresent spiritual essence, and are central to identity. The privileging of themes such as these enables a culturally meaningful and relevant analysis.

Further, the themes, particularly *ko wai au?*, the intra-board process theme, offered the opportunity to gaze back at the non-Māori director by examining the stereotypical roles Māori directors report experiencing. In fact, rather than asking *who am I?*, the theme is about *who I am not*.

### **Future Research**

The generalisability of the thematic grouping in this study can be tested in other public health sector governance settings, such as Primary Health Organisations. Are these results specific to the health setting? What about other public sector governance settings? Successfully utilising these thematic groupings in other settings

would establish the validity of these themes as a possible template for intra-board analysis.

Findings in this study may offer insights and tools for broader management study such as human resource management, and organisation development and change in Aotearoa/NZ. Any group situation where Māori and non-Māori interact may encounter similar inter-group processes as those reported by the participants in this study.

Any setting where Māori are called upon to act as a representative of Māori may benefit from an analysis of the findings in this study by calling into question misunderstandings non-Māori may have of their Māori counterparts. This study could offer insight into any governance setting where Māori may face cultural incommensurability whether as cultural representative(s) or not.

Other indigenous theorists may find the study provides insights into Western governance domains in their own contexts. Indeed this study may offer a template for intra-board and intra-group process research with other Others. While the themes that arise out of this study come from a Māori cultural perspective the themes may be useful in the understanding of identity in relation to any group process. That is, where am I from, who am I, and to whom am I related may fundamentally affect the experience of Otherness for non-Māori, as well.

Future research questions generated by this study could include the following:

- What are the experiences of Māori directors in other health governance settings such as Primary Health Organisations?
- What are the experiences of Māori directors in other public sector governance settings, including State Owned Enterprises?
- What are the experiences of Māori in corporate governance settings?
- What are the experiences of other indigenous directors in similar governance settings in other countries?

## **The Study Contributions**

This study achieves the research objectives by providing primary Māori-centric data on intra-board process. Further, this primary data, with the assistance of Māori research traditions and postcolonial theory and critique has generated considerable insight into board heterogeneity.

In taking a Kuhnian approach to the accumulation of knowledge, this study potentially moves multiple fields of inquiry forward an incremental step.

Governance theory and practice, postcolonial management theory and critique, and Māori-centred research traditions inform and underpin this study. Each field engages in puzzle solving of its own and it is hoped this study can offer some insight into each.

Management governance scholars identify the need to better understand intra-board process and call for more qualitative research. It is this current management governance debate in particular that generated the research question, what is the experience of Māori directors on District Health Boards? In particular, governance process theory calls for the empirical study of director activity, theorising that intra-board process data can assist with the understanding of director efficacy. Director heterogeneity and director efficacy are two particular areas of interest for management governance theorists. This study offers an empirical contribution to the governance field by offering specific insight into board process. In addition, this study offers an empirical contribution to board process in relation to director heterogeneity. Management governance theory identified the knowledge gap thereby laying the foundation for this study. This literature however was unable to provide the adequate methodological and analytical tools with which to proceed. Instead, significant contributions from Māori-centred research traditions and postcolonial theory and critique provided the methodological and analytical tools with which to proceed. Governance theory then provided necessary but not sufficient literature for this study.



Health governance theory and research is also considered in this study although, again, while a necessary consideration, it was not a sufficient consideration. Health governance in Aotearoa/NZ, in the adoption of NPM, is beginning to question the adequacy of NPM theoretical tools to generate insight into increasingly diverse and complex public sector governance demands. Extant research and commentary identified DHB Māori directorial concerns but had not situated these concerns in any productive theoretical debate. Despite the adoption of new public management doctrines health governance theory does not appear to engage with management governance theory.

Management governance scholars apply multi-theoretical approaches to the understanding of the governance phenomenon. This study, in using management governance theory, provides additional insight into public sector health governance in Aotearoa/NZ. Specifically this study provides insight into intra-board process in health governance in Aotearoa/NZ using a different paradigm. Such insight would not be available using existing health governance theory.

Postcolonial management scholars identify the need to critically examine the study of management using a postcolonial lens. Postcolonial critique in the study of governance is emergent and is largely theoretical rather than empirical. In relation to governance, to date; corporate citizenship, stakeholder theory, and public sector accountability have been examined with a postcolonial lens. This study makes an empirical postcolonial contribution to governance. Currently considerable tension exists between indigenous theorising and postcolonial theorising. Importantly, this study illustrates the synergistic utility of the combination of both the indigenous approaches and the postcolonial approaches. Again, this is a situation where in and of itself each approach was necessary but not sufficient.

A rapidly developing Māori research tradition calls for theoretical examination using a Māori lens. Māori scholarly challenge to research methodologies is recognised as trans-disciplinary and international. While well established in disciplines such as

education and in health, Māori research traditions are emergent in management and absent in the governance sub discipline.

Theoretical analysis specifically highlighted productive tensions between Māori understandings and non-Māori understandings of intra-board process. Māori-centred research traditions offer culturally-determined methodologies and analyses. They validate Māori world views and/or lived experience and generate participant empowerment. In an attempt to move Kaupapa Māori scholarship forward scholars debate issues of theoretical and methodological authenticity, ever challenging boundaries and expanding research settings.

Māori research traditions provided the tools necessary to generate Māori-centric data. Postcolonial theory and critique provided the analytic tools .However, this synthesis was not achieved without acknowledgement and articulation of significant tensions within and between these approaches. These tensions remain unresolved amongst those indigenous scholars who wish to make use of the tools of postcolonial theory and critique.

The opportunity to research with Māori directors using Māori-centred methodologies in combination with a critical theory such as postcolonial theory and critique has expanded one such research setting and allowed for unique and enriched data. This study demonstrates the possibilities of an extension of Māori-centred research traditions into previously Western domains, such as the board room. The study pushes the boundaries of one's tūrangawaewae , a place where one has a right to stand and belong.

## References

- Alvesson, Mats. (1993). *Cultural perspectives on organizations*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvesson, Mats. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 13-33.
- Andreotti, Vanessa. (2009). Engaging critically with 'objective' critical analysis: a situated response to Openshaw and Rata. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 19(3-4), 217-227. doi: 10.1080/09620210903424535
- Ashcroft, Bill, Tiffin, Helen, & Griffiths, Gareth. (2000). *Post-colonial studies: the key concepts*. London New York: Routledge.
- Ballara, Angela. (1998). *Iwi : the dynamics of Maori tribal organisation from c.1769 to c.1945*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. (2000). Whose land is it anyway? National interest, indigenous stakeholders and colonial discourses: The case of the Jabiluka uranium mine. *Organization & Environment*, 13(1), 3-38.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. (2003). The practice of stakeholder colonialism: national interest and colonial discourse in the management of indigenous stakeholders. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis : a critical engagement* (pp. 255-279). New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. (2007). *Corporate social responsibility: the good, the bad and the ugly*. Cheltenham, UK Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby, & Linstead, S. (2004). Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57(2), 221-247.
- Barcham, Manuhua. (2002). (De)constructing the politics of indigeneity. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples* (pp. 137-151). Cambridge; Oakleigh, Vic.: Cambridge University Press.
- Barlow, Cleve. (1991). *Key concepts in Maori culture*. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, Pauline, & Clayden, Clare. (2007). Report No. 2: Governance in District Health Boards. Wellington, New Zealand: Health Services Research Centre, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Barnett, Pauline, Tenbenschel, Tim, Cumming, Jacqueline, Clayden, Clare, Ashton, Toni, Pledger, Megan, & Burnette, Mili. (2009). Implementing new modes of governance in the New Zealand health system: An

