Wero: Transforming GLAM places into spaces of wellbeing through Māori values - Hineahuone challenges the status quo

nā

Carin Smeaton

October 2023

Table of Contents

Abstract

Research problem

In my own experience as an Indigenous woman working in GLAM, I've felt confronted by a worldview not immediately conducive to my own in these spaces. This research provides an *overview* of how GLAM in Aotearoa *(New Zealand)* is faring in bicultural practices since Tui McDonald's *1993* report was published.

Methodology

This research identifies tangible *values present* in GLAM space by applying a *Mana Wāhine/Hineahuone* framework and *documentary analysis*. It allows me to compare and contrast *Māori values* in *practice* from 6 *anonymous* GLAM institutions (GIs).

Results

Whānau flourish when we see ourselves reflected in GLAM space that embraces Māori values.However, the lack of consistency in and progress in biculturalism, bilingualism and Tikanga Māori is noticeable in many Institutions, even in 2023 - *30 years after* McDonald's report.

Implications

This is a timely reminder that, despite having made some improvements over time, incrementally, this is not enough and it's too slow. If GLAM and its executive leads want to be *transformational*, it should reflect and *act on* its responses to Whānau Māori.

Hineahuone meets Lael & Grace

i always see them at countdown Lael & Grace grounded in front of the olive oil & othr fancy condiments i know Lael from W's class who (by her own admission) is unfairly seen as tha grumpy auntie at the tangi

Lael's young & dinē she flew here above jetstream her frightfully featherd wings strapped 2 her arms spiriting her all tha ways from portland to tāmaki she follows tha sun across tha horizon tha sun she says always forgives u

it forgives u for calling yr boss a cunt it forgives u for mistaking seattle for portland it forgives u for losing yr shit cos portland's in washington grace says it's easy 2 be mistaken we all are (even Lael) but tha sun don't care

Lael used to work for seattle library they both love libraries Grace says she visits central all tha time i want her to see our heavens our livin breathin roof when the mārakai is ready when it opens up for matariki (if i'm still there)

when it's gotten green n grown as big as guv grey's concrete cum footprint on tha whenua auntie wanna tour too libraries change so quick she sighs she visits us every year just to keep up she's happiest here with a coffee

Introduction

Context

Having a space to gather and connect is vital for well-being. This is increasingly important as socio-economic, cultural and natural environments turn more precarious due to climate change, neoliberalism and the ongoing effects of colonisation. After the catastrophic floods of 2023 in Te Ika-a-Māui, a purposive space to connect and share stories about who we are and where we are from plays a vital part in community resilience and collective memory (L. Nikora, personal communication, 2023, June 28). No matter what is taken from us; we will still have our connections, stories, memories and knowledge.

Collective memories are reflected and shared in spaces where Indigenous values are lived and practised. Māori values such as manaakitanga, whanaungatanga, wairuatanga, kaitiakitanga and mana motuhake are vital for the well-being of not only people but also taonga and the environment, from which they permeate. Having a space where stories and memories are shared brings people together and potentially creates connections and community, while our Indigenous stories provide us with a connection to whenua (*land*) and whakapapa (*ancestry*).

However, it is not always easy for us to access our stories from GLAM institutions. Many of our stories are not in readily accessible places. Such institutions are a construct of an imperial white supremist worldview that considered Indigenous communities to be incapable of having their own knowledges.

200 years of colonisation has disrupted "the status and value of Māori language, cultural practices, connections to land, concepts of well-being" (Lee-Morgan, 2021,

p.5). As a result, we are unable to access the stories that might reflect our own experience and identity to the extent we might even question our authentic past, present and future existence in such repositories, especially if these repositories do not align with the Indigenous values which empower, reflect our experiences, connect us, and make us feel welcomed.

Positionality

I work in the research team at an urban public library as a senior library assistant - with Muaūpoko, Safune, Clan Colquhoun and Ashkenazi Jewish connections. In my work and (single-parent) whānau life, I'm interested in easier access to collections and connection space to empower whānau, hapori Māori and Indigenous communities to share their stories and knowledges.

Because of my own whānau experience of alienation from culture, and discovery through whakapapa, I regard learning and being empowered through our relationships as vital to wellbeing. I am inspired by community initiatives such as mārakai (food gardens) that support wellbeing in holistic ways that promote both physical wellbeing in terms of food security/activity, and spiritual wellness through connection, relationships, knowledge and belonging.

However, in my mahi (*work*), I have yet to see any guiding mission statements on the ways to authentically apply *Māori values* to service and environment. Without tangible guidelines on Indigenous values, these will simply not be practised. I have also noticed that any good intentions are lost in the murk when there's no clear understanding or support of kaupapa Māori values for staff.

I have experienced through a recent kaupapa (initiative) that, when Māori values have been authentically applied to everyday practice, whānau Māori (Māori community) can get access to stories from more diverse Indigenous voices and ways including oral and visual storytelling. This experience provided hapori authentic

connections and collective experience of sharing stories and memories reflecting their own diverse lived experiences.

Frameworks

In te Ao Māori, collective memory from the whenua is traditionally kept and passed on by wāhine (Mikaere, 2022). This investigation will use a Mana Wāhine lens because it recognises that core Indigenous values are traditionally enforced by wāhine Māori. Mana Wahine theory recognises who we are culturally in relation to each other. These values include whakapapa (*placed layers, i.e., genealogy)*, whanaungatanga (*extended relationships*), manaakitanga (*generosity,support*), kaitiakitanga (*guardianship*) and whenua (*land*).

Due to colonisation and its mana-reducing treatment of wāhine Māori, many stories and recollections have been subjugated and lost (Peters, 2021). This research will privilege the spirit of mana wāhine Māori - wāhine Māori who weave their community together with relationships, advocacy and their vision for a just society. It recognises that their voice is vital as they pass on Māori values intergenerationally.

Mauri is the *life force* or vital essence of an entity or being. It is present in people, places, things, and the spaces in between. Currently, libraries are struggling to make themselves more welcoming and aligned with Māori values. Tikanga provides a culturally safe space for Indigenous communities to access collections and stories, both oral and written. Connections through Māori values are critical determinants of well-being and identity. Durie's *Te Whare Tapa Whā* framework (1998) weaves this Mana Wāhine conceptual lens into this wero's method to check how existing tangible GI values stack up to *four pillars* (taha) of Indigenous well-being - spiritual, mental, physical, and extended family.

I also want to add that during the time this wero was investigated, many librarians were going through restructures. Hence, with kaitiakitanga in mind, I decided not to involve people in this study as participants due to wishing to mitigate further

(professional and personal)risks. Documentary Analysis will be further discussed in the Methods sections to justify this method as the way of qualitative measurement.

