# *NEW ZEALAND PERSPECTIVES ON CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION EDUCATION*

*Olivia Baldwin-Denton*

*Project Report – February 2019*

*Submitted to the School of Information Management, Victoria University of Wellington in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Information Studies*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Olivia Baldwin-Denton – 300115313*

# ABSTRACT

## RESEARCH PROBLEM

Aotearoa New Zealand lacks the provision of education in the areas of cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation. Aotearoa's cultural heritage is unique, priceless, and incomparable in the sense of budgets and policy directives. It is no more or less valuable to society than healthcare, physical infrastructure, or any other conceivable political fiscal concern. Cultural heritage however is largely intangible, invisible, and easily forgotten, consisting of reo/language, reta/correspondence, tikanga/protocols, pukapuka/books, mauhanga/records, and taonga/treasures it can seem esoteric and noncritical. This invisibility makes advocacy challenging as it must overcome the very New Zealand idea that intangible equals incidental equals unnecessary and the self-congratulatory attitude that as a colonised nation with founding bicultural partnership documents regardless of the practical application of these, we have already met the standard for biculturality. Tangible and intangible heritage describes who we are and why we are and the lack of provision for the care of these concepts, objects and practices places this in very real danger.

## METHODOLOGY

This research project uses qualitative feminist semi-structured interviews based in cooperative inquiry and feminist methodologies.

## RESULTS

Of the eight organisations I planned to approach, I spoke with eleven individuals affiliated with a range of those organisations amongst others. The significant overlap of responses regardless of which GLAMR subsection each participant was aligned with, emphasised the sector-wide sharing of the lack of conservation educational concerns and more extensive unanticipated educational lacks within Aotearoa New Zealand.

## IMPLICATIONS

What this means for the cultural heritage sector in Aotearoa New Zealand is that there is a lack of opportunity, a lack of future proofing, a lack of value attributed to cultural heritage in Aotearoa and a cultural heritage framework that is based in Eurocentrism. Future research for this research agenda includes the design of a kaupapa based on mana taonga through which an educational experience in the area of cultural heritage conservation can be framed. Secondarily, future investigations must be made into the reasoning for the failure of cultural heritage conservation educational frameworks in Aotearoa and the justification for denying equitable access to this career path. Finally, the concept of a collaborative partnership pilot programme requires exploration using this research project and other existing reports and scholarship as the basis to prove cultural heritage conservation has a place in the educational landscape of Aotearoa New Zealand.

# PROBLEM STATEMENT

## RATIONALE

This research project was based on the concept of righting the unethical boundary of unobtainable education in the field of cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation within Aotearoa New Zealand. This initial research problem revealed itself to be a complex and multi-layered issue for the cultural heritage sector in Aotearoa New Zealand. At its heart was concern for the continuing degradation of our harakeke taonga with no universal specialist knowledge to cater for this at the present time (C. A. Smith, Paterson, Lowe, & Te Kanawa, 2018). A secondary central element is that the galleries, libraries, archives, museums, and records (GLAMR) industry is broadly based on the currently accepted ideals and practices of universalism/Eurocentrism, which frames how we perceive cultural heritage as a practice, application, or value (Brown, 2014; Cloonan, 2015; DeSilvey, 2017; Lending, 2018). The question of how to address this, through decolonising cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation practice, is international in scope and is growing in momentum (DeSilvey, 2017; Sentance, 2018). The breadth of this issue exists across the GLAMR spectrum as the concept of curation and collection is foundational to all GLAMR organisations (Cloonan, 1994; Fang, Russell, & Fang, 1991; Taylor, 2014). Colonial methodology underpins the application of these processes along with the base philosophies of these organisations (Brown, 2014; Cloonan, 2015). The intersectionality of information pushes aside the idea of difference existing between museum, library, archival or other cultural heritage collection items (Cloonan, 1994; Fang et al., 1991). After reflection and refinement of the research objective, the research focused on the identification and isolation of essential educational experiences that are required to build a training programme in this field.

The ultimate outcome of creating a cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation training programme in Aotearoa New Zealand is part of a larger research agenda that can be tackled in a piecemeal way, starting with this research project identifying key elements relevant for a cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation educational experience. The significance of this project lies primarily in the shift of the base mentality for training and organisational procedures from a Eurocentric focus towards a decolonised understanding of our taonga and collection and curation practices across the GLAMR spectrum. A parallel outcome that positively serves the needs of Aotearoa New Zealand includes the ability to better equip ourselves against cultural heritage degradation in whatever format that item or collection exists.

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research project aimed to investigate and outline the potential components for a cultural heritage conversation/preventive conservation educational programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. This key objective is part of a wider research agenda towards successful implementation of cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation education in this country. One of the central foci of this programme would be on the caring for traditional harakeke fibres, a unique substrate requiring specialist processes and treatments to be developed and implemented (C. A. Smith et al., 2018; G. Smith, Te Kanawa, Miller, & Fenton, 2001). Other central ideals would exist around the content and

concepts  of Te Ao Māori and Moana Oceania. With our taonga scattered across the globe, awareness around the specific needs for the care and protection of our tangible and intangible cultural heritage is a step towards reclaiming our voice, reclaiming our mana, and reclaiming our taonga at the very least by offering educational training and support for kaitiaki, locally, regionally and internationally (Brown, 2014; B. A. Milne, Bishop, & Glynn, 2013; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). This overarching research agenda is broad and complex, meaning that this research project focused only on the collation of components for any future proposed educational experience in this area.

The primary objectives this research covered were:

- Identify critical issues for cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation in Aotearoa New Zealand in context.
- Identify training experiences that extend existing knowledge in cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation for GLAMR students and professionals not limited to conservators.
- Identify sustainable methods for imparting knowledge across the GLAMR sector.

# LITERATURE REVIEW

The breadth of this research project requires a wide range of literature content across the GLAMR spectrum. Due to the scope of material being reviewed, the content was curated within themes. These themes include: background, cultural context and indigeneity, collection management and planning, the role of education, thoughts for the future, and finally interesting questions as employed by others to create their literature outputs. Retrospectively, these thematic groupings relate well to the thematic coding of the research data, fitting, not seamlessly but comfortably into the common concepts of concern as identified by the narratives of the research participants and subsequent analysis.

## BACKGROUND

The GLAMR sector is large, and within the heritage conservation, preventive conservation and preservation subgrouping of this sector there is a considerable amount of division between factions of GLAMR (Cloonan, 2015). Although there is significant overlap within the physical practices of heritage conservation/preventive conservation, the spectrum of collection content invites this segmentation partly as a shadow of past master crafts and related guilds (Taylor, 2014). Today's GLAMR environment largely disallows the proliferation of such specialisms, requiring practitioners to become specialists in all fields creating a high level of risk for the neglect of areas like heritage conservation or preventive conservation practices.

Cloonan (2015) discusses the safeguarding of intellectual and cultural property through the care and preservation of items, collections, and cultures; implying two key conceptualisations of the term preservation as "preserving the objects that carry information, and preserving the information itself" (2015, p. xvi). This definition speaks directly to the pervasive nature of this research and how it affects the whole GLAMR sector. GLAMR institutions play a vital role in the care and protection of culture and cultural heritage. In Aotearoa New Zealand there are unique requirements due to the added facet of embedded layers of biodiversity that are facing budgetary and population based challenges, without even considering the theoretical arguments of importance or relevance on the world stage (Lewis, 2008; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). Cloonan (2015) manages to weave the various GLAMR strands together, discussing concepts from western antiquity through to critical current issues such as the relationships between GLAMR institutions and indigenous peoples.

Beyond this seminal text by Cloonan (2015) which draws together a range of preservation and conservation perspectives, the literature of this sector generally tends to focus on components of this community, seldom mentioning the similarity of situation, training, or ideals that exist across GLAMR. Instead, this research has drawn together threads not commonly interwoven under this sole purpose – the collection and protection of cultural heritage.

## CUTURAL CONTEXT AND INDIGENEITY

The concept of preservation itself is based in the colonising tradition of collecting otherness (Brown, 2014; Cloonan, 1994). While collections are touted as tools for learning, as knowledge libraries; they have always existed as an exhibition of power and oppression, weighting objects and cultures against

each other (Cloonan, 1994; Elsner & Cardinal, 1994; Sentance, 2018). The questions of how and why artefacts are kept requires review from all perspectives, rather than just the keeper (or jailer?) of an object, memory, or other tangible or intangible cultural heritage artefact (Cloonan, 1994; Sentance, 2018).

The universalistic or Eurocentric perspective is as insidious as it is pervasive. The opening euphemism of Milne's doctoral thesis (2013) employs a child's colouring book to describe how we teach within a monoculturally white frame, and is in equal parts terrifying and heart breaking. However this touches on the ugly truth of Aotearoa New Zealand's educational landscape and with this the greater landscape for how we understand – and teach others to understand – the world through a white/pākehā/Eurocentric lens of epistemological racism (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Milne (2013) speaks with young Māori and Moana Oceania students about the concept of "white spaces," which are any space where in order to fit you must suppress your cultural identity, your world view, yourself; and through this reinforce all the negative racial and cultural stereotypes, subliminal frameworks, and metadata present in our society. Milne (2013) defined the idea of "whitestreaming," which arguably extends to how we define culture, information and data. These white spaces both literal and virtual follow us into adulthood effectively closing the loop unless we actively work to redefine our understanding of what these concepts are and how we interpret and interact with society, culture, and our cultural heritage.

A clear embodiment of the injustices within current practices is exhibited by Widdowson and Howard's (2008) text *Disrobing the aboriginal industry: The deception behind indigenous cultural preservation*. This text not only stands firmly within the whitestream but even denigrates concepts such as traditional knowledge, rangatiratanga and the meagre compensations for breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as failures not because they are too little too late but because they encourage separatism. The volume of literature following this thought pathway is alarming. This simply shows how problematic otherness is to the dominant group, presenting it as disruptive (B. A. Milne et al., 2013). The differences between Eurocentric and non-Eurocentric research concepts and ideas are used by this text and many others to disestablish and belittle any influence that researchers such as Milne or Linda Tuhiwai Smith have built for the decolonisation of research and thinking over the last two decades (L. T. Smith, 2013). The choice of researchers and authors such as Widdowson and Howard to see only the colonial viewpoint or to state openness to diverse thinking and then dismissing the application of these methodologies while claiming to be unbiased through the use of historical materialism as a framework is a root of neoliberal movements against cultural diversity or any diversity. This research aims to challenge the history and lens used as basis for this framework, and ask how can this style of writing and research be unbiased when the framework used is a legitimised form of racism that places colonial cultures above all others (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; B. A. Milne et al., 2013).