- empirical study. *Health Policy*, 93(2/3), 118-127. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.06.004
- Bell, Avril. (2004). *Relating Maori and pakeha: the politics of indigenous and settler identities*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Berle, Adolf Augustus, & Means, Gardiner C. (1932/1968). *The modern corporation and private property* (Rev. ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace & World.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1990). The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 207 - 221). London: Lawrence & Wishart
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. (2003). Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Maori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 221-238.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*.
- Bishop, Russell. (1994). Initiating Empowering Research? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29(1), 175-188.
- Bishop, Russell. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: a Kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bishop, Russell, & Glynn, T. (1992). He Kanohi Kitea - Conducting and Evaluating Educational-Research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 27(2), 125-135.
- Boston, J, Martin, J, Pallot, J , & Walsh, P. (1996). *Public Management: The New Zealand model*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Boulton, Amohia, Simonsen, Kiri, Walker, Tai, Cumming, Jacqueline, & Cunningham, Chris. (2004). Indigenous participation in the 'new' New Zealand health structure. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 9(S2), 35-40.
- Braun, Virginia, & Clarke, Victoria. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Burgess, Z., & Tharenou, P. (2002). Women board directors: Characteristics of the few. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37(1), 39-49.
- Cadbury Report. (1992). *Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporate governance*. London, England: The Committee and Gee and Company.

- Came, H. (2011). Transforming institutional racism in healthcare management in Aotearoa New Zealand *Proceedings of the Australia New Zealand Academy of Management Conference* (pp. 1-19). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Campbell, Bronwyn Margaret. (2005). *Negotiating biculturalism : deconstructing pakeha subjectivity*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Psychology), Massey University, Turitea Campus, Palmerston North, Aoteroa/New Zealand.
- Carpenter, M. A., & Westphal, James D. (2001). The strategic context of external network ties: examining the impact of director appointments on board involvement in strategic decision making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 639-660.
- Cash, M., & Taurima, W. (2002). Tumatanui: The experience of the first indigenous wine company to export high quality wine from New Zealand (A bicultural research project). *Monographs in Māori Business: Breaking the Boundaries*(3), 81.
- Clegg, Stewart R., Hardy, Cynthia, Lawrence, Tom, & Nord, Walter R. (Eds.). (2006). *The SAGE handbook of organization studies*. London, England; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cooke, B. (2003). Managing organizational culture and imperialism. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: a critical engagement* (pp. 75-93). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cunningham, Chris. (2008). Māori Development and Māori Advancement. *Matariki*, 1(2), 49 - 57.
- Daily, C. M., Dalton, D. R., & Cannella, A. A. (2003). Introduction to special topic forum corporate governance: Decades of dialogue and data. *Academy Of Management Review*, 28(3), 371-382.
- Daily, C. M., Dalton, D. R., & Rajagopalan, N. (2003). Governance through ownership: Centuries of practice, decades of research. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 46(2), 151-158.
- Davis, James H., Schoorman, F. David, & Donaldson, Lex. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy Of Management Review*, 22(1), 20-47.
- Denzin, Norman K., & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1994a). Introduction: entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-17). California: Sage.
- Denzin, Norman K., & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.). (1994b). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, Norman K., & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.). (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Denzin, Norman K., Lincoln, Yvonna S., & Smith, Linda Tuhiwai (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Devlin, Martin. (2004). Governance Kiwi Style? *New Zealand Management*, 51, 22-24.
- Devlin, Martin. (2006). Hands Off– Is public sector governance a charade? *New Zealand Management*, 53, 66-67.
- Donaldson, Thomas, & Preston, Lee E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.
- Drichel, S. (2008). The time of hybridity. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 34(6), 587-615.
- du Gay, Paul. (2002). A common power to keep them all in awe: A comment on governance. *Cultural values*, 6(1-2), 11-27.
- Durie, Mason. (1994). *Whaiora : Maori health development*. Auckland, N.Z.: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, Mason. (2005). *Indigenous health reforms: best health outcomes for Maori in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Unleashing innovation in health care conference, Calgary, Canada.
- Durie, Mason. (2011). *Nga tini whetu : navigating Maori futures*. Auckland, New Zealand: Huia.
- Edlin, Bev. (2007). *Boardroom decision-making: determinants of effectiveness*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Management), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori directed practice. *Mai Review*, 1, 1-11.
- Elias, N., & Scotson, J.L. (1994). *The established and the outsiders: A sociological enquiry into community problems*: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fama, E.F., & Jensen, M.C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26, 301-325.
- Finkelstein, S., & Mooney, A. C. (2003). Not the usual suspects: How to use board process to make boards better. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 101-113.
- Forbes, Daniel P., & Milliken, Frances J. (1999). Cognition and corporate governance: understanding boards of directors as strategic decision-making groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 489-505.
- Frankenberg, Ruth, & Mani, Lata. (1993). Crosscurrents, crosstalk: race, 'postcoloniality' and the politics of location. *Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 292-310.
- Frederick, H., & Henry, Ella. (2004). Innovation and entrepreneurship amongst Pakeha and Maori in New Zealand. In C. H. Stiles & C. S.

- Galbraith (Eds.), *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process* (pp. 115-140). Kidlington. England: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Freeman, R. Edward. (1994). The politics of stakeholder theory: some future directions. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4(4), 409-421.
- Freeman, R.E., & McVea, J. (2001). A stakeholder approach to strategic management. In M. A. Hitt, R. E. Freeman & J. S. Harrison (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Strategic Management* (pp. 189-207). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Freire, Paulo. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Gandhi, Leela (1998). *Postcolonial Theory; A critical introduction*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Gauld, R. (2005). Delivering democracy? An analysis of New Zealand's district health board elections, 2001 and 2004. *Australian Health Review*, 29(3), 345-352.
- Gibbs, A. D., Fraser, G., & Scott, J. . (1988). Unshackling the hospitals: Report of the hospital and related services taskforce. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Gillies, A., Tinirau, R., & Mako, N. (2007). Whakawhanaungatanga— Extending the networking concept. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 8(2), 29-37.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen, & Locke, Karen. (2007). *Composing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Goodin, R. E. (2000). Waitangi tales (Aboriginal rights, New Zealand, treaties). *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 78(3), 309-333.
- Harris, R., Tobias, M., Jeffreys, M., Waldegrave, K., Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. (2006). Effects of self-reported racial discrimination and deprivation on Maori health and inequalities in New Zealand: cross-sectional study. *Lancet*, 367(9527), 2005-2009.
- Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. (2012). from <http://hpaied.org/>
- Hawarden, R., & Stablein, R.E. (2008). New Zealand women directors: Many aspire but few succeed. In S. Vinnicombe, V. Singh, R. J. Burke, D. Bilimoria & M. Huse (Eds.), *Women on corporate boards of directors: International research and practice* (pp. 57-66). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
- Henry, E., & Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Maori: locating indigenous ontology, epistemology and methodology in the academy. *Organization*, 8(2), 234-242.
- Henry, E., & Pringle, J. (1996). Making voices, being heard in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Organization*, 3(4), 534-540.