Purpose

This *challenge*, a **wero**, will highlight the benefits and challenges of bringing Indigenous values into library spaces. According to Tā Hirini Moko Mead (2003, p.126), the wero is a ritual challenge of manuhiri (*guests*) and stems from a time when mana whenua (*hosts*) needed to know whether it was a peaceful visit. This was essential to ensure a smooth pōwhiri (that wouldn't potentially end up a blood bath). By looking at different library spaces and both written and unwritten texts, this research challenges GLAM to seek ways to create more space that reflects Māori values. Such principles protect the right of hapori to access Indigenous stories in a *stable space* and they are needed to sustain thriving healthy relationships and mauri ora.

Tikanga is always evolving but the underlying principles always stay present. I am particularly interested in stories and memories of wāhine Māori, which this *wero* argues is vital and a core link to Māori values.I want to challenge GLAM institutions in Aotearoa to walk the talk and put to practise their commitments to Te Tiriti. In practice this nurtures a culturally safe, stable space for Indigenous peoples.

Research Question

To what extent are Indigenous values reflected in public spaces of GLAM places in Aotearoa?

- What could GLAM space look like when applying Mason Durie's *framework?*
- How are mana wāhine Māori values reflected in GLAM spaces and services?
- Can whānau see their identities in GLAM spaces?
- Do GLAM institutions have tangible policies in place that could manifest and sustain Māori values in their physical or virtual spaces?

Literature Review

So far, not much literature has been published on how Māori values are practised in the spaces and places of the GLAM sector. The gaps in Indigenous research are as wide as the moana. It's even harder to find previous literatures addressing this topic in an Aotearoa GLAM context.

Spencer Lilley is one of the few Indigenous scholars in Aotearoa to publish research in GLAM from a te ao Māori perspective. This literature review therefore draws on Lilley's mahi, as well as from other fields such as creative arts, social work and health. These fields have frameworks that can be (and have been) adapted for GLAM. With this in mind, the following literature review will trace three threads. It's important to note that several questions prompted by these threads have also emerged. These questions are also directly connected to kaupapa of this wero. But let us continue. The three threads are as follows:

- Socio-historical context through a mana wāhine lens
- Values and space
- Method: Potential frameworks for wellness in GLAM

Socio-historical context and the mana wāhine lens

Historically, Māori values have been reflected through wāhine Maori due to their intrinsic connection to the whenua. Having documented socio-political resistance from 1970 till now (Hutchings, 2019), wāhine toa - the wāhine Māori who led this charge while still being mothers, grandmothers, aunties, sisters and wives - are and continue to be the voices of resistance, challenging and questioning colonial narratives through creative and vital mahi.

For Māori, connecting through whenua, collective memory and stories are essential for identity, well-being and healing. Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (1991) underlines the

connection that wāhine Māori have with the whenua and how the harakeke flax plant resembles the physical and cultural connection to whanaunga and the passing along of this knowledge through raranga. Stories from mana wāhine reflect a love for the land, sky, mokopuna and tupuna. Traditionally, the role of wāhine Māori is deeply interwoven with whenua, relationships and "rituals of creativity" (Te Awekotuku,1991, p. 65).

Papatūānuku's Progeny features seven wāhine Māori poets who have been woefully under-recognised in New Zealand. Through a mana wāhine lens, Robin Peters (2021) discusses their roles as repositories of socio-historical culture. Informed by Māori values, Peters reports that stories by wāhine are vital sources of a collective memory and connections but these have been erased by colonial narratives to this present day. The values that these wāhine toa reflect, cannot be overlooked by GLAM institutions that aspire to authentically transform their spaces so Indigenous communities can see themselves in the stories. Narratives can connect a community as well as separate it. They indicate how well things are relating in wellness and stability, recognising the interdependence of it all.

Historically Wāhine Māori *are* the whenua. Wāhine Māori are akin to the earth. The first woman Hineahuone was created from the red clay of Kurawaka. She provides stability through nourishment which is critical for well-being, and "if we don't treat her right, we're dead" (S. Rapira-Davies, 2023, August 22). Mason Durie observes it is no coincidence that concepts of kupu Māori (*words*) related to Māori values are synonymous with mana wāhine. For instance, whenua (*land*) shares the same kupu as placenta; whānau (*family*) as birth; Hapū (*sub-tribe*) as pregnancy (Durie, 1999).

How are mana wāhine Māori values reflected in GLAM spaces and services? How could an Indigenous-led space better help hapori access stories that resemble wāhine Māori experiences, worldviews, and struggle for mana motuhake (*freedom to make decisions* (rangatiratanga[1]) *on their own land*)?

_____

[1] In comparison, *tino rangatiratanga* means sovereignty.

Spencer Lilley's 2019 content analysis of Maori customers accessing items of interest and services reported that reo Māori materials need a *stable digital* or in person platform to meet the needs of māori and to be able to access stories that reflect us. The online annotated bibliography *Kōmako: A Bibliography of Māori Writing in English* was created by Bridget Underhill in 2003. She wanted to provide *stable* updated bibliographic information and offer a bibliographic resource that included lesser-known Māori writers. Like Peters, she wanted to give the research back to Māori writers and communities who were historically left out of the literary canon, hence, subject to institutional erasure. Erasure would have particularly targeted wāhine Māori.

Content from Kōmako was possible through the support of *the Maori Artists and Writers Society*, which also recognised that connection and relationships was vital for Māori stories to flourish. In true mana Wāhine spirit, Kōmako recognises that maintaining relational ties to whānau Māori leads to better and more stable access to items of interest for everyone. If a GLAM space embraces Māori values, hapori is more likely to remain with the knowledge even if the space itself disappears.

Mana wāhine and their historic resistance from the margins inform me how their values are transformative. The values of mana wāhine open up a new way for hapori to access their stories that might also connect us. A GLAM space living with Indigenous values has mana when welcoming and acknowledging historical subjugated communities; who in return might share their own stories. This way, institutions can listen to whānau on their own terms rather than from inside the four walls of its own limited and potentially skewed worldview. What could GLAM space look like when applying Mason Durie's *Marae framework* for instance?

Values and Space

Te Ao Māori nurtures values by which we can guide the way we live and practise in our everyday life and workplace. In *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*, Hirini Moko Mead (2003) describes values as underpinning tikanga. These principles could

be transformative in institutions such as libraries that have traditionally favoured neo-liberal governance and management.