Brown (2014) brings the key issue surrounding this research problem to the fore almost immediately, identifying that colonial powers have cast a broad and shallow net over colonised peoples, collecting their tangible heritage as perceived proof of anthropological progress and assuming that that all contexts of humanity follow the same trajectory and include the same resources and concepts (Brown, 2014). These views of similarity still exist, but are growing into finding similarities of culture or practice rather than as stark hierarchical viewpoints such as the concept of to keep objects or let them decay naturally (DeSilvey, 2017). Expanding colonial empires and policies of aggressive

assimilation emphasised the need for documentation of otherness, favouring the written word of an outsider/researcher over that of kupu tuku iho or other indigenous medium, often through state funded salvage missions that inform taste of the colonial power and document cultures being concurrently eradicated (Brown, 2014; Lending, 2018). Accessibility and ownership of indigenous content for indigenous peoples is paramount as seen in the founding mana taonga policy of Te Papa (C. McCarthy, 2011). The process of opening collections and repatriating collected tangible heritage is underway in some areas, with some collections. There are collections that continue to reside within institutions outside of their cultural jurisdiction. Most notably the marble friezes from the Parthenon (Lending, 2018). Is this the protection of an ancient wonder? Or is this cultural theft/colonial or corporate pillage sometimes referred to as "elginism" (Lending, 2018)?

Questions have been raised around the importance, in the greater scheme of things, relating to solving cultural ill health as exemplified in many colonised indigenous communities (Brown, 2014). The hierarchical standing of access to and understanding of cultural heritage artefacts has been placed well below resolving the disproportionate poverty, addiction, and incarceration in many indigenous communities, but this begs the question of whether these issues would be present without whitestreaming and the related thefts, marginalisation and suppression of identity, culture, and humanity (B. A. Milne et al., 2013)? Brown (2014) either intentionally skates over this point or naively misses it entirely rather than tackling it head on and accepting the presence of these issues and colonial participation in the proliferation of them. Brown (2014) accepts continuing marginalisation and racism as a reality, placing her in a similar realm of moral delinquency to Widdowson and Howard (2008). We cannot avoid the issue of wrongdoing in both historic and contemporary contexts anymore. To do so is morally wrong and will only continue the increase in the whitestreaming of our social and cultural intelligence. Instead we must challenge the status quo by re-writing the pedagogies and methodologies that outline our cultural heritage sector in the hope that if our identity is actively framed within our bicultural partnership and relevant to our multicultural reality perhaps society will follow suit, taking our place as world leaders in modern citizenship.

## COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

The connection between preservation and accessibility is inextricable (Merrill-Oldham, Clark Morrow, & Roosa, 1991). The concept of accessibility and the subsequent potential reuse changes subtly across the GLAMR community. For libraries and records management organisations this could be the practicalities of usage for the purpose of knowledge and information retention and dissemination. For museums or archives there is the retention factor, but also usage in an abstract sense where users engage with the content but in conceptually different ways. Knowledge and information across these organisations presents itself differently, but the underlying understanding that all these overtly different objects frame the principle manifestation of cultural heritage is explicit across the GLAMR community.

The metamorphosis of libraries and across the GLAMR sector over the last thirty years is discussed by Teper (2005) as one of "keeping pace" (2005, p. 32). The concept of preservation and collection care has moved from the narrow view of individual item treatment to the global view of general preventive, overarching care of whole collections (Taylor, 2014). Content is still treated on a case by

case basis where required but efficiency-based, proactive actions to eliminate or control as much as possible the long term factors like condition and environment help to minimise the likelihood of individual interventions (G. Smith et al., 2001; Taylor, 2014; Teper, 2005).

Efficiency and retrenchment poses one of the greatest, enduring challenges to cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation through the perceived importance of this profession (Cloonan, 1994; Taylor, 2014). Participants in Taylor's (2014) study mentioned their struggle to convince prospective clients and even current employers of their value. One participant goes so far as to say that until there was flooding on three floors in the library they were associated with, the director felt having a conservation lab was an unjustifiable excess (Taylor, 2014). Following this event, the conservation team were regarded as invaluable, having saved that library from huge potential costs incurred by damages and closures, but this anecdote highlights the realisation challenges that this research agenda faces.

However the importance of this research pushes it forward as harakeke textiles and other taonga have made their way into international collections through various methods, following European contact with Aotearoa New Zealand and Moana Oceania (Lending, 2018; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). Currently there is no standard understanding of how to care for harakeke items and as a result they exhibit "active deterioration" despite the application of international best practice which can be semantically aligned as enlightened, universal or European practice and thus misaligned with our case for the decolonisation of indigenous collections (C. A. Smith et al., 2018, p. 139; Winter, 2014). Smith et al. (2018) discusses the experimental use of sodium alginate as a basic consolidant for harakeke fibres and textiles in the context of cultural heritage collections, which may alleviate the current and future challenges for conservators as a direct result of the uniqueness of these items within the status quo of collection care, use and display. However there must be consideration around how items are treated which may be scientifically correct, but do they consider the mauri of that item? Do these strategies consider whether preservation is the ethical pathway for the item in question (DeSilvey, 2017)? Have these strategies considered whether this item is fulfilling its meaning for existence by being kept prisoner, away from its people, whanau and whenua?

## THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

Although published over 30 years ago, Dosa and Lemke's (1991) concepts of education remain relevant today. Education is a social construct that enhances our experience of life, and has the potential to enhance how we effect change in our lives, what elements we can support or control in our day to day activities. The concept of a broad, inclusive educational training design fits with the concept of this project through the ability to capture the widest possible audience and support the widest possible requirements without losing effectivity (Dosa & Lemke, 1991). The paper goes on to discuss the requirement for comprehensive and exploratory programmes to be designed for future (as at 1986) preventive conservation and conservation understanding and processes (Dosa & Lemke, 1991). Knee-jerk responses of the twentieth-century to degradation of relatively new mediums such as photographic materials and cheaply mass-produced paper products shows that supposed progress does not always bring us to the desired outcome. The proliferation of media diversification requires us as kaitiaki to consider these issues deeply with knowledge, care and respect for the mauri of each

item, and with an acceptance that we cannot know if we have come to the pinnacle of our technological prowess in conservation techniques (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; C. A. Smith et al., 2018).

The importance of cultural/geographic/climatic variations in cultural heritage conservation educational programmes is a step towards eliminating the whitestreaming from our educational systems (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; B. A. Milne et al., 2013). There is an expectation of divergence for the very reason of this project proposal and research, that there is no singular universally accepted method. Aotearoa New Zealand and Moana Oceania require divergence for all of these reasons. We reside in a uniquely cultural and geographically isolated landscape that places prospective students at significant and tangible disadvantage, and produces cultural heritage objects that are exclusive to our microcosmic climate and environs (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; B. A. Milne et al., 2013; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). Similar to Aotearoa's regionally distinct taonga and kaupapa are Japan's traditional methods and cultural heritage content (ICCROM, 2018). The National Research Institute for Cultural Properties in Tokyo is renowned for sharing with the world traditional Japanese paper-based methods as a strategy for safeguarding exported cultural heritage, similar to our internationally housed taonga, that reside distantly from specialist conservators (ICCROM, 2018; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). This Institute believes in the importance of traditional knowledge and methods to support the preservation of Japanese cultural heritage both nationally and internationally (ICCROM, 2018). This exemplar of regional specialism highlights a precedent for the traditional care of taonga in Aotearoa and internationally and offers a potential case study to base future research on. These reasons of regional and cultural exclusivity, biodiversity and specialism also strongly argue that Aotearoa New Zealand should support and foster the development of a conservation and preventive conservation educational experience so we can lead the world in the protection, treatment and understanding of our taonga, our cultural heritage.

The provision of educational content in conservation/preventive conservation requires interdisciplinary cooperation within the GLAMR sector for success across Aotearoa New Zealand and Moana Oceania (Dosa & Lemke, 1991). The concept at this point is broadly to try to attract as much support from all corners of the GLAMR community, using this community as the infrastructure upon which to build a programme (Dosa & Lemke, 1991). Past recommendations for educational experiences include formal educational programming through institutions, informal training or professional development and workshops, and international exchanges amongst others; all worthy of review within this research agenda (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; Stolow, 1980). The design of conservation/preventive conservation programmes should reflect the environment and needs of the community they serve as presenting challenges include everything from "building environments to the adhesive used for barcode labels" making climatic variation a significant factor (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; Merrill-Oldham et al., 1991, pp. 7–8). Can we really expect a deep and nuanced understanding of the preventive conservation challenges and needs of, for example, an organisation in developing Moana Oceania from a conservator trained in the universal/colonial/Eurocentric traditions of Australia, America, or Europe? Aotearoa should cite Japan as the successful business case it exemplifies, arguing for the validity of regional cultural heritage knowledge and expertise (ICCROM, 2018).

Resolutions from a GLAMR seminar in 1986 talk about the paramount importance of preservation and conservation knowledge for information professionals, in whatever format that information is presented (Cloonan, 2015; Fang et al., 1991). These resolutions included guidelines to support the

development of conservation/preventive conservation programmes within the information profession and related training (Fang et al., 1991). The Stolow report of 1980 outlined recommendations for a largely Eurocentrically traditional, though ethnologically focused conservation education/national training programme for New Zealand (Stolow, 1980). Merrill-Oldham, Clark Morrow and Roosa (1991) break the requirements of conservation/preventive conservation management down into more practically based focal points, the how of conservation/preventive conservation programming. Merrill-Oldham et al. (1991, p. 9) identify these realities or practicalities as "a four-point framework": rationale, administrative issues and policy implications, human and material resources, and developmental phases.

As director of the preservation services arm of the National Library of Australia, Lyall (1991) acknowledged the responsibility of Australian institutions to support its Pacific neighbours through "improved services" (1991, p. 66). There was no clear plan of how this would be enacted and it is questionable whether anything came of this somewhat grand statement. Lyall (1991) discussed the role of the UNESCO Regional Conservation Centre and the development of how support could be shared with South East Asia and the Pacific, should more funding become available.  Perhaps no funding did become available, perhaps there was no accountability following this statement, perhaps there was not sufficient perceived interest or appetite at the time. There would certainly be interest now, if these opportunities were still offered, however the local and international political climate may have shifted significantly in the intervening years.

The pervasiveness of cultural heritage goes beyond artefacts in museums or the documentation of experiential cultural practices, but lives in all content in all places (Cloonan, 2015; Fang et al., 1991; Taylor, 2014). The idea that as a small country, Aotearoa New Zealand may not require or could not support an accessible educational experience in the discipline of cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation is myopic at best. While a formal tiered scheme of degrees in this area may be unattainable at this point in time, that isn't to say that this could be the long term goal.