- Higgs, D. (2003). Review of the Role and Effectiveness of Non-Executive Directors. London, England: Department of Trade and Industry/HMSO.
- Hillman, Amy J., Cannella, Albert A., & Paetzold, Ramona L. (2000). The Resource Dependence Role of Corporate Directors: Strategic Adaptation of Board Composition in Response to Environmental Change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(2), 235-256. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00179
- Hillman, Amy J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3), 383-396.
- Hillman, Amy J., Nicholson, Gavin, & Shropshire, Christine. (2008). Directors' Multiple Identities, Identification, and Board Monitoring and Resource Provision. *Organization Science*, 19(3), 441-456.
- Hood, Christopher. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x
- Hughes, Emma, Lockett-Kay, Jan, Boulton, Amohia, Barcham, Manuhua, & Mafile'o, Tracie. (2007). Thinking about coordination in health system governance: Centre for Indigenous Governance and Development, Massey University.
- Humphries, M., & Grice, S. (1995). Equal employment opportunity and the management of diversity: a global discourse of assimilation? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 8(5), 17-32.
- Huse, Morten. (2009). *The value creating board: corporate governance and organizational behaviour*. Abingdon Oxon New York, NY: Routledge.
- Huse, Morten. (2011). The "Golden Skirts": Changes in board composition following gender quotas on corporate boards *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference* (pp. 1-19). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking otherness from the margins. *Organization*, 13(4), 463-488. doi: 10.1177/1350508406065851
- Ingle, C., & Van Der Walt, N. (2005). Do Board Processes Influence Director and Board Performance? Statutory and performance implications. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 13(5), 632-653. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8683.2005.00456.x
- Irwin, K. (1992). Towards Theories of Maori Feminisms. In R. Du Plessis & P. Bunkle (Eds.), *Feminist voices: women's studies texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 1-21). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.



- Jackson, Moana. (1992). The Treaty and the word: the colonization of Maori philosophy. In G. Oddie & R. W. Perrett (Eds.), *Justice, ethics, and New Zealand society* (pp. 1-10). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, Moana. (1995). Justice and political power: reasserting Māori legal processes In K. M. Hazlehurst (Ed.), *Legal Pluralism and the Colonial Legacy : Indigenous Experiences of Justice in Canada, Australia and New Zealand* (pp. 243 - 263). Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- Jensen, M.C., & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.
- Jesson, Bruce. (1987). *Behind the mirror glass: the growth of wealth and power in New Zealand in the eighties*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Johnson, J. L., Daily, C. M., & Ellstrand, A. E. (1996). Boards of directors: A review and research agenda. *Journal Of Management*, 22(3), 409-438.
- Johnson, Jay T. (2008). Indigeniety's Challenge to the White Settler-State: Creating a Thirdspace for Dynamic Citizenship. *Alternatives*, 33, 29-52.
- Jones, Camara Phyllis. (2001). Invited Commentary: "Race," Racism, and the Practice of Epidemiology. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 154(4), 299-304.
- Jones, D., Pringle, J., & Shepherd, D. (2000). "Managing Diversity" meets Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Personnel Review*, 29(3), 364-380.
- Jones, D., & Stablein, R. (2006). Diversity as resistance and recuperation. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 145-166). London: Sage.
- Kaplan, Abraham. (2005). Functions of theory. In C. C. Lundberg & C. A. Young (Eds.), *Foundations for inquiry: Choices and trade-offs in the organizational sciences* (pp. 181-184). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- King, Michael. (2003). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland, N.Z.: Penguin Books.
- Koenig, T., & Gogel, R. (1981). Interlocking Corporate Directorships as a Social Network. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 40(1), 37-50.
- Kondo, Dorinne K. (1990). *Crafting selves: power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2d , enl ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Leblanc, Richard, & Schwartz, Mark S. (2007). The Black Box of Board Process: gaining access to a difficult subject. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 15(5), 843-851. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8683.2007.00617.x
- Lewis, Reina, & Mills, Sarah (Eds.). (2002). *Feminist postcolonial theory: a reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lockett-Kay, J. (2005). *Community participation in the establishment of a primary health organisation in the Horowhenua: A longitudinal case study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Management), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Lockhart, J. (2010). Revisiting the black box: Reflections on governance activities, governance research and the prescription for best practice.
- Lorbiecki, Anna, & Jack, Gavin. (2000). Critical Turns in the Evolution of Diversity Management. *British Journal Of Management*, 11, S17-S31. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.11.s1.3
- Lorde, Audre. (1983). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: writings by radical women of color* (2nd Edition ed., pp. 94-101). New York, NY Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.
- Lorsch, J.W., & MacIver, E. (1989). *Pawns or potentates: The reality of America's corporate boards*: Harvard Business Press.
- Lundberg, Craig C., & Young, Cheri A. (2005). Paradigm concerns and developments. In C. C. Lundberg & C. A. Young (Eds.), *Foundations for inquiry: Choices and trade-offs in the organizational sciences* (pp. 59-60). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Maaka, R., & Fleras, A. (2005). *The politics of indigeneity: Challenging the state in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*: University of Otago Press.
- Magrane, Johnathan, & Malthus, Sue. (2010). Audit committee effectiveness: a public sector case study. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 25(5), 427-443. doi: 10.1108/02686901011041821
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *Mai Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Marie, Dannette, & Haig, Brian. (2006). Kaupapa Māori research methodolgy: a critique and an alternative. *New Zealand Science Review*, 63(1), 19-21.
- Martyn, Karen Stacie. (2006). *Decision-making in a corporate boardroom: inside the black box*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Management), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- McCormack, F. (2012). Indigeneity as process: Māori claims and neoliberalism. *Social Identities*, 18(4), 417-434.