According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012), Indigenous values govern our relationship with each other and with the environment. Kaupapa Māori principles extend *beyond research* and can be applied to other sorts of academic and cultural engagement (Smith, 2012). I imagine this to include libraries and other GLAM institutions. Indigenous research methods also ring true for GLAM access and outreach, where *Wai 262* (2011) has drawn clear guidelines that resonate with Linda Smith's recommendations. Smith presents seven principles that include respect, kanohi kitea, ata whakarongo, manaakitanga, kia māhaki, kaitiakitanga and to *not* trample on the mana of people (Smith, 2012). These values are important for GLAM to build trusting and authentic relationships with hapū and create community spaces that are consultative, cathartic and partnered with Indigenous peoples.

Historically, the crown and local government have tried to trample on mana, whenua, language and culture through violent means and fostering urban migration. The Crown would punish hapori Māori for speaking their own language at school and take land if they did not desist to the settler government's demands, leaving many tangata whenua alienated in environments that are not socio-economically conducive to traditional hapū/whānau living arrangements.

Throughout the assault, Māori have had to remain collectively resilient. In their research paper *Marae Ora Kāinga Ora*, Jenny Lee Morgan and colleagues (2021) describe the health of the urban marae as a measure of community well-being. Their *MOKO* project drew on Māori knowledge systems, values and practices such as whenua, whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga that strengthen the interdependence of marae wellbeing and community wellbeing (Morgan, 2021).

The essence of life and mauri is vital for such connections to flourish. Mauri is a *whole-of-person-reflection* of spirit, mind, body, environment and relationships (Durie, 2016). Values protect the mauri of space. Having Indigenous values authentically understood and lived in GLAM spaces can be transformative for a space's mauri. Lily George (2019) describes it as "simply good manners." A

community marae, for instance, is not just about four walls and a beam, it's about hopes and dreams of the community (Lee Morgan, 2021).

Ngāti Whātua Orākei have used their customary values and principles to underpin te taiao Māori. Michelle Thompson-Fawcett (2017) reports that iwi/hapu values have been at the core of their governance and processes for their housing developments and projects. This is so iwi members can see themselves reflected in their space. Not all processes and outcomes need to be understood by non-Maori. However, it is vital, as hapori Māori, to recognise your own identity, *be* yourself and *see* yourself in the whenua where you whakapapa (Thompson-Fawcett, 2017). Can whānau see their identities in GLAM spaces? GLAM space should permanently accommodate Māori narratives and context on their own whenua.

Mason Durie (1999) describes marae encounters as embodying values that follow us everywhere. Domains of Marae and its values affect behaviour of tangata whenua and manuhiri even beyond the physical space of the marae. Domains of safety, circle, time, interconnectedness, authority and generosity all contribute to our identity as Māori. Durie recommends to practitioners in social settings to consider these domains and marae patterns of thinking and behaving when considering behavioural attributes. There's no reason why such a spatial domain should not be acknowledged outside the marae as we traverse two worlds. Like a marae, shared space for whānau Māori could be seen as a body that is subject to tapu (*sacredness*) and noa (*the 'norm'*). Practising Māori values allows tikanga to be present in a place that historically has been regarded as hostile to Māori.

As Troy Tuhou (2011) found in his research on university libraries, the wā ('*vibe*') of a space *matters* for Indigenous students who tend to avoid culturally void spaces. Culturally safe spaces for community are vital for well-being and connection. Could the essence of such projects inspire well-being in urban public spaces such as libraries? Do GLAM institutions have tangible policies in place that could manifest and sustain the values in their physical or virtual spaces? Could a library provide a culturally safe space and provide spaces that reflect local Indigenous communities?

Kaupapa Māori values for wellness in GLAM

Marie Battiste (2014) reports that research institutions tend to commodify Indigenous knowledge as it becomes more of an interest to western culture. This informs me that it is vital that guidelines need to be available to protect Indigenous knowledge against western institutions' desires to validate misappropriation and commodification (Smith, 2001). What and who do GLAM institutions prioritise when making decisions about their policies? Are hapori consulted? Is space acknowledged as an extension of knowledge organisation systems (KOS)? How is this reflected in the organisation of Indigenous stories?

The following thread includes successful guidelines and frameworks that some institutions have implemented with positive results for Indigenous communities. Such guidelines have developed from groundbreaking research, carried out by Indigenous researchers and tribal delegates for their communities.

A 2015 case study by Doyle and colleagues gives an overview of X̱wi7x̱wa library in Canada. The framework used at X̱wi7x̱wa places the needs of Indigenous community at its heart. It acknowledges that space is a vital part of KOS and that reflexivity can be detectable in spaces. This research finds that by using an Indigenous framework, consultation, and space, Indigenous communities can access their own stories without the barriers of navigating a western system. X̱wi7x̱wa's framework could provide a means to measure other libraries' Indigenous responses to best practice. It also reminds us that space is not separated from KOS when Indigenous values are authentically actioned.

In her groundbreaking doctoral research *Polycultural Capital,* Karlo Mila-Schaaf (2010) recognised the importance for young Moana communities of having a space to share with others of their community in order to flourish. *Takaanini Paataka Koorero* used Mila-Schaaf's research to implement an *Atu Mai* framework to benefit local hapori by connecting their stories and tikanga Māori in library space. How much does GLAM listen to their local Indigenous community to understand what they want? Kim Taunga (2023) comments that, since its conception, recruitment of staff

until present-day *Takaanini Paataka Koorero* has lived and breathed tikanga Māori via *Karanga Atu, Karanga Mai*. Reciprocity and relationships are valued. Community and mana whenua lead events with their ideas while the institution actually listens.

Aotearoa is fortunate to have tikanga Māori that has been shared for generations to guide our lives and best practice (S. Lilley, private communication, 2023, October 5). *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei* by Spencer Lilley (2016) discusses the Wai 262 Report and its relevance to libraries. Wai 262 provides tikanga Māori-based guidelines relevant to protecting Indigenous knowledge in the fields of arts and culture. Lilley draws on the recommendations from this report to discuss best practice for libraries to care for taonga and the space from where it's accessed.

Back in the early nineties, Tui McDonald's paper, *Te Ara Tika* (1993), reported that while libraries had policies that referenced Te Tiriti and its values, they did not *act on* this. She concludes:

> It would have been an interesting exercise to have carried out an in-depth analysis of both stated policies of libraries and the local authorities, and compared them with the actual practices as described in the responses to questions 1 and 2, i.e., what the mission statement says about the Treaty of Waitangi and the obligations under it, and what the library is actually doing right now in terms of providing services.(p. 39)

I'd be interested to know whether there's been any evidence of change, and what GLAM *does* and *doesn't* do in reflecting Indigenous values so that First Nation communities can comfortably access our own stories, knowledge and memories, which can enhance their well-being.