Currently without an equitable, accessible educational opportunity in Aotearoa, individuals may be selected or find themselves able to afford training internationally. This is an equivalent to the process of assessing items on a case by case basis, allowing treatment for an individual item or the financial support of an individual student, potentially at the cost of others (Taylor, 2014). We now choose to manage our collections broadly with preventive measures to attempt to lessen the incidence or frequency of individual attentions, as a cost saving measure (Taylor, 2014). Why do we not apply this risk assessment to our human resourcing and cultural competencies (Merrill-Oldham et al., 1991)? We risk losing resources by relying heavily on a small number of highly skilled individuals who are aging with no sustainable future proofing in place. Why not spread the load, mitigate the risk of human resource failure? Learning structures for this project recognise the importance of training in the workplace which has already been stipulated as a recognised form of education in this discipline (Stolow, 1980; Taylor, 2014). For conservation/preventive conservation the skills required are a mixture of theoretical knowledge, manual skill and dexterity, and an intangible, implicit understanding of the nature of the object in question which can only come through expert guidance and experience reflected both in Taylor's research and found within this research project and later discussed (Taylor, 2014). The importance of these skills, particularly that indefinable expertise, means that this

knowledge should be shared, spread, disseminated to best protect our cultural heritage, our taonga through ōritetanga and rangatiratanga, reciprocity and relationships.

Taylor (2014) investigated book conservation for her dissertation, and part of this included training programmes. Of the commentaries included in Taylor's text, all of the participants talk about the diversity of skills required, and this is specifically for the conservation of books only (Taylor, 2014). Taylor's  participants discuss how training has always previously been in Europe, that now even in America the opportunities for formal training are reducing after a relative boom in the 1960s when the master-apprentice training system was overtaken by formalised institutional training programmes (Taylor, 2014). They discuss the shift in gender balance, although there is nowhere a discussion on cultural diversity or pedagogy based in indigeneity (Taylor, 2014). There is one participant who discusses the realities of reduced formalised training opportunities, stating that a return to informal training is the only way to overcome this stumbling block and that formally qualified conservators "need to just get over" a practitioners lack of formal qualification, lest the profession perish (Taylor, 2014, p. 23). Informal knowledge sharing and apprenticeships or internships will be the only option for training in the absence of formalised qualifications (Taylor, 2014).

The idea of using a rare item as a focal point to build a programme around could be a way of drawing the tertiary providers into this conversation and questioning the status quo. Victoria University of Wellington (VUW) has resources including the J.C. Beaglehole Room, the Classics Museum, Wai Te Ata Press, and the Adam Art Gallery that are available and accessible but not widely advertised as a point of difference. Other tertiary institutions in New Zealand hold similar resources that could be reason to engage in study, but why stop there? There are organisations that specialise in the area of the collection and care of cultural heritage. With the existence of memorandums of understanding with these organisations why is there no engagement for the provision of exceptional specialist learning opportunities? Wellington alone houses the National Library, Alexander Turnbull Library, Parliamentary Library, Archives New Zealand, Te Papa Tongarewa the Museum of New Zealand; plus numerous other additional nationally significant privately and publicly held collections including perhaps forgotten but equally valuable historical governmental collections such as the those of various ministries and departments. These collections and those of other regional centres could well be crumbling, regardless of how well they're kept, how much they're revered as resources or artefacts; if we do nothing they will ultimately vanish because nobody thought to reach out and care about their cultural heritage value (Taylor, 2014).

## WHERE TO FROM HERE?

The rise of digital content, both born digital and digital surrogacy of analogue objects means that digital preservation and the associated cultural heritage ethical implications are a growing area of interest and importance (Teper, 2005). This is no longer a niche area to be farmed out to specialists, but should be part and parcel of any programme of study across the GLAMR community. Consider the model of the bust of Nefertiti, a cultural heritage object and openly available digital surrogate which could also be construed as a case of cultural appropriation alongside the original elginism (Lending, 2018; Wilder, 2016). The importance of seeing the whole rather than the constituent parts as related to each niche aspect of that whole is a fundamental part of conservation/preventive conservation within our unique cultural environment (Taylor, 2014). This doesn't preclude us from including niche

experts in our professional practice, but in order to find the best long term outcomes for our collections, both as discrete items and as whole collections; we must all have a reasonable understanding of those niche aspects regardless of their discipline or make it our business to work alongside experts rather than delegate jobs to those who hold expertise in their field which does not necessarily include cultural heritage values (Taylor, 2014).

The reasoning behind decisions to conserve and/or preserve has shifted over time, and greater thought is now given to the what and why, while conversations with stakeholders provide key guidance for these decisions where this was missing in the colonial tradition (Cloonan & Harvey, 2007). The concept of value has shifted from the perceived monetary value of a physical item to the social value of an object, idea, or other culturally significant artefact (A. Smith, 2007). Cultural heritage is historically a concept based in collections of physical content, but it extends beyond the physical in the present and future which in itself shows the requirement for a rethink (Cloonan, 1994; Fang et al., 1991; Lyons, 2018; A. Smith, 2007).

## THE QUESTIONS OF OTHERS

While reviewing the research outlined above, occasionally lists of questions were found that were used to elicit the information published. Some stood out as worthy of replication and have been used as inspiration for the design of the interview protocol in the context of this research:

- "What do you see as the critical issues for the [cultural heritage conservation/]preservation field…?
- What steps should be taken to address these issues?
- What are some international issues which the field must address?" (Cloonan, 1994, p. 8)

- "What do you anticipate to be a critical issue in … conservation[/preventive conservation] in the coming years?
- What has been the biggest change in conservation[/preventive conservation] during your career?
- What advice would you give someone who is entering the field?
- What training or experiences have been most useful over your years as a conservator?
- What is one thing you wished you had known when you first started conservation?" (Taylor, 2014, pp. 2, 21)

# RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research objectives of this project considered critical issues for broad ranging GLAMR cultural heritage conservation/preventive conservation in Aotearoa New Zealand and the wider international landscape. This research project hoped to discover sustainable, decolonising concepts of both practical and theoretical natures to incorporate as recommendations for the next stage of this research agenda: the programme in practice.

With this in mind, the research questions investigated were:

I.    What elements or concepts are necessary for a cultural materials/heritage conservation/preventive conservation training programme designed for an Aotearoa New Zealand context that would encompass the wider GLAMR spectrum?

II.   What are the critical issues for cultural materials/heritage conservation/preventive conservation training, practice, and theory in 2018/2019 and beyond?

# METHODOLOGY

Originally this research project was theoretically framed using action research as the key methodological basis. As this project has progressed the challenges posed by this methodological framework became striking. Action research is an excellent model that will be of value when this research progresses to planning a pilot programme. Action research methodology is traditionally used when attempting to solve problems in reality that are socially relevant rather than to fill abstract gaps in scientific understanding using feedback loops and active participation of both the researcher and research participants (Aragn & Castillo-Burguete, 2015; Punch, 2005; Schwandt, 2007a).

This research has focussed more specifically on cooperative inquiry methodologies using semi-structured qualitative interviews that have retrieved thick, rich data sets. Willis (2007) cites Heron as describing cooperative inquiry as a process where at least two researchers are present, however the concept of cooperative inquiry is not definitively based around the presence of multiple researchers although this is a common factor (Schwandt, 2007b). The key theoretical idea of cooperative inquiry is the collaborative properties of the research process under this methodological style (Schwandt, 2007b). This cooperative/collaborative ethos was built out of the action research basis, engaging the primary reasoning for any research objective from a social rather than theoretical question or requirement (Punch, 2005; Schwandt, 2007b, 2007a). Cooperative inquiry is one of the many methodological branches that have grown from critique of Lewin's action research methodology and various other contemporaneous methodological movements including emancipatory research and Marxism amongst others (Punch, 2005; Schwandt, 2007b). Cooperative inquiry bases its primary methodological shift away from action research within the act of participant involvement in the research design and trajectory (Punch, 2005; Schwandt, 2007b). This involvement is described as "research with people rather than on people", thus not only working to resolve a socially present concern but also allowing research participants to better understand both the problem and solution through active participation and ownership of any outcomes (Schwandt, 2007b, pp. 45–46).

The inclusive research style of cooperative inquiry places this research project within a second methodology, that of feminism (Punch, 2005). Feminist methodology lends itself to all non-

white/male/Eurocentric communities through the argument that scientific methodologies are primarily based in the "masculine way of viewing the world" without the flexibility to acknowledge there are other equally valid societal views (Punch, 2005, p. 136). This research argues that this definition should go further, stating that scientific methodologies acknowledge only a Western, white, Eurocentric and male view of the world. Feminism combats this ethos, working to not only acknowledge diversity but to actively seek participatory practices from social research in order to eliminate the narrow theoretical arguments outlined through the male-only experiences; arguments that are packaged as gender-free or universally true for all societal factions (Punch, 2005). This distorted perspective fundamentally differs from the purpose of this research, where variety, specialism, and decolonisation are highly valued entities (Cloonan, 1994; Fang et al., 1991).

The semi-structured feminist interview method used was highly successful for this research process as the range of participant experiences were broad. Participants within this research were identified for their involvement in the GLAMR sector. Not all the participants were from a conservation or preventive conservation background which created a clear picture through the data collected that the research issue identified is one of an array of similarly pressing educational lacks within Aotearoa New Zealand. A pre-determined interview protocol was developed for this research from which to create a known platform for both researcher and participant to begin the conversation (Ayres, 2008). The feminist interpretation of this semi-structured technique allowed for greater freedom of where these questions would take the research "enabling greater openness and insight, a greater range of responses, and therefore richer data"(Punch, 2005, p. 173).

The qualitative research processes used through this research project emphasised the importance of collaboration and fluidity as the data collected far exceeded the outcome expectations by highlighting not only the anticipated gap, but stressing further gaps in the GLAMR sector that require further research and confrontation. Punch (2005) states the importance of this freedom, expressing that adherence to a rigid methodological style decided prior to data collection can limit and influence the research outcomes.

Feminist qualitative research processes fit this research project as they have allowed for a freedom of exploration into the area being researched (Oishi, 2003). Conversations and content have primarily been based around the interview protocol but in almost all occasions have explored ideas on the periphery or entirely outside of the protocol expectations. Due to the lack of educational experiences in this sector in Aotearoa New Zealand qualitative processes and the feminist manifestation of the qualitative interview process empower both the interviewer and participant as equal partners to share experiences and opinions of what could be and why those ideas are valuable (Punch, 2005). The importance of the personal aspect of qualitative feminist interviews is based in the interpretation of body language, tone, humour and other non-verbal or non-lingual cues (Ayres, 2008; Punch, 2005). The non-verbal passion for their GLAMR roles and the concepts considered in this research project by all of the participants was palpable and can only have been fully communicated and captured through the intimacy and holistic practice of the feminist qualitative interview (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Punch, 2005).

There are challenges and limitations associated with the interview as a method style. Challenges can include the situational conditions of interviewing and emotional investment that is required to artificially create a private and safe atmosphere within which confidential information can be

imparted between two individual who are usually strangers (Alvesson, 2011). Limitations related to the personal nature of interviewing can mean that data collected or data shared by the participant is subject to implicit bias (Alvesson, 2011; O'Leary, 2017). Subjectivity is almost unavoidable in the interview process as it is a conversation between two individuals who are invested in the content being discussed (Alvesson, 2011; O'Leary, 2017). These potential unintentional biases can be minimised through both interview practice such as including a second interviewer to passively observe the situation and manage the rationality of the interview; and through interview processing by the researcher identifying and listing all conscious impressions, preconceived ideas and biases relevant to the interview prior to beginning coding and analysis (Alvesson, 2011; O'Leary, 2017).