- McGuigan, T. (1975). *A health service for New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand Government Printer.
- McKinley, Elizabeth. (2005). Brown Bodies, White Coats: Postcolonialism, Maori women and science. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(4), 481-496. doi: 10.1080/01596300500319761
- Mead, Hirini Moko. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia/ Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi.
- Mikaere, Annabel. (2011). *Colonising myths - Maori realities: he rukuruku whakaaro*. Wellington, N.Z.: Huia Publishers and Te Wananga o Raukawa.
- Minister of Health and Associate Minister of Health. (2006). *Whakatātaka Tuarua Māori Health Action Plan 2006-2011* Wellington, New Zealand
- Ministry of Health. (2002). *He Korowai Oranga: Māori Health Strategy*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Mir, Ali, Mir, Raza, & Upadhyaya, Punya. (2003). Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: a critical engagement* (pp. 47-73). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Modlik, Helmut Karewa. (2004). Issues facing Maori in governance. *Public Sector*, 27(1), 20-23.
- Moeke-Maxwell, Tess. (2005). Bi/Multiracial Maori Women's Hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(4), 497-510. doi: 10.1080/01596300500319779
- Monks, Robert A. G., & Minow, Nell. (1995). *Corporate governance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Business.
- Morck, Randall. (2008). Behavioral finance in corporate governance: economics and ethics of the devil's advocate. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 12(2), 179-200. doi: 10.1007/s10997-008-9059-4
- Morgan, M., Coombes, L., & Campbell, B. (2006). Biculturalism, gender and critical social movements in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Still speaking from psychologies' margins. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 5, 52-68.
- Mueller, R.K. (1981). *The incomplete board, the unfolding of corporate governance*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Nairn, R., Pega, F., McCreanor, T., Rankine, J., & Barnes, A. (2006). Media, racism and public health psychology. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 11(2), 183-196.
- New Zealand Human Rights Commission. (2010). *Census of Women's Participation 2010*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Nicholson, Gavin, Pugliese, Amedeo, & Bezemer, P-J. (2011). Opening up the black box: An exploratory study of director's interactions during board meetings *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Australian and New*

- Zealand Academy of Management Conference* (pp. unpagged).  
Wellington, New Zealand.
- Nkomo, Stella M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: rewriting "race in organizations". *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 487-513.
- Nkomo, Stella M. (2011). A postcolonial and anti-colonial reading of 'African' leadership and management in organization studies: tensions, contradictions and possibilities. *Organization*, 18(3), 365-386. doi: 10.1177/1350508411398731
- O'Higgins, E. (2002). Non-executive Directors on Boards in Ireland: co-option, characteristics and contributions. *Corporate Governance-an International Review*, 10(1), 19-28.
- Oberheim, Eric, & Hoyningen-Huene, Paul. (2012). The incommensurability of scientific theories. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (pp. URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/incommensurability/>).
- Openshaw, R., & Rata, E. (2007). The weight of inquiry: Conflicting cultures in New Zealand's tertiary institutions. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 17, 407-425.
- Orange, Claudia. (2011). *The Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed.). Wellington, N.Z.: Bridget Williams Books.
- Overall, J., Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. (2010). Governance and indigenous social entrepreneurship: when context counts. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 6(2), 146-161.
- Özkazanç-Pan, Banu. (2008). International management meets the "rest of the world". *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 964-974. doi: 10.5465/amr.2008.34422014
- Panoho, Joy. (2003). *Multiple directorships on New Zealand Boards: The case of Sir Selwyn Cushing*. (Unpublished MBA Report), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Panoho, Joy. (2007). Who is afraid of the postcolonial? In C. Prichard, D. Jones & R. Jacques (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Organization, Identity, Locality III Symposium* (pp. 24-30). Albany, New Zealand: Department of Management, Massey University.
- Panoho, Joy, & Stablein, Ralph E. (2012). A postcolonial perspective on organizational governance in New Zealand: Reconciling Māori and Pākehā forms. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Against the grain: advances in postcolonial organization studies* (pp. 200-217). Copenhagen, Denmark, Oslo, Norway, Malmö, Sweden: Copenhagen Business School Press, Liber, Universitetsforlaget.
- Paradies, Y., Harris, R., & Anderson, I. (2008). *The impact of racism on indigenous health in Australia and Aotearoa: Towards a research*

- agenda*. Darwin, Australia: Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal Health.
- Parliamentary Library. (2009). *New Zealand Health System Reforms* (Research paper 09/03). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Penhira, M. (2011). *Mouri Tu, Mouri Moko, Mouri Ora! Moko as a wellbeing strategy*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Penhira, Mera, Cram, Fiona, & Pipi, Kataraina. (2003). *Kaupapa Māori Governance: literature review and key informant interviews* (pp. 33). Wellington, New Zealand: Katoa Ltd.
- Pere, L., Boulton, A., Smiler, K., Walker, T., & Kingi, L. (2007). Report No. 6: Māori Health and the 2001 Health Reforms *Health Reforms 2001 Research Project* Wellington, New Zealand: Health Services Research Centre.
- Pettigrew, Andrew M. (1992). On studying managerial elites. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(S2), 163-182. doi: 10.1002/smj.4250130911
- Pfeffer, J. (1972). Size and composition of corporate boards of directors: The organization and its environment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 218-228.
- Pihama, Leonie, Cram, Fiona, & Walker, Sheila. (2002). Creating methodological space: a literature review of Kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30-43.
- Pihema, W. (2006). Deploying renditions as modes for indigenous critique: Why indigenous communities must kidnap and torture the language, theory and practices of critical management studies to renew ideas of organisation, identity and locality. In C. Prichard, D. Jones & R. Jacques (Eds.), *Proceedings of Organization, Identity, Locality (OIL) II Conference* (pp. 30-33). Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Management, Massey University.
- Prasad, Ajnesh. (2012). Beyond analytical dichotomies. *Human Relations*, 65(5), 567-595. doi: 10.1177/0018726711432183
- Prasad, Anshuman. (2003a). The gaze of the Other: postcolonial theory and organizational analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: a critical engagement* (pp. 3-43). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, Anshuman. (2006). The jewel in the crown: postcolonial theory and workplace diversity. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 121-144). London, England: Sage.

- Prasad, Anshuman (Ed.). (2003b). *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: a critical engagement* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, Pushkala. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Rata, E. (2000). *A political economy of neotribal capitalism*: Lexington Books.
- Rata, E. (2003a). Late capitalism and ethnic revivalism. *Anthropological Theory*, 3(1), 43-63.
- Rata, E. (2003b). Leadership ideology in neotribal capitalism. *Political Power and Social Theory*, 16, 44-73.
- Rata, E. (2005). Rethinking biculturalism. *Anthropological Theory*, 5(3), 267-284.
- Reid, Papaarangi, & Cram, F. (2005). Connecting health, people, and country in Aotearoa New Zealand. In K. Dew & P. Davis (Eds.), *Health and society in Aotearoa New Zealand* (2nd ed., pp. 33-48). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, Papaarangi, & Robson, Bridget. (2006). The state of Māori health. In M. Mulholland (Ed.), *State of the Maori nation: twenty-first-century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 17-31). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Roberts, John, McNulty, Terry, & Stiles, Philip. (2005). Beyond agency conceptions of the work of the non-executive director: creating accountability in the boardroom. *British Journal of Management*, 16, S5-S26. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00444.x
- Ruwhiu, D., & Cone, M. (2010). Advancing a pragmatist epistemology in organisational research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 5(2), 108-126.
- Ruwhiu, D., & Wolfgramm, R. (2006). Kaupapa Maori Research: a contribution to Critical Management Studies in New Zealand. In C. Prichard, D. Jones & R. Jacques (Eds.), *Proceedings of Organization, Identity, Locality (OIL) II Conference* (pp. 51-58). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Said, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism* (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward W. (1994). *Orientalism (25th anniversary ed.)*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Salancik, Gerald R., & Pfeffer, Jeffrey. (1978). A Social Information Processing Approach to Job Attitudes and Task Design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224-253.
- Scott, C, Fougere, G, & Marwick, P. . (1986). Choices for health care: Report of the Health Benefits Review. Wellington, New Zealand.