Kaupapa (method)

At the conclusion of *Te Ara Tika*, Tui MacDonald (1993) recommends further investigation into how well GLAM policy translates into 'walking the talk.' Documentary analysis (DA) broadly does this by teasing out the contradictions and tensions in a text. It allows us to pay attention to what's *taut* - taupapatu - through discord in language and worldview. For this wero, DA will also be used to compare and contrast tangible commitments to serving Indigenous communities at six anonymous GLAM.

In part, my wero seeks to provide the GLAM sector with a useful overview - enough to indicate how much progress has been made since Tui MacDonald's research. It also draws useful comparisons with Lilley's relatively recent (2018) documentary analysis on New Zealand & Australian University libraries. Lilley's DA research sought to report the presence of visible services and help for Indigenous people on campus. He noted the number of *services* for Indigenous students that were accessible through academic Library websites. Notably, he found the services still waning - even after all this time since McDonald's research.

But my wero also seeks to identify tangible *values* present in GLAM service space, i.e., values that are conducive to the well-being and healing of Indigenous communities. Documentary Analysis has traditionally been employed by First Nations' communities to address language and meaning in text. For example, the Sāmoan tradition of observing contradictory language and concepts - *Iloilo Ga o le gagana*, or 'examining of language' (Galuvao, 2018) has been applied to education policy. Galuvao's research addressed how the meaning in text relates to Sāmoan primary school students using a traditional 'examining of language' common in Sāmoan interrogative discourse such as trials. Through this examination, a disagreement can get addressed by the concerned party through a collective acknowledgement. Similar to raupatū, grievances are addressed through a formal initial process of noting the discords.

From a te Ao Māori perspective, texts containing discord and contradictions could be investigated as a form of *raupatū* (M. Tarawa, personal communication, 2023).Values discussed in a policy can be cancelled out by inconsistencies in language and concepts due to power discrepancies. Arguably, a dominant and imperial worldview that subjugates a First Nation's kaupapa leads to constraints and discord within text and its meaning. In this case the historically marginalised text has more risk of being discarded. It risks being stamped out by the dominant one if the problematic contradictions remain unacknowledged without interrogation. This in effect can be seen as institutional racism - a rape of our *earth mother*, Papatūānuku. It is māmae all over again.

As a method, DA will be applied to compare open access and visible texts from 6 anonymous GLAM institutions - *tahi, rua, toru, whā, rima, ono* - in Aotearoa, including one non-profit GLAM organisation. The types of text will be institutional text that is accessible for hapori - reasonably and easily found without having to be looked for too deeply. Where it is appropriate, paratext such as job advertisements and surrounding physical environment will be included in my observations. These were found physically onsite in public accessed spaces; and digitally on the open access *seek.co.nz* website, and the social media sites linked to the respective GI's homepage. Paratext is important as it provides context to the expectations alluded to in GLAM institution (GI) space. It may be indicative as to whether the GI is indeed walking the talk or not.

Story gathering

Tangible texts which acknowledge the people of the land and the whenua are a vital step toward the well-being and healing for Indigenous peoples (Pōhio, 2023). It's simply "good manners" as has been noted by Lily George (2019) in the literature review. Being a qualitative method, data for documentary analysis will be collected from both the digital and physical spaces of 6 anonymous institutions -

Online space includes signs and text from:
- Institutional websites
- Institutional policies
- Social media sites
- External job vacancy notices

In person space includes:
- Institutional signs
- Institutional posts
- Institutional noticeboards
- What is present and tangible in the surrounding physical environment

I will be framing questions based on kaupapa Māori values as a tool to measure a GI's commitment to their Indigenous communities. These values are interconnected in te Ao Maori. They include (but are not exclusive to) whenua, whakapapa, reo Māori, whanaungatanga, wairuatanga, manaakitanga, kaitiakitanga, and rangatiratanga. In the Māori world, such values do not stand exclusively apart from one another. *Tino* rangatiratanga from Article 2 of te Tiriti o Waitangi has been consciously noted as a Māori right. In this sense, the Māori right to '*absolute sovereignty*' can be differentiated from the Māori value known as rangatiratanga or mana motuhake (*self-determination*). Data has been collected from questions interrogating the presence of these values in the GI's in-person and digital environment.

Positionality and navigating the GLAM institutions

- I am aware that the GLAM institutions I visit have different financial, donor (private and state) and resource capacities.
- I tried to put myself in the shoes of an Indigenous visitor wondering about an overall GLAM institution trying to sense a connection to the place or at least to a space where they can just "be"(Pohio, 2023). In all cases but one, this was actually genuine.

- I spend the same amount of time in each GI. The timeframe spent in each one ranges from 20 to 40 minutes. This was largely dependent on how welcome I felt being there. I visited six GI's spread over five days during *korero mai te reo Māori* week.

- As someone who works in the GLAM sector, I have various degrees of familiarity with the places I visit. This ranges from working at one of them, through to visiting another for the first time.

- Due to personal budget and time constraints, the participatory GIs were all located in an area within a radius of approximately 2 to 5 kilometres. All are located on traditional lands of the same mana whenua as rightful kaitiaki.

- My professional circumstances have determined DA as the best option in light of current GLAM restructures where staff risk loss of position. Ethically speaking the anonymity of the DA is safer. Therefore the description will be navigated with kaitiakitanga in mind.

How have I captured the stories?

My experiences and observations at each GI have been captured visually. Selected GLAM institutions (GI) have been given a particular tone of *red ochre* ranging from 4 different shades that represent how they measure up to the following pātae (questions). The red ochre's *variable depth of tone* is aligned with the extent by which Māori values are apparent (to me) in response to these pātae:

- *Māori values: Are whānau able to see themselves in this space?*
    - Does the institution acknowledge the whenua where it stands?
    - Does the institution acknowledge the people of the land (mana whenua)?
    - Is context (of the space in relation to tangata whenua) provided?
    - Is dual language used in signage and text?
    - Are the terms/language arranged and used as hapori would expect?
    - Is this consistent?
    - Is GI polyvocal?

- ○ Is there contradictory language that 'muddy the waters' and disadvantage hapori Māori?
  - ○ Are there clear safe spaces for hapori?
  - ○ Does the GI have space to listen to its first nations hapori?

- Tino rangatiratanga: Does GI acknowledge te Tiriti o Waitangi principles/rights of Article 2?
  - ○ In what ways?

- What's **not** there?