For this research a second interviewer was not used and implicit biases were minimised through the second method of identifying these and isolating them before analysis. This decision was made primarily because it was not considered necessary to subject participants to the moderately uncomfortable experience of having a conversation with a stranger while a second stranger passively observes the conversation. This technique has questionable benefit for the data outcomes as participants are less likely to feel safe and therefore may moderate their commentaries, as this technique has been likened to a police interrogation by Alvesson (2011).

In the context of this research project, the importance of partnerships across the GLAMR sector is fundamental. This project is a gateway to the larger research agenda of designing a preventive conservation and conservation educational experience or pathway of experiences for Aotearoa New Zealand. Cooperative inquiry alongside an expanded feminist theory and action research feedback loops are ideal methodologies through which to create a kaupapa based in mātauranga Māori that serves the needs of Aotearoa New Zealand and Moana Oceania as we will be able to interpret the starting requirements for how these are to be realised within the community through a collaborative research process rather than dictate how a programme should look and be accomplished based on abstract research.

## METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

### POPULATION SAMPLING

Research participants from three layers of organisational strata were approached as planned. These layers are outlined as strategic – leading/shaping high-level policy decisions; technical – leading evidence based decisions and processes in practice; and practical/applied – working in the sector; levels within GLAMR organisations that have influence in the cultural heritage conservation field of Aotearoa New Zealand. This research project did not manage to secure any participants from academic institutions that have run cultural heritage conservation courses in the past. The pool of eight organisations from which recruitment was planned included:

- The Ministry of Culture and Heritage
- Te Papa Tongarewa the Museum of New Zealand
- The National Library of New Zealand
- Archives New Zealand
- Auckland Museum

- Christchurch Museum
- Wellington Museum
- Victoria University of Wellington

Of these eight organisations eleven participants from several of these organisations were secured along with other organisations and unaffiliated professionals in private practice. Of the organisational levels proposed this research project was unable to attract many participants from either the high-level strategic or the practical/applied levels associated with GLAMR. The research participants primarily consisted of technical, however participants were engaged from the strategic level within their organisations as well as a single practical/applied participant. This sample offered a wide variety of experiential contexts within the GLAMR sector, however the inclusion of at least one participant from a nationally strategic context would have enriched the data significantly.

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Research data was collected through a series of semi-structured qualitative interviews. The feminist and cooperative inquiry methodologies allowed refinement of the interview protocol, adapting the content and questions to the individual participant and their narrative while exploring the predetermined areas required for this research (Miles et al., 2014; Punch, 2005). Extra time was not required as all the participants were supplied with the interview protocol ahead of time to consider their position and narrative prior to the interview taking place. This meant that the predetermined questions were covered in the allocated interview time and any extra information participants wished to share was also able to be incorporated into this allocated time.

Analysis of the transcribed data followed two cycles of coding for each interview: first cycle - thematic and simultaneous coding, second cycle - pattern coding (Miles et al., 2014). Following these two coding cycles the thematic codes were amalgamated across the entire data set, looking at relational aspects of the existing codes in order to find a more holistic data grouping (Miles et al., 2014). The initial proposal discussed the incorporation of repetition, and implicit connotations of word use and related non-verbal cues for use in coding and analysis (O'Leary, 2017). These concepts were found to be unnecessary as they would add little to an already rich, thick data set (Miles et al., 2014; Punch, 2005). The layers of coding employed supported the discovery and identification of both expected and unexpected concepts relevant to the research, particularly through the application of simultaneous codes (Miles et al., 2014). Through the act of performing the various coding cycles, connections between themes and GLAMR sectors became explicit, allowing the identification and mapping of discrete concepts and elements that support the research and endorse any recommendations (Miles et al., 2014; O'Leary, 2017).

To ensure confidentiality of the research participants they are referred to within this report numerically as participants "P[insert number here]" for example P1 or P9. Organisations have also been omitted from the text where they may infer the participant's employment as this may breach the confidentiality of the research agreement and applied ethical constraints.

# FINDINGS/RESULTS

Within the methodologies outlined above the interview protocol was used to establish an understanding of each participant's personal pathway into the GLAMR role they inhabit. This meant that the range of data gained was broader than required to address the research questions as outlined on page 15 of this report. This method therefore also procured richer data than a more sanitised questioning method would have, and a better understanding of the reasoning behind each individual narrative was achieved.

The significant aspects of the interview structure for the purposes of fulfilling the research objectives for this project were the two central parts of the interview, following the preliminary questions. These aspects are:

- Problematic current and future areas of the GLAMR sector/participant's role.
- What the participant feels are relevant experiences for an educational experience in this area.

The final question of the interview protocol was a specific possible future as framed by the interviewer, though was not necessary to fulfil the research objective of this project. The question was included to offer an exemplar of how an educational experience framed around a specific substrate is or could be managed/maintained.

The key finding of this research was that the anticipated educational/training gap explored for the purposes of this project is inhabits only a small part of a much larger issue for cultural heritage training in Aotearoa New Zealand and the wider Moana Oceania communities. Specialist training capability is required, and not only in cultural heritage conservation but also areas including digital preservation, copyright compliance, heritage law, archival practice and likely many other areas that are as yet unidentified by this and other research programmes (P2, 2018; P3, 2019; P7, 2018; P8, 2018; P9, 2018; P10, 2018).

## PROBLEMATIC AREAS FOR GLAMR

Current and future issues identified consisted largely of the anticipated and commonly discussed issues of space and storage, relevance, perceived value, funding, the gap in training, problematic formats and materials, and capability. This research also identified several major threats for the future that require addressing in the areas of succession planning, biculturality, and anticipating the future's history within cultural heritage.

The first question regarding this problem area was what happens when conservators skilled in the field of mātauranga Māori retire or move on from the roles they currently inhabit? With no existing training capability in Aotearoa New Zealand and no accessible or equitable programme for potential students, there is a lack of future-proofing within the sector.

> "we need to [think about] succession planning, which when we talked about one of the most pressing things was probably that. We have no New Zealand conservators coming through" (P8, 2018).

One of the reasons for this could be attributed to the mundane issues of funding and perceived value as this particular area of the GLAMR sector doesn't have the advocacy or support to facilitate opportunities for new conservators.

"It's growing [through the changes of experiences but] they aren't developing any courses because there aren't the jobs really, that's the catch 22" (P3, 2019).

Without advocacy around the value of conservators, there is a proliferation of work that requires attention and a largely unskilled workforce managing it in an ad-hoc manner. Several participants even admitted that they were untrained conservation enthusiasts acting on a needs-must basis with sporadically funded external support within the collections they administered (P1, 2018; P6, 2018; P10, 2018).

The second part to this issue is around how the management of our collections doesn't simply lie in the physical or scientifically quantifiable treatment, handling or storage of an item. Taonga of Aotearoa's and Moana Oceania's communities possess intangible qualities that require explicit respect and adherence to protocols for those taonga. One participant stated that this aspect of manaakitanga is a global concept that manifests in alternate forms depending on where you are geographically, making the incorporation of specific indigeneity into an educational experience difficult (P3, 2019). However, arguably an in-depth understanding of one culture or group of similar cultures would enhance the capacity for integration into an entirely different culture should that be necessary, through the required acceptance of alternate realities (P4, 2018).

"it's interesting in New Zealand the way in which we deal with intangible and tangible stuff we've always led discussions in the conservation community and we have different ways of working with things but … more recently … it feels like we're a bit at groundhog day, we're having to start again … looking at concepts of mauri, of wairua, of decision making that make those equal partners in the physical, in the conservation of the materiality of an object" (P8, 2018)

Conservators in Aotearoa New Zealand are primarily internationals who on arrival lack the implicit competencies required to manage taonga in the reality of kāwanatanga and rangatiratanga. What appears to Eurocentrically trained individuals as static, inanimate objects, are items that possesses mauri and/or wairua making these objects more than simply objects in the Eurocentric sense. Taonga possess their own lifeforce and personality, commanding a different understanding of respectfulness and care to philosophies taught elsewhere.

"Objects have their own mauri and their own force and, I'm using English words … objects have their own force, their own personality, they have a will, we know this in [the institution] to be true. Sometimes they want to be found, sometimes they don't, sometimes they let you work on them, sometimes they don't … I'm speaking literally … the taonga have their own lives and … we interact with them as we do with people" (P4, 2018).

The second question for this problem area is while some GLAMR organisations and institutions are making significant inroads into redress around mana taonga, kāwanatanga and tikanga based practice, how are others able to choose the whitestream? Is this not permitting individuals and groups to undermine rangatiratanga and persist in undermining other realities through epistemological racism under the guise of personal freedoms? Policies, actions and language have connotations both implicit and explicit and these colour how we interact with collections, colleagues and other stakeholders.

"cultural awareness … I am aware of it, I understand it, so I've been able to make the decision to either engage with you or not on my terms… Perspectives, talking about 'the Māori perspective', to me that has a real undermining of people's reality". (P4, 2018)

Some participants showed zealous enthusiasm for reconfiguring how data and collections are managed. However when questioned whether these concepts would be considered in the context of the participant's organisation the enthusiasm diminished, and excuses of relevance to main collections were made, though specific items were mentioned for possible targeted policy shifts.

> "I'd certainly be open to dealing with a collection, a Māori collection [using a bicultural methodology] … with guidance" (P6, 2018).

While some may argue that this is a starting point from where the GLAMR sector can begin it's bicultural becoming, there is the uncomfortable sensation of tokenism accompanying it.

> "The intentionality of how an institution applies its cultural competency, I know that really varies around the country.  … Te Papa has been great in making mana taonga one of its foundations, … its bicultural constitution … Other people, other institutions have looked at that and adopted this approach … to greater and lesser extents" (P4, 2018).

The third question for this problem area is a higher level issue around space or the lack thereof as issues of increasingly tight physical storage are grappled with. This era of bulk collecting practice challenges the management of sustainably retaining an accurate representation or trace of the community (P6, 2018; P8, 2018). What is cast off by institutions in the name of rationalisation? There is no crystal ball that shares an understanding of the importance of ephemera or minutiae that may appear to be inconsequential at this time.

> "trends and personal opinion and subjective [drive what is valued and what is not, meaning that] we base history on you know that kind of thing, on just a snapshot" (P3, 2019)

> "Some of the more novel content or the personal content that we've got here that captures the hearts and minds of the people is you know like technically speaking its outside the remit of what the… mandate is of collecting items of long-term historical value.  Determining what is going to be of historical value and determining what's going to be of social value in the future is really contentious and you end up making tough decisions about [items] you know will having ongoing, primarily personal, genealogical whakapapa value but that are not [within the scope of the organisation's collection policy]" (P4, 2018).