- Sharp, A. (1997). *Justice and the Maori : the philosophy and practice of Maori claims in New Zealand since the 1970s* (2nd ed.). Auckland, N.Z.: Oxford University Press.
- Shaull, Richard. (1972). Foreword (M. B. Ramos, Trans.) *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (pp. 9-14). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *Journal of Finance*, 52(2), 737-783.
- Signal, L, Martin, J., Cram, F., & Robson, B. . (2008). *The health equity assessment tool: a user's guide*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health.
- Smith, Graham Hingangaroa. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Maori: theory and praxis*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Education), University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London; Dunedin, N.Z.: Zed Books; University of Otago Press.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (2005). On tricky ground: researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 85-107). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Spencer, Anne. (1983). *On the edge of the organization : the role of the outside director*. Chichester ; New York: Wiley.
- Stablein, Ralph Edward. (2006). Data in organization studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed.). London ; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stablein, Ralph Edward, & Panoho, Joy Colleen. (2011). Comparative research epistemology and methodology: Past, present and promising. In C. Cassell & B. Lee (Eds.), *Challenges and controversies in management research*. New York: Routledge.
- Stiles, P., & Taylor, B. (2001). *Boards at work: How directors view their roles and responsibilities*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, P. (2007). Indigenous governance: The Harvard Project, Australian Aboriginal organisations and cultural subsidiarity. Alice Springs, Australia: Desert Knowledge CRC Working Paper No 4.
- Sullivan, P. (2009). Reciprocal Accountability: Assessing the accountability environment in Australian Aboriginal affairs policy. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 22(1), 57-72.
- Tauri, Juan Marcellus. (1999). Family group conferencing: The myth of indigenous empowerment in New Zealand. *Justice as Healing*, 4(1), 1-8.

- Tauri, Juan Marcellus. (2005). Family group conferencing: The myth of indigenous empowerment in New Zealand. In N. W. D (Ed.), *Justice as Healing : indigenous ways* (pp. 313 - 323). St Paul Minnesota: Living Justice Press.
- Taurima, W., & Cash, M. (1999). *Tumatanui: The Experience of a Group of Maori Funeral Directors*. Lower Hutt, New Zealand: Open Polytechnic Press.
- Tedmanson, Deidre. (2012). Whose capacity needs building? . In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Against the grain: advances in postcolonial organization studies* (pp. 249-275). Copenhagen, Denmark, Malmö, Sweden, Oslo, Norway: Copenhagen Business School Press, Universitetsforlaget, Liber.
- Tenbenschel, Tim, Mays, Nicholas, & Cumming, Jacqueline. (2011). A successful mix of hierarchy and collaboration? Interpreting the 2001 reform of the governance of the New Zealand public health system. *Policy & Politics*, 39(2), 239-255. doi: 10.1332/030557310x519678
- The Treasury. (1987). Government Management: Brief to the Incoming Government 1987 Volume I (pp. 1-471 ). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Tinirau, Rāwiri, & Gillies, Annemarie. (2011). Utilising Māori research methodologies in Māori business contexts *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference* (pp. 1-15). Wellington, New Zealand.
- Tyson, L. (2003). The Tyson report on the recruitment and development of non-executive directors *London Business School: Department of Trade & Industry*.
- van der Walt, Nicholas, & Ingley, Coral. (2001). Evaluating board effectiveness: The changing context of strategic governance. *Journal of Change Management*, 1(4), 313-331.
- Veracini, L. (2001). *Negotiating indigenous resistance in the South Pacific: Australia, Aotearoa/New Zealand and Kanaky-New Caledonia, Three cases in historical representation*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <Go to ISI>://000188062900007
- Veracini, L. (2003). The evolution of historical redescription in Israel and Australia: The question of the 'founding violence'. *Australian Historical Studies*, 34(122), 326-345. doi: 10.1080/10314610308596258
- Victoria University of Wellington Public Affairs. (2007). Optimism for long-term benefits of 2001 health reforms. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Vinnicombe, S., Singh, Val, Burke, Ronald J., Bilimoria, Diana, & Huse, Morten (Eds.). (2008). *Women on corporate boards of directors: International research and practice*: Edward Elgar Publishing.



- Walker, R. J. (1987). *Nga tau tohetohe = Years of anger*. Auckland, N.Z. ; Harmondsworth England: Penguin Books.
- Walker, R. J. (1990). *Struggle without end = Ka whawhai tonu matou*. Auckland, N.Z.: Penguin.
- Walker, R. J. (1993). *Tradition and change in Maori leadership*. Auckland, N.Z.: Research Unit for Maori Education University of Auckland.
- Webber, M. (2009). The multiple selves and realities of a Māori researcher. *Mai Review*(1), 1-8.
- Webster, S. (1993). Postmodernist Theory and the Sublimation of Maori Culture. *Oceania*, 63(3), 222-239.
- West-Newman, C. L. (2004). Anger in Legacies of Empire. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7(2), 189 - 208.
- Westphal, James D., & Milton, Laurie P. (2000). How Experience and Network Ties Affect the Influence of Demographic Minorities on Corporate Boards. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(2), 366-398. doi: 10.2307/2667075
- Westphal, James D., & Stern, I. (2007). Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male caucasian): How ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect additional board appointments at US companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 267-288.
- Westphal, James D., & Zajac, Edward J. (1995). Who shall govern - CEO/board power, demographic similarity, and new director selection. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(1), 60-83.
- Westwood, R.I., & Jack, G. (2007). Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies: A provocation. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 3(3), 246-265.
- Westwood, R.I., & Rhodes, C. (2004). Playing with ourselves: Spaces for Australian organisation and management studies *Proceedings of the Inaugural Colloquium of the Australasian Caucus of the Standing Conference on Organisational Symbolism (SCOS): Boundaries, Bounded, Unbounded: Positions in Organisation Studies*. Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland.
- Winiata, Maharaia. (1967). *The changing role of the leader in Maori society: a study in social change and race relations*. Auckland, New Zealand: Blackwood and Janet Paul.
- Wright, Colin. (2001). Can the Subaltern hear? Rhetoric of place and the place of rhetoric in postcolonial theory. *Postcolonialweb.org*. <http://postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/casablanca/wright.html>
- Young, Robert. (1995). *Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture, and race*. London, England, New York, NY: Routledge.