Results

Captured stories

There is an expectation for GIs to acknowledge Indigenous communities without resorting to tokenism. In te ao Māori, this can be done by practising values and recognising rights stated in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, a living breathing document that represents an equitable partnership between tangata whenua and the state, a partnership that all publicly-funded GLAM are expected to honour. In this chapter, qualitative results are organised *visually* to show Māori values/rights reflected (or not) in GLAM. Main trends will be highlighted in lieu of the small individual details from individual institutions. In this case, an overview showing notable observations makes this more of a qualitative overview of the current climate than a detailed quantitative ranking.

Inspired by Mason Durie's (1998) wellness framework, the stories from this documentary analysis are visually told in *two* excel "wharenui" accommodating *in-person* and *online* results. As previously suggested, a wharenui, being the part of a marae housing our tupuna, can be interpreted as a body. In this case (and ideally) it represents 'mana wahine'. Both wharenui are colour-coded to visually show a snapshot of significant strengths and gaps across the GIs. It is designed to provide an overview of glam institutions in an urban centre where mana whenua and settler communities share collective (at times selective) memories. Results from qualitative documentary analysis are not intended to be exact. Ideally, this method would be a small part of a larger more braided river and whānau-led kaupapa. As it is, as previously stated, these results are subject to my own biases and positionality as an Indigenous GLAM worker stepping into both familiar and unfamiliar GLAM environments.

Onewhero - The red ochre of Kurawaka

In te Ao Māori, stories of interconnection and interdependence often begin with the first woman. Hineahuone was made out of red clay by Papatūānuku's son Tane. Her sneeze of life prompted Tane to cry out "Mauri ora" to acknowledge Hineahuone as the first human - wāhine Māori. Considering this, her cells within the her (chart) are represented as four shades of red ochre. The deeper the red, the stronger her *backbone* functions. The stronger her backbone the more mana in her presence and kaupapa Māori. In this way, shades of red ochre are representative of this wero's mana wahine framework.

It's important to note that "*minimum*" in this case does not mean deficient. On the contrary, in this wero "*minimum*" sets a high bar. It represents a *clear presence* of te ao Maori and *nothing less*. If there was a deeper tone for GLAM to aspire to, this stronger depth of red ochre would naturally appear when *all* vital Māori values in *all* GLAM settings are consistently present.

- Tone 4 is when *all* pou and panels are consistent in all Māori values, principles and rights, this is the shade they will be. *This* is the tone GLAM should be aspiring to ❤️
- Tone 3 meets the *minimum* expectation of Māori values/rights practised
- Tone 2 allows room for reflexivity or unconscious biased interpretation
- Tone 1 means māori values/rights are barely noticeable
- Tone 0 values or rights are absent or intangible

The six glam institutions have been assigned easy pseudonyms:

- *Tahi,* an art gallery
- *Rua,* an academic library
- *Toru,* a public library
- *Whā,* a non-profit arts library
- *Rima,* a tertiary education library
- *Ono,* a museum

These GIs appear horizontally across the top panels of the wharenui. Conversely, *values and rights appear vertically* (presenting visually as pou) below each GI. The presence of value/rights is determined by my own personal experience visiting their space as an Indigenous librarian, researcher and māmā.

The following charts are taken from the appendices to visually give an overview of results from In-person and virtual observations:

VALUES & RIGHTS: WHAT'S THERE?	tahi	rua	toru	whā	rima	ono
VALUES: Does GI acknowledge land where	2	1	2	1	1	3
Does GI acknowledge tangata whenua?	2	0	2	2	2	3
Does GI acknowledge Mana Whenua?	0	0	2	1	1	3
Is context provided?	2	1	1	2	2	3
Is dual language used in signage?	2	1	1	1	1	3
Is dual language used in text?	2	1	1	1	2	3
Are terms used tika?	3	1	0	3	0	3
Are terms arranged beside each other?	2	0	0	2	0	3
Is reo rua consistant?						
Is GI polyvocal?	2	0	2	3	2	3
Is adverserial language/concepts avoided?	2	0	1	3	1	2
Are there clear safe spaces for hapori?	2	0	1	2	1	3
Does GI provide a whanau space?	1	1	1	2	2	3
is vibe of space and service friendly/warm	3	0	3	3	3	2
Does staff acknowledge customers in te re	3	0	2	3	1	3
RIGHTS: Is Te Tiriti acknowledged?	0	0	2	2	3	1
Is there a tangible repatriation policy?	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indigenous Mission Statement visible?	0	0	1	3	3	1
Are things in the right space?	2	0	2	3	2	2
What's not there?	casual whanau space	Manaakitanga, Reo, context, whanau friendly spaces	space for kai and whanau groups, horotiu acknowledged	Dewey (yay)	appropriate placements of bins, matua collection is near social table, lacks bilingual signage, clear space for mums	lacks transparent policy, not many staff to talk to, amzing whanau friendly space

VALUES & RIGHTS: WHAT'S SEEN ONLINE?	tahi	rua	toru	whā	rima	ono
VALUES: Does GI acknowledge the land?	1	2	0	2	0	3
Does GI acknowledge the people of the land?	2	0	0	3	0	3
Does GI acknowledge mana whenua?	0	0	0	0	0	3
Is context provided?	1	2	0	3	0	3
Is dual language used in signage?	1	2	1	1	0	3
Is dual language used in text?	1	1	1	1	0	3
Is bi-lingual text/signage arranged appropriate	2	1	0	2	0	3
Is reo rua consistant?						
Are terms used tika?	2	2	1	2	0	3
Is GI polyvocal?	2	2	1	3	0	3
Avoids adverserial language/concepts?	2	1	1	3	0	3
Are there clear safe spaces for hapori?	2	2	1	3	0	3
Does GI provide space to listen?	2	3	3	3	3	3
Is ol space Indigenous service friendly?	1	1	1	3	0	3
RIGHTS: Does GI acknowledge Te Tiriti	3	0	1	3	0	3
Are things in the right space?	2	1	1	3	0	3
Indigenous mission statements/policy visible?	1	1	1	2	0	3
Is repatriation rights policy tangible?	1	0	1	1	0	3
Recruitment	1	0	0	2	2	2
Social Media	2	1	1	2	1	2
What is missing?	Mana Whenua nod	Open Access implications	Pages, context	links to Indigenous socials & sites		links missing
What's notably positive?	Whanau permission for reprints	Better than inperson vibe		Article 2 throughout		Strong
	Links					

Kaupapa Māori values

Across the GI board (with one exception) the stand-out strength is the noticeable warmth and manaakitanga practised by kaimahi. A genuine warm welcome and greetings in te reo Māori from kaimahi can go a long way in an otherwise historically colonial space. It is a vital start if values and principles are reflected in the people who provide the service. However, frontline service shouldn't be the only staff acknowledging values through practice. This should extend to lead management - those who can make decisions and action the different ways Māori values can be reflected and practised. When this happens such values would be seen consistently

throughout the GI space, not just at frontline service points or during rostered shifts with certain kaimahi.