Though the question is asked whether content should be kept in the pervasive method currently employed?

> "do we need to keep everything and is preservation letting it go" (P8, 2018)

Content held within institutions can suffer from poor or irrelevant metadata. Without the capability to understand what is held within cultural heritage institutions, there is no way to support either deaccession or retention. The exponential growth currently being experienced by cultural heritage institutions means there is the possibility of professionals being overwhelmed with content, often content with poor automated metadata surrounding it which can explain the constant and pressing issue of storage.

> "Apparently, they have done studies where you increase your storage and seven years later you need more and that's standard all over the world" (P3, 2019).

With this concept in mind, it is questionable whether it is even possible to reorganise content description to reflect a hypothetical desire of Aotearoa's GLAMR sector to jettison colonialism. Perhaps the wider GLAMR sector sees a certain safety in this seemingly impossible task.

## RELEVANT EXPERIENCES FOR EDUCATION IN THIS AREA

During interviewing for this research project, every participant was keen to emphasise the possibilities for an educational experience in the area of cultural heritage conservation and/or preventive conservation training. The ideas shared by the participants were wide ranging but centred on particular themes that that were repeated time and again. There were two key foci for inclusion in an educational experience which were:

- The potential for bicultural experiences that would enhance an understanding of Aotearoa's biculturality and the importance of this fundamental aspect of our society.
- The necessity for practical, hands-on experience in context/in the field.

The potential overlap within these two concepts converges through regionalised or iwi specific "centres of excellence" (P8, 2018). However this concept caused some divergence of opinion along the lines of whether it would be better to generalise this experience or to work directly with iwi, hapū or whānau groups of renowned skill (P10, 2018).

Outside of these two key elements for inclusion, other elements that this research identified as important for inclusion are listed below. These concepts cover the practical training, concepts, facilities, or abstract support through knowledge bases and relationships.

- Noho marae (P6, 2018).
- Centres of excellence (P8, 2018).
- Memorandums of understanding and organisational/societal partnerships (P5, 2019; P7, 2018; P8, 2018).
- Indigenous pedagogy based in mana taonga (P1, 2018; P4, 2018; P5, 2019).
- Inclusion of Moana Oceania both in relationships and training content (P5, 2019; P6, 2018).
- Accessibility and movement away from a "user pays" system (P1, 2018; P6, 2018; P9, 2018).
- Copyright (P9, 2018; P10, 2018).
- Te Tiriti o Waitangi (P7, 2018).
- Stakeholder management (P1, 2018; P4, 2018; P7, 2018; P8, 2018; P9, 2018; P10, 2018).
- Mentoring and sector support relationships (P1, 2018; P2, 2018; P7, 2018).
- Continuous learning requirement (P4, 2018).

- Creation of learning cohorts, sector based peer relationships (P1, 2018; P2, 2018; P11, 2019).
- Practical learning experiences through internship/volunteering/apprenticeships (P1, 2018; P3, 2019; P5, 2019; P6, 2018; P7, 2018; P8, 2018).
- Travel/movement to extend the breadth of experiences (P2, 2018; P3, 2019; P4, 2018; P7, 2018; P8, 2018).
- "Echo learning" requirement – presenting your new knowledge/training back to sector colleagues/peers (P11, 2019).
- Different levels of educational experiences available to different classes of participants, from beginner/layperson to sector professional seeking extension (P6, 2018; P10, 2018).
- Use of institutional facilities (P3, 2019; P8, 2018).

The fundamental element of Te Tiriti o Waitangi is the basis for training in Aotearoa. This was implicit for the majority of participants, so instead of explicitly mentioning this during interviews, participants often went further to specify how it would influence the pedagogical framework.

"If we had a conservation school here we could explore mana taonga, it could be built in, it is the point of difference … that brings a lot of researchers … our bicultural stance" (P1, 2018).

This exploration and creation of a bicultural pedagogy would further the cause for realising value of conservation professionals and valuing cultural heritage in this country. Without an educational framework of any description, there will continue to be a dearth of research in this area and a disregard of expertise that is already present in Aotearoa and Moana Oceania.

> "We don't actually value the skills or knowledge involved.  It's the tall poppy thing, … this inherent … misconception of what is valuable … Do we need to follow these international standards if that doesn't work in the local context? … Why can't we look to our own kind of research?  Why can't we develop our own way?" (P2, 2018)

>  "We are in the privileged position to have Indigenous knowledge holders, Mamas and Papas; here in Aotearoa who have such in-depth knowledge – their knowledge 'together' with the learned conservation knowledge hand in hand would be respectful on so many levels" (P5, 2019).

# DISCUSSION

Throughout the interview process common themes and concerns were identified that run across the GLAMR sector. These thematic anxieties are largely noted in existing literature, some of which is discussed above, showing that ignoring these issues will not reduce them. The key themes identified during coding and analysis were both predetermined by the nature of the interview questions, and organic following the narratives of the participants. These key themes were:

- Sector agility and the rise of generalisation
- Mana taonga, cultural intentionality and integrity
- Values and attitudes
- Elements for inclusion in an educational experience
- Sustainability and future

## SECTOR AGILITY AND THE RISE OF GENERALISATION

Cloonan (2015) discusses the factionalism of GLAMR and this was portrayed in the environments and organisational structures of the GLAMR institutions visited during this research. This factionalism was recognised but remains yet to be dealt with. Agility, crossover and the hybrid nature of roles was repeatedly raised during the interview process implying the expectations of roles within GLAMR organisations interrelate or even replicate themselves from one area to another. Cloonan (2015) discusses the overlaps of GLAMR and their primary objective, but acknowledges there is a place for specialism as even with a common goal, the means of obtaining that goal diverges across different institutions. Taylor (2014) suggests this factionalism as a trace of past behaviours and training of specialisms. Specialisms and the simultaneous movement towards generalism exacerbate partitions between GLAMR institutions. The common goal of care for shared concepts, shared taonga, and the importance of those taonga and their connection with communities becomes alienated by factionalism. The greater viewpoint during this research was that we require all of the above. Specialists for their expert knowledge and abilities are required, generalists both to meet the shortfall in the interim and to support the development of a broader, more holistic practice in Aotearoa New Zealand are required. But most fundamentally we require the ability to foster local specialists trained under a pedagogy that is relevant to the unique Te Ao Māori world view.

How cultural heritage manifests in society is constantly evolving, growing ever wider with the inclusion of more information based platforms, processes, and objects. Expectations on organisations and individuals involved with GLAMR grow with these changes as we are charged with the care and protection of broad ranging content and data (Cloonan, 2015; Lyons, 2018). Inclusions of digital heritage expectations have been present from the inception of digital (Cloonan, 2001). Pressures on institutions include issues of physical space to store holdings, meaning that institutions are moving to digital holdings. This has benefits for users in areas such as instantaneous remote access and potential for reuse, and for GLAMR professionals as we no longer have to worry about fragile items sustaining damage. Yet this movement also places new and unfamiliar risks on our cultural heritage and identity, such as the fragility of democracy should our cultural identity documents be attacked cybernetically (Lyons, 2018). With the movement towards generalisation, are GLAMR professionals now required to have a rudimentary understanding of cybersecurity and how to allay hacking?

GLAMR institutions are critical for the care and protection of culture and cultural heritage as these ideas define identity, and who we are as a nation. Initially this research framed cultural heritage as primarily in the physical, but through the course of interviewing this concept has been found to be all encompassing across the tangible and intangible facets of GLAMR (Cloonan, 2015; C. A. Smith et al., 2018).

GLAMR expectations of agility and the need to retain relevancy both as an individual and as an institution largely mirror one another across the sector (Cloonan, 2001, 2015). Yet heritage institutions and educational organisations operate in parallel, maintaining isolationist ideals and content when they could be sharing skills and knowledge, building stronger specialist based kaupapa to enhance capabilities and ensure ongoing relevance. The GLAMR sole purpose for existence is collecting, protecting, and expressing cultural identity and each part of GLAMR requires concomitantly discrete and interwoven skillsets that could be developed through shared experiences and understandings of what they do and why (Cloonan, 2015; Taylor, 2014).

## MANA TAONGA, CULTURAL INTENTIONALITY AND INTEGRITY

Since colonisation, Aotearoa New Zealand has attempted with varying levels of intentionality and success to engage as a society founded in biculturalism (C. McCarthy, 2011; Orange, 2004). Colonisation brought with it the Eurocentric world view of otherness, managed through collection, cataloguing and ultimate alienation of non-European cultures (Brown, 2014; Cloonan, 1994; Elsner & Cardinal, 1994). It is understood that this organisation of data has enabled systematic alienation of culture from society, and regardless of the intent within these actions the outcome requires change (C. McCarthy, 2011; Sentance, 2018). Collection, cataloguing, arrangement and description are built in a colonial, Eurocentric tradition and inside that exists political metadata (Brown, 2014; C. McCarthy, 2011). How we decide what elements require notation, how objects or actions are described, why aspects of information are chosen for inclusion, are all shaped by the world view and decisions of the schema designer. How often are these questioned and in what institutions? Stark differences in the responsive, agile nature of students from different existing training programmes within GLAMR implies an unwavering traditionalism in at least one area of Aotearoa's GLAMR sector. Te Papa's mana taonga policy works against this tide of Eurocentric traditionalism as a "declaration of the Māori control of Māori taonga" which has been applied throughout the institution's collections and across the cultures represented within it, granting "all cultures with 'the right to stand within Te Papa via their cultural property'" (C. McCarthy, 2011, p. 97). This concept of rangatiratanga and mana motuhake is seldom replicated in other GLAMR institutions, arrogantly attesting that we as the professionals know better through our relationship with and knowledge of the taonga.

The segments of GLAMR move at different paces, with the museums sector arguably ahead of the curve. Te Papa has been leading the charge towards decolonisation of cultural heritage organisations with the creation of its mana taonga policy in 1991 (C. McCarthy, 2011). How cultural heritage practitioners approach the foundations of practice will vary through the individual quirks of character however organisations should be basing praxis on mana taonga and the principles of rangatiratanga and mana motuhake. Without these underpinning concepts within our professional philosophies and pedagogies, how is autonomy of knowledge ensured for tangata whenua? Without these concepts breathing mauri into constitutional ethics across the GLAMR sector, the colonial conceit of the Eurocentric or "universal" ethos they are based upon will continue to be reinforced.

GLAMR professional pedagogies should no longer be able to choose to adopt approaches of rangatiratanga, manaakitanga, and mana taonga to the lesser extent. Mana taonga is a fundamental policy and critical pedagogy that should underwrite all GLAMR education, not least that of a cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation programme. Through this basis we can begin to colour in the white spaces of our institutions and organisations, unpicking the epistemological racism that seeps from the political metadata surrounding every object and collection item (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; B. A. Milne et al., 2013). The use of mana taonga as basis for all GLAMR education and organisational frameworks will instil this as the dominant philosophy within Aotearoa rather than as a disruptive pedagogy, seen as destabilising the internationally accepted Eurocentric method of collection, collation and legitimised implicit racial stereotyping (C. McCarthy, 2011; B. A. Milne et al., 2013; L. T. Smith, 2013).