Young, Robert. (2001). *Postcolonialism: an historical introduction*. Oxford, UK, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Young, Robert. (2003). *Postcolonialism: a very short introduction*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: APPROVAL OF ETHICS APPLICATION FOR THESIS



**Massey University**

2 May 2007

Ms Joy Panoho  
Department of Management  
PN214

FILE

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT  
TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR  
(Ethics & Equity)  
Private Bag 11 222  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
T 64 6 350 5573/350 5575  
F 64 6 350 5622  
humanethics@massey.ac.nz  
animaethics@massey.ac.nz  
glc@massey.ac.nz  
www.massey.ac.nz

Dear Joy

Re: **HEC: Southern B Application – 07/08**  
**A Maori-centered inquiry into health governance: Maori Directors on District Health Boards**

Thank you for your letter dated 1 May 2007.

On behalf of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B I am pleased to advise you that the ethics of your application are now approved. Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Dr Karl Pajo, Chair  
Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B

cc Dr Jan Lockett-Kay  
Department of Management  
PN214

Prof Tony Vitalis, HoD  
Department of Management  
PN214

Dr Manuhua Barcham  
Centre for Indigenous Governance  
& Development  
PN331

Dr Henry Barnard, HoS  
School of People, Environment & Planning  
PN331

---

Massey University Human Ethics Committee  
Accredited by the Health Research Council

## APPENDIX B: REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO TE MATAWHANUI

From: Panoho, Joy [mailto:J.Panoho@massey.ac.nz]

Sent: Monday, 18 June 2007 2:54 p.m.

To: 'Nga\_Metuangaro@moh.govt.nz'

Subject: Introduction – Inquiry re Te Matawhanui

Tena koe,

Ko Ngāpuhi te Iwi, ko Te Parawhau rātou ko Te Uriroi, ko Patu Harakeke ngā Hapū. Ko Joy Panoho taku ingoa. No Whangarei ahau. I currently live and study in Papaioea.

Prof Chris Cunningham has kindly suggested I contact you regarding the protocol for communication with your Te Matawhanui roopu.

I am a Massey (Papaioea) Doctoral student, a recipient of a HRC Māori Career Development Award (2007/8). I am researching District Health Board governance. The title of my thesis is;

A Māori-centered inquiry into Health governance: Māori Directors on District Health Boards

The purpose of the thesis is to explore the views and experiences of Māori DHB directors. I am hopeful that one of the outcomes of the research will be the identification of best practice. It would be helpful to this project if I were able to attend Te Matawhanui hui. My involvement at these hui would be as an observer only though I would be happy to be helpful in any way possible. (kaimahi?, kaiawhina?)

I know that an opportunity to attend such hui would help contextualise my research and will assist me to further identify director concerns. I also plan to interview individual Māori directors at a separate time.

I have had ethical approval from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee for this research. Any issues such as confidentiality and so forth would be respected and assured.

Please let me know how I might proceed. Thank you for your consideration.

naku noa, na Joy Panoho

Further information regarding my project -

My supervisors are: Dr Jan Lockett-Kay, who leads the health management programme at Massey University and is an experienced director in the health sector, and Dr Manuhia Barcham, who is the Director for the Centre for Indigenous Governance and Development.

Purpose. The New Zealand Public Health & Disability Act 2000 introduced changes to the structure and nature of health governance. The 2001 Health Reforms Project has identified areas of promise and of concern amongst Māori directors regarding the nature of their role. The purpose of this project is to document experiences of Māori directors that both enable and constrain effective governance. Based on this data I will do a critical analysis to begin to refine a set of determinants of effective governance. The aim will be to produce a document that will provide guidance for existing and future Māori District Health Board directors.

Additionally, this project is for the partial fulfilment of my PhD study in Management.

## APPENDIX C: INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Project Title: A Māori-centered Inquiry into Health Governance:  
Māori Directors on District Health Boards

### INFORMATION SHEET for PARTICIPANTS

#### Researcher Introduction

Tēnā koe. Ngā mihi mahana ki a koe.

Ko wai au?

Ko Ngāpuhi te Iwi, ko Te Parawhau rātou ko Te Uriroi, ko Patu Harakeke ngā Hapū. Ko Joy Panoho taku ingoa. No Whangarei au, engari e noho ana au i Papaiōea inainei.

My supervisors are:

Dr Jan Lockett-Kay, who leads the health management programme at Massey University and is an experienced director in the health sector, and Dr Brendon Puketapu, who is the Director, Māori Strategy, for the Tertiary Education Commission.

He aha taku mahi Rangahau?

Purpose. The New Zealand Public Health & Disability Act 2000 introduced changes to the structure and nature of health governance. The 2001 Health Reforms Project has identified areas of promise and of concern amongst Māori directors regarding the nature of their role. The purpose of this project is to document experiences of Māori directors that both enable and constrain effective governance. Based on this data I will do a critical analysis to begin to refine a set of determinants of effective governance. The aim will be to produce a document that will provide guidance for existing and future Māori District Health Board directors.

Additionally, this project is for the partial fulfilment of my PhD study in Management.

Participant Recruitment. You have received this information because you have agreed to be contacted as a potential participant in this research because you are a DHB director or you have health governance experience.

Participant involvement. I will schedule an interview (maximum of one hour) at a time and location that is convenient for you regarding your experience as a director of the DHB. If there is anyone you wish to accompany you, please invite them. With your permission, I will audio record the interview. Any transcripts prepared from the interview recording will be passed back to you to allow correction of any errors.

Participant's Rights. You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time before May 2009;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.
- ask for the audio recording to be turned off at any time during the interview.

Project Procedures. Every effort will be made to ensure your confidentiality. Pseudonyms will be used in the transcripts. No personal information will be reported. Consent forms and physical tapes will be kept in a locked cupboard in my supervisor's office and computer files will be password protected. In some cases, a transcriber may be employed but only with a confidentiality agreement in place. Otherwise, only the supervisors and myself will have access to the recordings. The recordings will be destroyed on approval of the PhD thesis. Analyses of the data from all the participants will be used to prepare my thesis and any subsequent publications.

Project Contacts. Please contact me and/or my supervisor(s) if you have any questions about the project.

Researcher:



Joy Panoho  
Department of Management  
Private Bag 11 222  
Palmerston North  
j.panoho@massey.ac.nz  
027-229-4600

Supervisors:  
Dr Jan Lockett-Kay  
Senior Lecturer in Health Management  
Department of Management  
Private Bag 11 222 Palmerston North  
J.Lockett-Kay@massey.ac.nz

Dr Brendon Puketapu  
Director, Māori Strategy  
Tertiary Education Commission  
PO Box 27-048  
Wellington 6011  
brendon.puketapu@tec.govt.nz  
(06) 350 5799 ext 2782      04 462 5200

#### Committee Approval Statement

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 07/08. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Karl Pajo, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 04 801 5799 x 6929 email [humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz).

## APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Project Title: A Māori-centered Inquiry into Health Governance:  
Māori Directors on District Health Boards

### PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held for a period of five (5) years

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I agree/do not agree to the interview being audio taped.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

I understand that I may request to stop the taping or the interview at any time and/or not answer any question that I do not wish to answer.