The story told by the *red ochre* tells us that the further you go into a GLAM space the more inconsistencies come to surface - especially if you see the world through a critical Indigenous lens. I noticed that while an acknowledgement of tangata whenua was generally apparent, *mana whenua* was not clearly recognised in 4 of the 6 GIs. It is ironic that while most GIs are clearly polyvocal empowering diverse communities with appropriate and inclusive signages and services, bilingual *reo Māori* signs remain *in*consistent.

Two institutions sufficiently used bilingual signage and texts.These GIs arranged text/signage so that te reo Māori got placed next to the english text (rather than under or over it). However this arrangement did vary in degree of consistency with one GI more consistent than the other. I think it's important for GIs to consider their own reflexivity. It's worthy for GLAM to consider how unconscious biases can be reflected in signs and in texts to the detriment and 'othering' of Indigenous communities.

Raupatu

Adversarial concepts/language includes situations where Māori principles are appropriated to explain western concepts. Labelling security as "kaitiaki,"or making sweeping claims of manaakitanga when this value is not consistently present contradicts kaupapa. This can be seen happening in 5 out of 6 GIs. Can a GI claim manaakitanga when visitors need to pay for food in order to eat inside the GI? Is there a clear space for a visitor to enjoy kai? Is there appropriate whānau space for hot foods, feeding pepe and whānau? Is it conducive to tikanga? Do clear tapu or noa boundaries exist as they do in marae settings? Consistency means that values such as manaakitanga do not just make appearances for important events or cultural showcases. It needs to stay grounded and strong between these times rather than recede back to "business as usual."

Another area of contention is the right of tino rangatiratanga for whānau. Whānau have a right to kaitiaki our taonga and our ancestors' taonga. Repatriation policies need to be accessible to whānau to empower them to self determine where and how taonga is cared for. No institutions had transparent policies that are relevant to whānau in its physical space. They might have a policy tucked away somewhere but if so it was not visible, how can whānau be empowered to make decisions over their own taonga as article 2 of te Tiriti states? Ethically, how can an institution claim to honour te Tiriti in its strategic plan when repatriation policy remains inaccessible? In this case , how would mana whenua even know a conversation is possible? (S. Lilley, personal communication, 2023, October 5). This in itself is contradictory.

How does it look?

Kanohi kitea

The horizontal analysis reflects how each institution appeared to me on that particular day at that particular time. This happened to be the first week of Mahuru Māori - a month (September) in which Reo Māori is celebrated. As with values/rights, tangible trends, fluctuations, strengths and deficiencies are noted along with the GLAM institution's intent to practise these values. If GIs have a te reo Maori policy to follow, are they actually following it through?

As it can be seen, GIs paint a picture of tonal inconsistencies, flickering between the lights and darks of red ochre. *Ono* is the only GI pou with strong red clay vibes. Notably the signage and text is consistently bilingual here. Text is generally arranged beside each other reflecting equity rather than an imperialist take on the world where an often marginalised language is literally subjugated under a culturally dominant one.

To be fair it should be noted that *Ono* is more generously funded than the other five GI's (S. Lilley, private communication, 2023, September 12). However, signage shouldn't need generous donors to be equitable without further subjugating an already historically marginalised community. When signage is not consistently bilingual in 90% of GIs, it is indicative of a lack of intent to allocate resourcing to fulfil the commitment to te reo Māori (S. Lilley, personal communication, 2023, October 5), practise māori values, and honour te Tiriti in GLAM.

Speaking to power, lead management have the power to change signage if they choose to, while intentions of frontline staff often fluctuate due to limited (authoritative or financial) power to turn a space into an Indigenous one. Generally speaking, GLAM frontline staff are more likely to turnover at a quicker rate than management. For GLAM, this risks losing all the whānau-led initiatives when the proactive kaimahi of kaupapa Māori jump waka or move on due to restructures.

In contrast to the curatorial spaces, two academic libraries predominantly preach pale pink. This ranged from cool absence to viral inconsistency. While te Tiriti principles were displayed at the entrance of *Rima* near warm welcoming kaimahi, not all these principles continue to be discernible further on - particularly in issues concerning the boundaries between tapu and noa. Toilets near feeding areas, images of taonga and tupuna could be found placed above overflowing rubbish bins, or near tables where food, drink is allowed and pretty "coarse" banter is heard. These are just a few examples indicating that crown-supported GIs still do not consistently practise Māori values in their physical space despite their crown-binding partnership with iwi Māori to be inclusive.

Digital ātea

Anecdotal evidence suggests that students access their sources and services online anyway. They rarely ever step into a library while studying at university and beyond, preferring to access resources digitally instead. Considering such a belief, this section addresses whether the digital space fares any better. Interestingly, a

non-profit reflected *tino rangatiratanga* more convincingly than the bigger crown-affiliated institutions. It was clear from its (Whā) public events that it was self-determined in its kaupapa. Therefore it is evident that values are determined by true intent and kaupapa rather than wealth or easy access to capital.

Generally, in the digital realm, the horizontal trends remain similar. Ono however has both the Indigenous (IP) and repatriation policies accessible online. It is probably best to note here that across the GIs, most had whānau-related policies somewhere within the digital realm (particularly websites). However many were not easily found and hence accessible. Most social-medias provided only policies related to etiquette and behaviours.

One academic library, rua, included noticeably more te ao Māori in their digital ātea (site) than via kanohi kitea (in person ātea). This implies that Indigenous customers at this institution might feel more welcomed online and would therefore seek out *digital* resources rather than items or services offered in the physical library space. This indicates that the institution is not sufficiently upholding the kanohi ki te kanohi aspects of tikanga (S. Lilley, personal communication, 2023, October 4). Furthermore, this GI digital site does not unacknowledge mana whenua. It is not alone. The aforementioned GI also shares this absence with most of the other GI digital spaces across the whenua, with the exception of GI Ono.

Across the board, including in recruitment and social media, reo rua signage and text, including its arrangement, was inconsistent. Generally, there was less dual language seen online than in person. *Four* out of six online recruitment calls did not include any particular expectations pointing to cultural competency or honouring te Tiriti o Waitangi. Only one GI (Ono) included consistent reo rua in its socials.