## VALUES AND ATTITUDES

Thematically, the aspect of value was amongst the most frequently discussed during the research process and this ties neatly back to the issue of generalism through the deprofessionalisation of the sector, seeing GLAMR as aligned with esoteric "soft" skills. Strategic directions for GLAMR institutions are led by the national institutions but as these filter down through the layers of organisation they become murkier with lower percentages of GLAMR professionals reaching management level and GLAMR spaces being run as businesses rather than whare taonga. Empathy and understanding of what an object or collection is through a comprehension of mauri is essential for an appropriate interpretation of the strategic policies of these national institutions and yet arguments like for the cessation of physical collections are growing louder to meet retrenchment and static storage capabilities (Lewis, 2008).

Current populist values placed on cultural heritage hold inexplicable contradictions that suggest legacies of our colonial past, the New Zealand economic strategies of the mid-1980s forward, and the "she'll be right" attitude that nationally we're able to circumvent the standard and form our own conclusions (K. McCarthy, 1998). Recent restructures of New Zealand's national cultural heritage institutions discussed during the research process demonstrate the perceived value of the GLAMR profession and taonga. International sector backlash halted a number of planned cutbacks, however this was only due to the clout held by these international experts and the question was raised as to why expertise in Aotearoa was not available and if so why not, and if not why was it not recognisable?

Stolow's report was written in a climate of interventionism and protectionism where self-sufficiency was paramount (K. McCarthy, 1998; Stolow, 1980). Since this time we have entered the age of free market economies, retrenchment and GLAMR institutions being required to quantify their value to society (Lewis, 2008; K. McCarthy, 1998). These overarching policies of rationalism must be tempered with an understanding of public good. From a rationalist, cost-benefit analysis perspective the expense of conservation work can be altogether unjustifiable even though this creates major risks for priceless, and irreplaceable collections that represent fragments of Aotearoa's cultural heritage.

## ELEMENTS FOR INCLUSION IN AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Education is a touchstone of society, a basic human right (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; United Nations General Assembly, 1948). Culture and the right to freely enjoy and participate in culture is equally a basic human right (United Nations General Assembly, 1948). With these agreed fundaments in mind, Aotearoa New Zealand's failure to address the long-identified requirement for training opportunities that support the conservation and preventive conservation of our unique cultural identity is astonishing.

## CHANGING OUR LEADERSHIP MENTALITY

As discussed earlier, the factionalism of the GLAMR sector in Aotearoa requires attention. Stolow (1980) believed that the only economically viable training practice was to align all GLAMR under the common requirement of conservation and preventive conservation training. This concept of shared knowledge and shared responsibility impresses the crucial point of public good that has been mislaid in the free market economy (K. McCarthy, 1998). Competition over audiences and profit margins have squeezed out the small but important programmes such as the Heritage Materials Science programme at Victoria University of Wellington and impeded the development of any replacement conservation training programmes following the phasing out of the Dunedin Public Art Gallery programme (Stolow, 1980). In order to sustainably create and maintain a programme of this nature Aotearoa's GLAMR sector requires a mind shift from where specialisms diverge to how specialisms intersect. This may be challenged as an idea, particularly in organisations where managerial roles are not held by GLAMR trained professionals.

To combat factionalism, ethical GLAMR leaders who's knowledge and strategies are based on mana taonga and mātauranga Māori need to be engaged on the behalf of common public good (C. McCarthy, 2011; B. A. Milne et al., 2013). This leadership should be from all corners of GLAMR: professional bodies, lead institutions and organisations, educational providers, and fundamentally Manatū Taonga – the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. Pedagogies based in Te Ao Māori across GLAMR require thought and integration. Mana taonga is a critical principle for museological theory in New Zealand, but the rest of GLAMR needs to catch up. The wider GLAMR sector needs to move away from a mindset of meeting requirements and think about how they are upholding Aotearoa's bicultural partnership through theory and practice. At the start of this journey another concept that must be reviewed are the problematic terminologies used as terms of convenience to describe communities and groups in early attempts at decolonising GLAMR (Gordon-Smith, 2015; B. A. Milne et al., 2013).

## BICULTURAL PEDAGOGY AND PARTNERSHIPS

Of the organisations from which research participants volunteered, all of these individuals spoke of partnerships and interests in furthering educational opportunities. No participants spoke for their organisation at large, but in considering this shift towards a kaupapa arranged around public good, mana taonga and partnerships of reciprocity, the concept of shared opportunities becomes challenging to legitimately deny.

Our cultural heritage and identity is distinct from all others internationally. Connections have been drawn with Moana Oceania communities, through similarities across areas including language and mythology (Gordon-Smith, 2015). These connections bring into sharp focus the responsibilities of being a good neighbour. Climate change is beginning to significantly impact conservation planning issues in Aotearoa, but climate change is most notable in Moana Oceania with discrete cultural environments under threat from rising seas, extreme weather events, and natural disasters.

> "Climate change means that more and more irreplaceable cultural heritage will be lost. This will be compounded by the disappearance of material heritage and the intangible dimensions with which it is interwoven" (Hall, Baird, James, & Ram, 2016).

The risks associated with climate change are distinct from the theory of taonga living, fulfilling its duties and purposes, and dying naturally as intended (DeSilvey, 2017). Australia may have supported Aotearoa and Moana Oceania for a time through partnerships with various committees, however no long term public good resolution was found, possibly through a lack of significant funding opportunities (Lyall, 1991; K. McCarthy, 1998). The essential consideration of cultural identity representation and appropriate protection from degradation within the mana taonga framework of kāwanatanga, GLAMR must also accept cultural responsibilities as a wealthy neighbour to support these ideals through shared capability across Moana Oceania (C. McCarthy, 2011). Climate change will eventually rob Moana Oceania, Aotearoa and Australia of the distinguishing cultural heritage that is idiosyncratic to these locations (Hall et al., 2016). Part of being a community is respecting sovereignty of content and all the data surrounding that content, part of being a good neighbour is supporting the capability of the communities to which it belongs to protect and release content as culturally fitting (DeSilvey, 2017; C. McCarthy, 2011).

Stolow (1980) discussed the concept of regional centres each focussing on a discrete area of cultural heritage conservation. This concept could be extended and refined by regional centres of excellence surrounding both traditional and contemporary taonga conservation and preventive conservation skills instead of referring only to elements in traditional cultural heritage conservation, with each of these regional centres focussing on specific skills and materials (Stolow, 1980). The need for expertise can be seen in this research project the amount of work that requires completion, the push back against rationalising already minimal conservation capabilities, and in past reports written on this subject (Stolow, 1980). We need to consider the framework through which we award expertise, we need to consider what we require within an Aotearoa New Zealand based pedagogy.

By defining unique pedagogies, collections and GLAMR spaces begin their bicultural becoming – a journey towards decolonisation (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; B. A. Milne et al., 2013). Through a unique training programme there would be the opportunity to make cultural heritage conservation training accessible to communities within Aotearoa and Moana Oceania, and define a vitally important internationally expertise (Dosa & Lemke, 1991; B. A. Milne et al., 2013; C. A. Smith et al., 2018). The issues of colonialism and indigeneity are not unique to Aotearoa New Zealand, though each instance of colonisation has unique factors (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). This is a ground-breaking opportunity to redefine cultural heritage conservation training outside of the whitestream (B. A. Milne et al., 2013).

## PRACTICAL AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Historically practical training for cultural heritage creation, care, and conservation has been through apprenticeship relationships with masters of crafts passing tangible skills and intangible knowledge to their students via immersion (Stolow, 1980; Taylor, 2014). In the context of this research immersion is particularly relevant when considering the successes of language immersion education such as kura and kōhanga reo (Gonzales, 2016). Immersion in centres of excellence and on noho marae acknowledges the value of indigenous knowledge and knowledge holders within Aotearoa and Moana Oceania and provides a holistic understanding of taonga objects and theory.

Today conservators must obtain a tertiary qualification in order to be a conservator (Taylor, 2014). The practical aspects of this pose problems as every item has its own treatment requirements and mauri – no two items are exactly alike (Taylor, 2014). The individual nature of conservation treatment questions the capacity for formal/abstracted conservation education to support graduates who need to exhibit expertise from an early point in their career. The relevance a formal education can offer is not to be completely disregarded however as the importance of more traditional Eurocentric styles of learning are still present. For example chemistry is a strong component of conservation and preventive conservation education and can be successfully taught through theoretical and applied programmes as offered through formal educational facilities (Stolow, 1980; Taylor, 2014). The elements of practical and reciprocal training on noho marae and at centres of excellence offer the democratisation of education in a way that formalised programmes of study do not, while being supported by foundational knowledge in formal learning areas such as ethics, philosophy, and chemistry. This democratisation would encourage a movement away from education and training as a business in favour of education as societal good (B. A. Milne et al., 2013; United Nations General Assembly, 1948).

## THE ROLE OF FORMAL EDUCATION

Formalised educational models will always have a place in educational systems as these are the spaces where abstract research and theoretical teaching is able to flourish, balancing the practical learning required in conservation roles. In order to successfully propose a new training model, further research is required into the pedagogies and pilot areas for any fledgling programme to start with. Further to this, formal aspects of knowledge are required for successful, coherent GLAMR employment that are tied to western pedagogies (Taylor, 2014). These aspects include but are not limited to conservation science, heritage law, and copyright. The whitestream basis of these learning aspects in no way mean that these ideas cannot be extended beyond these concepts into a kaupapa of indigeneity, altering the framework to a bicultural world view (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; A. Milne, 2017).

Formal educational institutions will be required as partner agencies, supporting learning through memorandums of understanding, educational exchanges, cross crediting of content, and potentially specific paper offerings. Tertiary providers in Aotearoa hold a wealth of resources that are relevant to cultural heritage conservation and are in many cases departmental relics that have little support or funding. These special collections and informal museums could be utilised as portions of training alongside traditional indigenous learning. The content held within these collections may well benefit from the care and knowledge that can be shared as part of an educational experience.

## SUSTAINABILITY AND THE FUTURE

Cultural heritage exists across every aspect of tangible and intangible Anthropocene reality (Cloonan, 2015; Hall et al., 2016). Past content such as the Stolow report discusses physical, traditional concepts of cultural heritage from a Eurocentric perspective (Stolow, 1980). The shift since this point has seen not only a transformation of mindset with mana taonga providing a "central plank of biculturalism" for Te Papa in the 1990s, but also a change in what is collected and how organisations are collecting it (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; C. McCarthy, 2011, p. 97; Teper, 2005). Across the GLAMR spectrum collections are sizable and still growing, storage both physical and digital is a daily challenge, and we need to think critically about the what, how and why of collecting practice.