Signature:

Date:

Full Name - printed

## APPENDIX E: INTRODUCTION TO TRANSCRIPT

A Māori-centered inquiry into health governance: Māori directors on District Health Boards

Mā te mahi, ka ora te iwi

Tēnā koe

To follow please find the transcript of our kōrero

This is an opportunity for you to scan over the content and to correct any serious transcription errors. Because this is a verbatim transcript of conversation it is somewhat casual and lengthy, unlike a prepared written statement. While I envisage some direct quotation, my main use of the transcription will be to identify themes across multiple interviews. Therefore, do not be concerned with grammatical errors. Where quotations are used any such errors will not appear in the final document.

Please remember at no point will your identity, or any obvious identifiers, be revealed. You will be anonymous. Should you have further thoughts or contributions please contact me by e-mail or telephone.

I plan to have some preliminary analysis available by the time many of you meet together at your next Te Matawhānui hui. For those of you who will not be at this hui I will make alternative contact.

I sincerely thank you for your contribution

Ko te utu mō te aroha, ko te aroha anō  
(Respect received is respect acknowledged)

Ngā mihi mahana

Nā Joy Panoho

[j.panoho@massey.ac.nz](mailto:j.panoho@massey.ac.nz)

m 027 229 4600

**APPENDIX F: AUTHORITY FOR THE RELEASE OF TRANSCRIPTS OF  
RECORDINGS**

Project Title: A Māori-centered Inquiry into Health Governance:  
Māori Directors on District Health Boards

**AUTHORITY FOR THE RELEASE OF TRANSCRIPTS OF RECORDINGS**

This form will be held for a period of five (5) years

I confirm that I have had the opportunity to read and amend the transcript of the interview/s conducted with me.

I agree that the edited transcript and extracts from this may be used by the researcher, Joy Panoho, in her PhD thesis, reports and publications arising from the research.

Signature:                      Date:

Full Name - printed

## APPENDIX G: TRANSCRIBER'S CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

Project Title: A Māori-centered Inquiry into Health Governance:  
Māori Directors on District Health Boards

### TRANSCRIBER'S CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I (Full Name - printed) agree to transcribe the recordings provided to me.

I agree to keep confidential all the information provided to me.

I will not make any copies of the transcripts or keep any record of them, other than those required for the project.

Signature:

Date:

## APPENDIX H: TE MATAWHĀNUI HUI INTRODUCTION

Tēnā koutou ngā kaiwhakahaere o ngā roopū Hauora Māori. Ngā mihi mahana ki a koutou.

(greetings and warm wishes to the Māori Health directors group)

E hiahia ana au ki te haere ki tā koutou hui ki Whanganui-ā-Tara a tēnei wiki e haere mai nei. Ngā mihi atu mo tō koutou tono mai kia taea nei au te haere ki tō koutou hui hei kaimatakitaki. Kia ora koutou mo tā koutou tautoko i taku mahi. (I am very appreciative to be here, in Wellington at your hui, thank you for making this possible for me to come, thank you for your support of my research. My purpose here is as an observer)

Tērā pea e whakaaro ana koutou ko wai au?

Ko Whatitiri taku maunga, koia tēnei te whare tāpu o Ngāpuhi. Ko Parawhau, rātau ko Patu Harakeke, ko Te Uriroi ngā hapū. Ko Joy Panoho taku ingoa. No Whangarei au, engari e noho ana ai i Papaioea inainei. (Kātahi anō au ka tīmata taku ako i te reo Māori)

(If you are wondering who I am? Ngāpuhi is my iwi, Whatitiri my mountain, Patu Harakeke, Te Uriroi, and Te Parawhau are my subtribes. I am from Whangarei but currently live in Palmerston North, my name is Joy Panoho, I have just begun to formally learn te reo Māori)

He aha taku mahi rangahau? He poto whakataki – (Briefly, what is the nature of my research?)

I am a Doctoral student in Management, the recipient of an HRC PhD Scholarship. I hope to interview, at your earliest convenience, those of you that volunteer. I am interested in your experiences as a Māori director, in particular the roles that you fulfil. Very little is known about this aspect of directorship, furthermore research has shown that Māori face additional pressure both in terms of performance and scrutiny when fulfilling directorial roles. Interviews will be at the place of your choice, and, can be either individually and/or collectively carried out. This project has been approved by the Massey Human Ethics Committee ((PN214). The purpose of my research is to give voice to Māori directors on DHBs regarding matters that both enable and constrain director efficacy. Please be assured that this research is not an evaluation of your performance. Matters regarding consent and confidentiality will be fully discussed at the time of the interview.

My area of research is Māori health governance, in particular, the contrast between Western and Māori governance in the corporate and institutional setting of the District Health Boards. My work draws on Western, Kaupapa Māori, and Postcolonial theory critique and practice. For Māori, historical and contemporary governance is of great cultural and spiritual importance as well. This is an additional dimension that Western governance has yet to fully acknowledge and accommodate.

He roa whakataki (my research in context)

I propose to extend work that has begun in the health governance area, for example, Boulton, Simonsen, Walker, Cumming, & Cunningham (2004) and Kiro (2001). Modlik (2004) identifies accountability tensions, cultural influences and contextual difficulties as issues that impact uniquely on Māori directors. Dr Boulton and her colleagues present interim findings from their research, the Health reforms Research Project:

Whereas previously Māori participation was concentrated in health service provision, the inclusion of specific provisions in the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 has resulted in greater Māori inclusion in governance, planning and decision making roles. However, there are concerns over strategy implementation, sustainability and workforce development. ( S2:35)

My research focus on Māori directors of District Health Boards follows from this prior research. What's happening now that the latest round of reforms is settling in? How does appointment versus election affect Māori? How are Māori directors balancing representation and advocacy against accountabilities to the Minister? What are the relationships between Māori and non-Māori directors? What constrains and what enables effective Māori health governance? Under what circumstances do Māori directors report that they have had a positive impact on DHB decision making and resource allocation?

## APPENDIX I: TE MATAWHĀNUI HUI FOLLOW UP

Oct 15th 2007

Tēnā koutou anō ngā kaiwhakahāere o ngā rōpū Hauora Māori –

Anō - nga mihi mahana ki a koutou. Kia ora koutou mo koutou tautoko i taku mahi rangahau. I te harikoa tonu au kua haere i to koutou hui i tērā marama. (warm greetings again, thank you for supporting my research, I am very pleased to be here this month)

I would like to ask again if I may contact you regarding an interview. I anticipate this interview would take one hour maximum. I can travel to whatever destination is convenient for you. I can interview one on one or whatever number of directors may choose to be interviewed together. I would like to complete my interviewing within the next 3months if possible.