Conversely, feedback (or a right to reply) was more accessible online than in person. Most institutions had a readily accessible feedback space for site visitors. This, however, might imply that the more vulnerable and marginalised you are, the less likely you have access to this as the less likely you would have easy access to a device or wifi. Over all, Māori values in the digital realm were more inconsistent than not.

Result summary

To sum up the results, red ochre represented the *minimal standard of expectations* for our sampled GIs. With one exception, the pou (*backbones*) are *not consistently* painted a deep red ochre. This picture suggests that overall there still is a *long way* to go when it comes to GLAM institutions at least sufficiently practising and acknowledging Māori values and rights, both online and in person. In particular more work is needed in terms of acknowledging mana whenua, providing adequate bilingual signage consistently, and transparent, tangible and accessible policy related to IP and repatriation of taonga.

As with the (GI) vertical backbone, a majority of the horizontal *panels representing values* are lacking a vitality and depth of ochre needed to genuinely awhi te ao Māori. After all, the vital practice of Māori values, and rights indicates healthy and equitable relationships with hapū and community well-being. Blood deep red ochre 'backbones' acknowledging Māori values are needed to support Hineahuone. As Tā Mason Durie (1998) suggests, the well-being of a peoples cannot stand strong without *all* dimensions of the framework strongly and consistently existing. The healthy red ochre dimensions of Hineahuone, like tikanga, need values to be present first.

Discussion

Circling back to Tui MacDonald, what do our *wero* results say about the ways GLAM practices Māori values in their public spaces since *Te Ara Tika*? Do our institutions' ways of practice actually reflect their mission statements and obligations to te Tiriti o Waitangi as well as to their own strategic plans? On a positive note, our Wero suggests manaakitanga can clearly be seen being practised by most frontline services. But the results also point to persisting gaps. Inconsistencies are seen in the visibility of repatriation policies, bilingual signage/text, context, and respectful *public* acknowledgement of mana whenua. This chapter will speak to power by discussing the implications of such inconsistencies in our (Indigenous) well-being and healing in GLAM spaces.

The first observation is a general absence of any tangible Indigenous *policy* and *mission statement*. Notably, there is no obvious sign in the public space of a repatriation policy for images, manuscripts and other potential items of interest to whānau Māori. A visibly existing repatriation policy is empowering. It acknowledges tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. It can inform whānau and hāpu about their rights as kaitiaki, and support potential kaitiaki in the processes of reclaiming and reconnecting with taonga created by tupuna.

Kaitiakitanga is a Māori value as well as a Māori right. *Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Wai 262: Ko Tēnei Aotearoa* and *UNDRIP* clearly and repeatedly state the entitlement of whānau Māori and First Nations to care for and be recognised as the rightful and true guardians of taonga created by tupuna, regardless of problematic copyright and intellectual property legislation. If whānau are not made aware of their Indigenous right to repatriate taonga, it is unlikely that tupuna and taonga will be returned to their own whenua and guardianship.

Our wero indicates that *bilingual* signage and text are generally present. The acknowledgement of te reo Māori as one of the nation's two official languages, alongside sign language, is vital and encouraging. However, the results highlight that bilingual signage and text is inconsistently distributed throughout in-person and

virtual spaces. It's illogical that te reo Maori is prioritised in some spaces but not in others.

Ideally, bilingual text would be placed side-by-side rather than one underneath the other because the arrangement of bilingual signs can suggest that one language and culture is considered more important and the other is literally subjugated. Signage can affect the mana of a culture, peoples, language, mauri and space. Nathan Pohio (September, 2023) from *Toi Tāmaki* spoke about this in regards to Indigenous experiences in GLAM spaces. He noted that the use of bilingual signage and the way that Indigenous languages often are placed *under* the more dominant language reinforces the colonial notion of a dominant culture and language being more important than the 'others.' This is arguably equally as oppressive as omitting the Indigenous language altogether.

But what does it mean when this occurs in some parts of the building but not in others? Te reo Māori was recognised as an official language in 1987, when it was finally acknowledged as endangered due to years of cultural suppression and urbanisation that alienated hapori Māori from papakainga, marae, culture and te reo rangatira Māori. Wāhine Māori had already been aware of a potentially yet unimaginable devastating loss. They realised how alienation and dispossession caused by colonisation could disenfranchise some whānau Māori.

Tā Mason Durie (1999) notes the importance of a collective space for whānau Māori perhaps identify more with their turangawaewae than the whenua they whakapapa to. The following quote from Durie (1999) refers to the importance of having a space for whānau Māori that isn't restricted to the whenua of their iwi affiliations:

> The Māori population is as diverse as any other. This has implications for health services and strategic directions for Māori development. An exclusive focus on tribal structures might bypass many Māori. The changing nature of whānau affiliations in urban areas, but also in some rural situations, will inevitably lead us to strong associations between Māori derived more from location of residence and the pursuit of common everyday interests than a shared, though somewhat hypothetical tribal ancestry. (p.164)

In response to alienation and the threat of language and culture loss, mana wāhine stood up to initiate by Māori for Māori organisations such as urban marae, *Māori Women's Welfare League* and *Kohanga Reo*. These vital initiatives have been transformative for language and sociocultural revitalisation (M. Raukawa-Tait, 2023). This says a lot about the strength of mana wāhine Māori-led initiatives and how empowering they were and continue to be (despite being a casualty of state cost-cutting measures themselves).Their social organisations have prevented extinction of taonga such as te reo Māori in an unconducive cultural and political context. They have also supported those in the community, like myself, who know how it feels to be labelled "plastic Māori" due to the disconnection with one's own culture.

As a Tiriti partner, GLAM is obliged to *consistently and appropriately* use bilingual signage. In fact as a Crown-funded institution, GLAM is obliged to honour te Tiriti of Waitangi and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007). Using consistent and appropriate bilingual signage and text is a clear way of signalling respect for aforementioned Māori Institutions that have fought so hard to revive te reo Māori and tikanga Māori. It would be interesting to know whether bilingualism is included in any mission statements or not. This wero suggests that bicultural mission statements are hard to find in public spaces of GLAM. This might imply that there are not significantly more bilingual mission statements in GLAM institutions since *Te Ara Tika* when only 25% were reported as present (McDonald, 1993)

The decision to create a bilingual space is more likely to be actioned and made *best practice* when the intention and decision to do so initially comes from the top. This is due to frontline kaimahi, who are generally very supportive of bicultural policy, tending to come and go whenever an organisation is restructured. ELT (executive lead teams) are the staff more likely to remain stable in GLAM and have the structural power to ensure consistency of practice and policy. It would just take a lead team's intention and commitment to the *United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (*UNDRIP)*, *Wai262* and *te Tiriti o Waitangi* to turn bilingual and bicultural strategic goals into practice.