The glut of content associated with this Anthropocene era holds one of the most challenging concepts for cultural heritage conservation going forward: what will be kept and what will be discarded? How are these decisions around what to keep and what to let go made when it is known that historical collections such as from the 1600s include carefully curated views of what the collectors felt to be important. Objects through their collection and the implicit and explicit narratives placed around them mean they lose their objectivity and are subjected to a potential loss of manaakitanga and mana (Elsner & Cardinal, 1994). It has also been identified that these subjective narratives are used to deliberately marginalise (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). To sustainably build a conservation and preventive conservation educational experience in Aotearoa New Zealand consideration of the what, how and why questions from a bicultural standpoint of mana taonga is required (C. McCarthy, 2011). To ensure a strong and sustainable basis in kāwanatanga, Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the related concept of mana taonga describe the necessary combined starting point and continued direction of travel.

Stolow's report recommended the implementation of a "National Conservation Institute and Associated Regional Centres" as a long term response to the care and preservation of Aotearoa's unique "cultural patrimony" (Stolow, 1980, p. 166). The idea to form regional centres of excellence offers a sustainable, skill sharing model that provides informal learning opportunities, built with the "experiences, understandings and aspirations" of the founding bicultural partnership and multicultural reality in which Aotearoa finds itself (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 86). Aotearoa New Zealand should not aim to replicate international conservation training programmes, instead a process of innovating an experience that allows questions against the decisions of the past and moves towards an inclusive rautaki tohatoha ōrite programme while simultaneously acknowledging the cultural responsibilities towards Moana Oceania communities.

# RECOMMENDATIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The key recommendation resulting from this research is that there is a significant gap in GLAMR education and taught theory in Aotearoa New Zealand that requires addressing through the development of an educational experience in cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation. This is an area where there is high workload and only a small number of qualified practitioners.

The breadth of this research problem has grown significantly since the beginning of this project. However the strength of the work and research that has come before this project creates an excellent springboard for the next steps in this research agenda. Participants from this research project have expressed an interest in continuing to work with Victoria University of Wellington for this research pathway.

## ELEMENTS

The educational experience recommended from this research is one of primarily practical, community based learning through regional centres of excellence. Additional educational elements include components to support requisite theoretical knowledge in areas including chemistry, ethics, and law. To provide access to these additional components, this research recommends cross crediting and partnerships with existing tertiary providers throughout Aotearoa and Moana Oceania.

The basis for any educational elements should be located within a bicultural pedagogy that adheres to the mana taonga policy. Cross credited components hosted by existing tertiary providers would be designed in partnership with the experiential providers of this programme. The geographic spread of centres of excellence and partner tertiary providers supports the ideal of democratised education for social good.

## ADVOCACY AND RELATIONSHIPS

The catch 22 present in Aotearoa New Zealand is the attitude around cultural heritage value. This issues exists outside of the remit of this research and requires significant change through leadership and advocacy.

Recommended next steps to move this research from a hypothetical and conceptual stage into a testing phase using action and feedback loops include:

1. Advocacy through our professional bodies towards attitude change and GLAMR sector confluence.
2. Advocacy within GLAMR institutions supporting the value of conservation and preventive conservation to enable safe and ethical collection methodologies.
3. Building GLAMR-wide relationships to enable research towards a foundational GLAMR-wide pedagogy based on the mana taonga kaupapa.
4. Potential educational partners for pilot programme approached.
5. Funding and/or models of reciprocal learning outlined.

## FURTHER RESEARCH

Significant research is still required to realise this research agenda. This research project initially aimed to create a programme of study for cultural heritage conservation in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is now clear that this research agenda is immense and will take substantial time and efforts to reach the point of outlining a feasible pilot programme. With this in mind, the areas of further research required for this research agenda are:

1. Understanding why programmes in this area have been closed and/or failed to begin since the publication of the Stolow report on conservation programmes in Aotearoa.
2. What is required to build unity across the GLAMR factions through relationships of manaakitanga and ōritetanga.
3. Design conservation and preventive conservation kaupapa based on the principles of mana taonga and rangatiratanga that meet conservation requirements across the GLAMR spectrum.

# LIMITATIONS

This research project captured a satisfactory number of participants, able to represent a significant range of opinions from the GLAMR sector. This range of opinions cannot be certain of representing the GLAMR sector in Aotearoa New Zealand in its entirety and further research would be required, potentially using the concepts and recommendations made within this report as a basis for a quantitative survey tool.

It has been noted within this report that the representation of opinions across the strategic, technical, and practical layers of knowledge was limited. The sector-wide strategic view point is missing from this report as professionals from this area were not able to be engaged. This limitation was primarily due to the calendar period within which this research was undertaken, occurring over summer and coinciding with many organisational closedown periods. Should this research agenda progress further, involvement of this sector layer could be achieved by seeking participant engagement outside of the date ranges used for this project. This strategic level gap was minimised as a selection of participants represented the strategic policy level of their associated organisations. It is also noted that practitioners in private conservation practice were omitted from this research project, primarily due to the already high uptake of participants and limited time resource to undertake interviews. Should this research agenda progress further, private practice conservators should be included as data sources.

A notable challenge during the course of data collection for this research project was the variation of decolonisation definitions. Understandably different participants held different views, but the range of these views fluctuated wildly. This fluctuation of what constitutes decolonisation presents a possible limitation as if a researcher and participant are speaking on different planes there will be miscommunication and irrelevant data presented. This limitation was minimised through the process of clarification within discussion during interviews and by presenting participants with the transcribed interviews for review and comment prior to data coding and analysis.

# CONCLUSION

This research project was initiated under the personal passion of the researcher to highlight the lack of any cultural heritage conservation or preventive conservation programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand. With the support of the School of Information Management at Victoria University of Wellington this research project was refined and undertaken as an investigation into the requirements for a potential programme design in the cultural heritage conservation area. This training lack was not conceived under any specific aspect of the GLAMR sector, simply as a general lack.

Through the research process for this project eleven participants from across the cultural heritage sector were interviewed to:

- Gain insights into the critical issues facing cultural heritage in Aotearoa today.
- Understand how an educational experience could meet some of these critical needs.

The research methodologies allowed for the participants to actively partake in the design the research pathway took, contributing additional aspects that had not been considered within the original research proposal. Some of these aspects were the importance of copyright and digital preservation as key components of a conservation programme as well as the inclusion of Moana Oceania communities. Digital elements had been considered in the original research agenda but not to the extent that discussed digital preservation as requiring training opportunities in New Zealand alongside other areas that lack adequate training such as archival practice and copyright of non-standard cultural objects.

The findings from this research project centred on the objectives of discovering what the critical issues faced were and what elements would be relevant for an Aotearoa based cultural heritage conservation programme. Both these objectives were well covered by the data collected through the interview process. Outside of the everyday issues, some high level issues that require consideration were identified. These included:

- The lack of succession planning for cultural heritage in Aotearoa.
- Fundamentally supporting cultural heritage through a framework of culturally and geographically relevant kaupapa that supports and promotes the acceptance of other world views.
- The power that GLAMR professionals wield through the curation of collections, shaping the history of tomorrow.

The discussion around biculturality as a base framework for a cultural heritage conservation training experience was unilaterally supported by the project participants. Mana taonga is a critical policy that is proposed as the framing theory for a cultural heritage conservation and preventive conservation programme. Further research and discussion is required to achieve this as a methodological framework or pedagogy as currently mana taonga exists as a founding policy for Te Papa Tongarewa. However this research project is simply the prologue to a larger research agenda: collaboratively designing a cultural heritage conservation educational framework that serves the breadth of GLAMR.

Limitations for the future of this research are represented through the hypothetical nature of this project. The disparity found between conceptualisation and realisation where participants hypothetically embraced the concept of this project but subsequently chose either to deny the relevance for their situation or colour their narratives with feelings that the realisation of this research agenda would be implausible. This research found that participants were largely eager to support any ongoing research proposed at the time of interview, but held hesitant views of feasibility which could be seen as representative of a wider-GLAMR capability for acceptance of any proposed educational experience in the future.

Sustainability is a fundamental requirement to support the future progress of this research agenda, and for this reason this research project has recommended the creation of collaborative relationships and partnerships. These partnerships support the collaborative basis for this research agenda, working together across cultural heritage disciplines and organisations to build a cohesive, relevant educational experience that is based in a kaupapa of mana taonga and kāwanatanga under the world view of Te Ao Māori. By working across GLAMR, we have the opportunity to identify the many specialisms that are required to support cultural heritage conservation in Aotearoa and develop the partnerships and relationships that can provide expertise and facility for educational experiences to occur.

When considering the issues around the current design of GLAMR functions, we must return to the definition of preservation when related to cultural heritage and identity as stated by Cloonan (2015, p. xvi): "preserving the objects that carry information, and preserving the information itself". This statement when considered in the context of political metadata and the surrounding subliminal narratives that exist within metadata, places an urgency on the need to address these issues in colonised spaces like Aotearoa. Epistemological racism has no place in the twenty-first century, so the need to remove it from the systems and organisations through which we rely on accessing and safeguarding our cultural heritage information should be an important step in decolonising our GLAMR institutions and our cultural heritage frameworks. Cultural heritage is the defining feature of any society, and the understanding, protection, preservation, and release of cultural heritage should be framed by the mana through which cultural heritage exists. How Aotearoa presents itself to the world is as a unique cultural space. Through this research we can expand this beyond the superficial tokenism that bubbles under the surface. Through this research we have the opportunity to redefine Aotearoa as a world leading, biculturally framed, cultural heritage educational training space built with the "experiences, understandings and aspirations" of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the epistemological bedrock (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 86).