Tā te rangatira, tāna kai he kōrero

The focus of my project will be on your experiences of the directorial process (not on any directorial outcome). I am interested in your views and your issues as a director. This is in contrast to much governance research which focuses on outcomes, not process. While outcomes are important there is some question as to whether “results” give us enough insight into director activity. I am interested in your views of the governance process. I stress again, I am not evaluating your activity as a director. Your responses are confidential. Should you wish to know more about the process and the progress of the project I am happy to provide feedback on my findings at any stage. I eventually hope to collate a manual.

If you are willing to be interviewed can you please contact me directly? Please provide your contact details so that I may get in touch–

My details are;

j.panofo@massey.ac.nz Mobile 027 229 4600 or H 06 353 3514



I hope to have representation from ngā hau e wha!

Ko tāu rourou, ko tāku rourou, ka ora te iwi!

(with your contribution and my contribution we will be well)

Best of luck with the forthcoming elections and/or the round of appointments. Be assured I would like to interview you regardless of the outcome of the election and/or appointment process.

Nāku noa, nā

Joy Panoho

My PhD study is supported by the Health Research Council

This research has been approved by the Massey Human Ethics Committee (appln PN 214)

## Glossary of Māori words and phrases Ngā kupu Māori me ngā whakataukī

This glossary is a modest attempt to offer some functional translation for the reader and is not intended to be definitive. It is offered with the acknowledgement that the author is not a scholar of Māori knowledge. The body of Māori knowledge is vast and encompasses multiple specialist topics studied by expert and scholars, such as, tohunga and rangatira.

Translations are compiled from a variety of sources. The use of macrons can be variable and are not necessarily standardised. Many Māori words and phrases do not literally translate and must always be considered in context.

Aotearoa (noun) New Zealand.

Ākongā (noun) student, pupil, learner, protégé.

Arikinui Paramount Chief.

Hauhau a Māori movement started by Te Ua Haumēne that led to the founding of the Pai Marire faith.

Hauora (noun) health, well-being, vigour.

(verb) to be healthy, fit, in good spirits.

Hine ngaro: (noun) mental health.

Hōhā (verb) to be bored, tiresome, wearisome, fed up.

(noun) a nuisance.

Hui (noun) a meeting, gathering, assembly, conference.

(verb) to meet, assemble, congregate.

Iwi	(noun) extended kinship group, tribe, nation. Large group of people descended from a common ancestor.
Kaiako	(noun) teacher, instructor.
Kaitiaki	(noun) trustee, minder, guard, custodian, guardian, keeper.
Karakia	(noun) incantation, ritual chant, prayer.
Kaumatua	(noun) elder, adult, old woman, old man, respected adult.
Kaupapa	(noun) topic, matter of discussion, proposal, policy.
Waenganui	in between, in the middle.
Kingitanga	(noun) a movement of Māori people during the 1850s to create a leader of similar status to the colonising monarch. This was to halt the alienation of Māori land.
Koha	(noun) gift, offered in recognition of hospitality.
Kōhanga reo	Maōri language (immersion schools) the education of Te reo Māori, the Māori language.
Kōrero	(verb) to speak, tell, read, address. (noun) Speech, narrative, discussion, conversation.
Kuia	(noun) elderly woman, grandmother, female elder.
Mana	(noun) supernatural power within a person; it is determined by how much respect, prestige, status, and power they have.
Manaakitanga	(noun) hospitality, kindness, looking after people.
Manawhenua	(noun) territorial rights, power from the land, power associated with procession or ownership.
Te Matawhānui	the national collective of Māori DHB directors.
Māoritanga	see tikanga Māori

Mātauranga Māori education knowledge, wisdom, understanding and skill.

Matawaka (noun) kinship group, tribe, clan, race.

Mauri (noun) life principle, special nature, a material symbol of life principle, source of emotions.

Mihi (verb) to greet, acknowledge, pay tribute, to thank.  
(noun) a speech of greeting incorporating acknowledgement or tribute.

Pākehā (noun) New Zealander of European descent.

Pākehātanga (noun) The procedure, custom, habit lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, practise or convention of Pākehā.

Rangatira (noun) A respected or revered chief or person of power.

Rangatiratanga (noun) sovereignty, autonomy, ownership rights, right to exercise authority.

Raruraru (verb) to be troubled, perplexed, or in difficulty.  
(noun) a problem or trouble.

Ringatū (noun) a Māori Christian religion founded by Te Kooti in the 1860s.

Rūnanga (noun) a council, assembly, board, tribal council.  
(verb) to discuss in an assembly.

Taha Māori (noun) the Māori side, the Māori perspective.

Taha Pākehā (noun) the Pākehā side, the Pākehā perspective.

Tangata whenua (noun) the people of the land, local people.

Taonga: (noun) a special item, prized goods, effects or possessions.

Taonga tuku iho (noun) a treasure to be passed on, handed down.

Tauīwi (noun) foreign people, non-Māori, foreigners, immigrants.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi the Treaty of Waitangi.

- Tikanga (noun) traditional Māori procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, practise or convention.
- Tinana: (noun) body, trunk (tree), main part of anything.  
(noun) self, in person, in the flesh.
- Tohunga (noun) a skilled person, expert, sometimes a priest, a chosen person for their skill in a particular vocation.
- Tūrangawaewae: (noun) domicile, place where one has rights of residence and belonging through kinship and whakapapa  
(verb) to stand in a place where we belong
- Wairua: (noun) spirit, soul, essence.
- Whaikōrero (verb) to make a formal speech, oratory.  
(noun) an oratory, oration, formal speech, usually given at a powhiri or gathering.
- Whakamā (verb) to be ashamed, embarrassed, shy, bashful.  
(noun) shame, embarrassment, shyness.
- Whakapapa (noun) genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent.  
(verb) to recite genealogy in proper order.
- Whakatau: (noun) official welcome speech.  
(verb) to decide or settle.
- Whakataukī (noun) proverb, saying, aphorism.
- Whakawhanaungatanga (noun) the process of establishing relationships, relating well to others.
- Whānau (noun) family or familial group.  
(verb) to be born, or to give birth.

Whanaungatanga (noun) relationship, kinship, sense or family connection.

### Whakataukī and Phrases

Ahakoā kei waho mā, kei roto he Māori: white on the outside, Māori on the inside

Kāore te kūmera e kōrero mō tōna reka: (Whakataukī ) a kumera does not speak of its own sweetness

Kanohi ki te kanohi: face to face, in the flesh.

Kia tūpato he āta whakaaro, whakaaro āta ranei? cautious thoughts, or not?

Ko te utu mō te aroha, ko te aroha anō (Whakataukī )respect received is respect acknowledged.

Ko wai au? Who am I?

No hea au? Where am I from?

Te ao Māori (noun) The Māori world, all things Māori.

Te ao Māori mātauranga (noun) the world or Māori knowledge, understanding and skill.

Te Mārama o te ao Māori understanding of the Māori world, understanding about Māori.

Tā te rangatira, tāna kai he korero(whakataukī) for a leader, discussion is sustenance

Te Whāre Tapa Whā A Māori Health Model created by Professor Sir Mason Durie. The model encompasses the four cornerstones of Māori health, whānau, tinana, hinengaro and wairua.