# APPENDIX ONE: TIMETABLE FOR COMPLETION

| | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | Oct-18 | Nov-18 | Dec-18 | Jan-19 | Feb-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Literature review | ███ | ███ | ███ | ▒▒▒ | ▒▒▒ | ▒▒▒ | |
| Interview protocol development | | ░ | | | | | |
| Pilot test of interview protocol | | | ███ | | | | |
| Ethics approval | | ░ | | | | | |
| Approach interview participants | | | | ███ | ███ | | |
| Undertake and complete interview process | | | | | ░ | ░ | |
| Transcribe data | | | | | ███ | ███ | |
| Code data | | | | | | ░ | |
| Outline key programme content areas | | | | | | | ███ |
| Draft and submit final research project | | | | | | | ░ |

## APPENDIX TWO: TE REO MĀORI TERMINOLOGY GLOSSARY

| | |
|---|---|
| Aotearoa | New Zealand |
| Hapū | kinship group, clan, tribe, subtribe |
| Harakeke | New Zealand flax, PHORMIUM TENAX |
| Iwi | extended kinship group, tribe, nationality |
| Kaitiaki | trustee, minder, guard, custodian, guardian, caregiver, keeper, steward |
| Kaupapa | topic, policy, plan, purpose, scheme, proposal, agenda, subject, programme, theme, issue, initiative |
| Kāwanatanga | government, dominion, rule, authority |
| Kōhanga reo | language nest, Māori language preschool |
| Kupu tuku iho | oral history |
| Kura | school |
| Mana | prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma |
| Manaakitanga | kindness, generosity, support |
| Mana motuhake | separate identity, autonomy, self-government, self-determination, independence, sovereignty, authority |
| Mana taonga | Foundational principle of Te Papa Tongarewa |
| Manatū Taonga | Ministry for Culture and Heritage |
| Mātauranga Māori | Māori knowledge |
| Mauhanga | records |
| Mauri | life force, vital essence |
| Noho marae | marae (meeting house) stay |
| Ōritetanga | equality, equal opportunity |
| Pākehā | foreigner, alien |
| Pukapuka | books |
| Rangatiratanga | sovereignty, principality, self-determination, self-management |
| Rautaki tohatoha ōrite | equal sharing strategy |
| Reo | language |
| Reta | correspondence, letters |
| Tangata whenua | local people, indigenous people |
| Taonga | Treasure, prized possession |
| Te Ao Māori | the Māori world |
| Te Tiriti o Waitangi | the Treaty of Waitangi |
| Tikanga | correct procedure, protocol |
| Wairua | spirit, soul |
| Whakapapa | genealogy, lineage, descent |
| Whānau | extended family, family group |
| Whare taonga | treasure house |
| Whenua | land |

(Moorfield, 2003)

# APPENDIX THREE: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

My interviews will be conducted in a semi-structured manner and therefore may expand on the outlined protocol, however the basis of my questioning will be in line with the below concepts.

*Research questions:*
  A. What elements or concepts are necessary for a cultural materials/heritage conservation/preservation training programme designed for an Aotearoa New Zealand context that would encompass the wider GLAMR spectrum?
  B. What are the critical issues for cultural materials/heritage conservation/preservation training, practice, and theory (in 2018/2019 and beyond – possibly omit this date)?

*Protocol questions*
  1. What made you decide/want to come to this profession/sector?
      a. Childhood dream?
      b. More circuitous route?
  2. How long have you been involved in this profession?
      a. If had former career how long was this and did it cross over into the skills you bring to this role?
  3. Would you describe this as a growing profession (or not)?
      a. Does this relate to the amount of work? The kind of materials you see? The level of interest in this profession (new blood so to speak)? How?
  4. What education, training or experiences influenced your professional pathway and/or lead you to your current position in the GLAMR sector?
      a. Where did you gain this experience? (if not mentioned in answer)
      b. How recently was this/your most recent professional development/upskilling? How often would you train/upskill/participate in PD or research?
      c. Do you believe this is a profession or vocation and why?
  5. What are the most common issues you see for cultural heritage care in your work? Why?
  6. What do you think the most pressing tangible and intangible cultural heritage care issues are in Aotearoa New Zealand? Why?
      a. Have they changed during your career and do you see them changing in the future? How?
  7. Where do you feel the gap in specifically Aotearoa New Zealand knowledge is for the conservation care of our unique taonga locally or internationally? Why/why not?
      a. Can you describe this gap and why you feel it exists (or not)?
  8. How would you approach a broad spectrum GLAMR conservation and/or preservation programme?
      a. Would this be something you think would add to the sector? Why/why not *OR* how/how not?
      b. What sort of impact do you feel training/educating/upskilling lay people has on your work? Why/why not *OR* how/how not?
      c. What elements would you personally/professionally include for relevance, integrity, and long-term benefit? Why?
      d. Who would you include as your audience for these elements? Why?
  9. Could you see Aotearoa New Zealand emulating Japan as an internationally recognised hub of expertise for the conservation care of our taonga?
What would this mean to you? Why?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvesson, M. (2011). *Interpreting Interviews*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446268353

Aragn, A. O., & Castillo-Burguete, M. T. (2015). Introduction to practices. In *The SAGE handbook of*

*action research* (3rd ed., pp. 13–16). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473921290

Ayres, L. (2008). Semi-structured interview. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research*

*Methods* (p. 811). 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE

Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n420

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston

North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Brown, A. K. (2014). *First Nations, museums, narrations: stories of the 1929 Franklin Motor Expedition*

*to the Canadian prairies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Cloonan, M. V. (1994). *Global perspectives on preservation education*. *IFLA publications*. München:

Saur.

Cloonan, M. V. (2001). W(H)ITHER preservation? *The Library Quarterly*, *71*(2), 231–242.

https://doi.org/10.1086/603262

Cloonan, M. V. (2015). *Preserving our heritage: Perspectives from antiquity to the digital age*. Chicago,

IL: American Library Association.

Cloonan, M. V., & Harvey, D. R. (2007). Preserving cultural heritage: Introduction. *Library Trends*,

*56*(1), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2007.0046

DeSilvey, C. (2017). *Curated decay: Heritage beyond saving*. Minneapolis, MN: University of

Minnesota Press.

Dosa, M., & Lemke, A. B. (1991). Preservation/conservation education: Today and tomorrow. In J. R.

Fang, A. Russell, & A. J. Fang (Eds.), *Education and training for preservation and conservation:*

*Papers of an international seminar on 'the teaching of preservation management for*

*librarians, archivists and information scientists,' sponsored by IFLA, FID and ICA, Vienna, April*

*11-13, 1986.* (pp. 19–34). München: Saur.

Elsner, J., & Cardinal, R. (Eds.). (1994). *The cultures of collecting*. London: Reaktion Books. Retrieved

from https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/12464405

Fang, J. R., Russell, A., & Fang, A. J. (1991). *Education and training for preservation and conservation:*

*Papers of an international seminar on 'the teaching of preservation management for*

*librarians, archivists and information scientists,' sponsored by IFLA, FID and ICA, Vienna, April*

*11-13, 1986.* München: Saur.

Gonzales, M. L. L. (2016). Immersion programs and preserving endangered indigenous languages.

*EDUCADI*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.7770/educadi-V1N2-art1380

Gordon-Smith, I. (2015). Terms of convenience. *Un Magazine*, *9*(2). Retrieved from

http://unprojects.org.au/magazine/issues/issue-9-2/terms-of-convenience/

Hall, C. M., Baird, T., James, M., & Ram, Y. (2016). Climate change and cultural heritage: Conservation

and heritage tourism in the Anthropocene. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *11*(1), 10–24.

https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2015.1082573

ICCROM, I. C. for the S. of the P. and R. of C. P. (2018). International course on conservation of

Japanese paper (JPC). Retrieved from https://www.iccrom.org/courses/international-course-

conservation-japanese-paper-jpc-1

Lending, M. (2018). Negotiating absence: Bernard Tschumi's new Acropolis Museum in Athens.

*Journal of Architecture*, *23*(5), 797–819. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2018.1495909

Lewis, A. (Ed.). (2008). *Questioning library neutrality: Essays from Progressive Librarian*. Duluth, MN:

Library Juice Press.

Lyall, J. (1991). Developing educational programs for library preservation in Australia. In J. R. Fang, A.

Russell, & A. J. Fang (Eds.), *Education and training for preservation and conservation: Papers*

*of an international seminar on 'the teaching of preservation management for librarians,*

archivists and information scientists,' sponsored by IFLA, FID and ICA, Vienna, April 11-13,
1986.* (pp. 64–66). München: Saur.

Lyons, A. (2018). *Identity of a nation: Protecting the digital evidence of who we are* (Policy Brief No.
12/2018). ASPI Australian Strategic Policy Institute. Retrieved from
https://www.aspi.org.au/report/identity-nation

McCarthy, C. (2011). *Museums and Māori: Heritage professionals, indigenous collections, current
practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Papa Press.

McCarthy, K. (1998). *The rise and fall of CCAC : A case study in heritage politics : A thesis presented in
partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Museum Studies at
Massey University* (Masters). Massey University. Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/10179/6215

Merrill-Oldham, J., Clark Morrow, C., & Roosa, M. (1991). *Preservation program models: A study
project and report*. Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. A., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*
(3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Milne, A. (2017). *Coloring in the white spaces: Reclaiming cultural identity in whitestream schools*.
New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Milne, B. A., Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (2013). *Colouring in the white spaces: Reclaiming cultural identity
in whitestream schools*. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2003, 2019). Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index Online.
Retrieved 17 February 2019, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/

Oishi, S. M. (2003). A few words about qualitative interviewing. In *How to Conduct In-Person
Interviews for Surveys* (2nd ed., pp. 171–180). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984416.n8

O'Leary, Z. (2017). *The essential guide to doing your research project* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE
Publications Ltd.

Orange, C. (2004). *An illustrated history of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget

    Williams Books. https://doi.org/10.7810/9781877242168

Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.).

    London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Schwandt, T. A. (2007a). Action research. In *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed., p. 4).

    Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/97814129862681.n3

Schwandt, T. A. (2007b). Cooperative inquiry. In *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed., pp.

    45–46). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

    https://doi.org/10.4135/97814129862681.n51

Sentance, N. (2018). My ancestors are in our memory institutions, but their voices are missing. *The*

    *Guardian*.

Smith, A. (2007). Valuing preservation. *Library Trends*, *56*(1), 4–25.

    https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2007.0059

Smith, C. A., Paterson, R. A., Lowe, B. J., & Te Kanawa, R. (2018). Consolidation of black-dyed Māori

    textile artefacts: Evaluating the efficacy of sodium alginate. *Studies in Conservation*, *63*(3),

    139–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393630.2016.1266150

Smith, G., Te Kanawa, R., Miller, I., & Fenton, G. (2001). Stabilization of cellulosic textiles decorated

    with iron-containing dyes. *Dyes in History and Archeology*, *20*.

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies : Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London,

    United Kingdom: Zed Books.

Stolow, N. (1980). *Report on conservation and training programmes in New Zealand and*

    *recommendations for development of a national institute*. Wellington, New Zealand:

    Department of Internal Affairs.

Taylor, T. (2014). *Preservation conversations: Selections from interviews with book conservators*.

    Tuscaloosa, AL: Ilene Books.

Teper, T. H. (2005). Current and emerging challenges for the future of library and archival

preservation. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, *49*(1), 32–39.

United Nations General Assembly. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Pub. L. No. General

Assembly resolution 217 A (1948). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/universal-

declaration-human-rights/

Widdowson, F., & Howard, A. (2008). *Disrobing the aboriginal industry: The deception behind

indigenous cultural preservation*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wilder, C. (2016, March 1). Swiping a priceless antiquity … with a scanner and a 3-D printer. *The New

York Times*, p. C5.

Willis, J. W. (2007). Methods of qualitative research. In *Foundations of qualitative research:

Interpretive and critical approaches* (pp. 229–286). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications,

Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230108.n7

Winter, T. (2014). Beyond Eurocentrism? Heritage conservation and the politics of difference.

*International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *20*(2), 123–137.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2012.736403

*Name: Olivia Baldwin-Denton*

*Date: 18 February 2019*

*Course: INFO580*

*Word count: 14870 (including citations, excluding title page, table of contents, appendixes and bibliography)*