In particular, te Tiriti o Waitangi is an agreement from which the nation was founded with the crown. Budgetary decisions should never supersede Tiriti principles. When it does, it is a clear breach of the GLAM sector's Tiriti obligations, which can be argued as a form of raupatu. And if this is happening, the respective institution needs to seriously reflect on its ELT's cultural competency in its failure to equitably respond to hapori Māori.

Kaupapa Māori-centred approaches are needed for transformative structural change in institutions such that "people can make strategic changes that have emancipatory potential" (Smith, 1996). Māori-friendly approaches are good for helping previously culturally uninformed persons become familiarised with te Ao Māori. However, this is not transformative by itself when Māori remain absent from leadership roles or other decision-making positions.

Mason Durie argues, "Physical presence does not equate to being included, nor does it contribute to a secure identity" (cited in Waitere & Johnson, p. 121). Placing Māori staff on the frontline is not enough for Māori values in GLAM to be consistently present at *all levels*. As noted by a participant in *Te Ara Tika*, policy at a management level is not filtered through to "day to day work" (McDonald, 1993, p. 39). Even after all this time, Māori still are not at the GLAM table making the decisions alongside tangata Tiriti and tangata Moana.

It is interesting to note that, while structural change in GLAM strengthens the ELT status quo, it is increasingly less likely to favour a hauora-focused kaupapa. Hauora-focused frameworks such as Durie's *te Whare Tapa Whā* consider needs of hapori Māori from a te Ao Māori - *for Māori by Māori* - perspective. In my recent experiences of restructuring as a kaimahi in a GLAM institution, we have tended to lose the staff who are most proactive in the community engagement and creative programmes. These are the staff most likely to enhance connection and identity through kaupapa Māori and te reo Māori.

The question arises: Is neoliberal restructuring eroding away the staff most supportive of GLAM initiatives with hauora Māori kaupapa? Wellbeing for hapori is

conducive to kaupapa Māori initiatives. Without the intent to prioritise roles that support Indigenous-led initiatives and promote well-being, the GLAM space will inevitably reveal inconsistencies. This leads to contradictions, further distancing hapori Māori from where their own taonga and stories are potentially located. This is detrimental to the healing Indigenous people are experiencing through their own kaupapa Māori initiatives. As seen in *te whare tapa whā* of Hineahuone, when the red clay has turned her frame pale and fragmented, she won't be able to stand properly. Naturally, kaupapa Māori values will be deficient here.

Collections are often argued to be the guts of GLAM. However, collections need to be accessible. Collections can also include stories of various forms such as visuals and oratory that speak to Indigenous communities. Indigenous peoples, especially wāhine Māori, have always acted as repositories in our communities, in accordance with their traditional roles. Wāhine Māori are not islands. Their kaupapa includes mana whenua and mana tangata. Mana Wāhine *is* mana whānau, mana hapū, mana whenua and mana tangata: wāhine Māori are āhuatanga of mana (Waitere, 2019). Hence, repositories of matauranga and stories are found not just in collections of items but in the whenua and whānau who breathe mana and mauri into it.

Within GLAM walls, however, having just a *collection* is not enough (S. Lilley, personal communication, 2023, October 5). Hapori Māori need a space where hapori Māori feel connected so their whakapapa, stories, purakau, knowledge and histories can be exchanged. Otherwise, why would whānau Māori, elders, or urban Māori want to turn up and be involved? It would be important for engagement to be done tika otherwise elders will not want to be engaged (Pohio, 2023).

Communities need meaningful reasons to connect to a GLAM space. It's important for GLAM to acknowledge that accessing taonga and knowledge (sharing) in te Ao Māori is anathema to western institutions, yet it is vital that GLAM has space where whānau Māori can see themselves reflected in the environment. Once again, Linda Smith's comment rings true: western knowledge systems fragment Indigenous knowledge, which "silences what we did and do know" (Smith, 2001).

While not all Māori have access to their home marae, through establishing a consistent kaupapa Māori event space where whānau are consulted, leading, involved and seen, GLAM can offer a space of mana and tikanga that can feel like a community where mauri is present, relationships are central and hapori Māori flourish. Mana can also resonate through collections. Collections, images and art alike provide context, hence, education, in many ways (Pohio, 2023).

Connecting with local hapori and mana whenua enables GLAM to recognise both the seen and unseen histories. Listening to mana whenua helps GLAM as partners to understand and recognise previous unknown sites and stories. This is an important part of GLAM mahi. In-house collections are great, but some of the most vital stories are outside the walls - in the whenua, in our memories, and histories told by kaumatua, kuia and koro. Just because you can't see what is buried doesn't mean that it is not important and tupuna haven't been there (Atuahiva, 2023, September 1).

Not acknowledging place and context contradicts GLAM's kaupapa to awhi cultural preservation. It breaches the obligations to te Tiriti o Waitangi. It is a raupatu. It causes māmae - and not just for hapori Māori. This has recently come to light in an urban centre where long ago the river was bricked up hidden and repurposed as drainage for sewer. Now it has turned into a sinkhole and leaking sewage into the harbour contaminating the sea and its life. All this due to the decision to bury a taniwha out of sight (Jorgensen, September 1, 2023).

The onus is on GLAM to learn from mana whenua about their stories and mauri of the place. It will require putting te Tiriti o Waitangi principles before the budget, even during cost cutting-restructures. This after all was the agreement. This is also an important aspect of the reclamation process and can help contribute towards healing past trauma and raupatu.

The more Māori values are consistently practised in GLAM space, the closer the relationship between the institution and whānau can be. Such a space can be accountable for practising Māori values and bicultural principles committed to in mission statements in a visible and public space for all to see. When we can see mana whenua *consistently and respectfully* on the steps, along the glass doors,

written on the road and accessible in the collections, it's a healthy sign of partnership between whānau/whenua and crown-funded institutions such as GLAM. This acknowledgement benefits hapori Māori. It helps community wellbeing in healing and reconciling past injustices.

Wero

Nurturing relationships with mana whenua and local hapori in order to understand their stories, how they want to access items of interest and the significance of taonga needs support from the top.

This particularly needs support at an executive leadership level where decisions about protocols are made, and practised all the way to the frontline. Strategically, the ELT is best positioned to manage the roadblocks that challenge Māori initiatives and responses in a western institution, especially in terms of practising culturally responsive values. It's important to note that such values are more likely to remain present in times of restructure when supported at upper management levels.

I challenge GLAM organisations to base the ELT on-site, so that decision-makers are connected and aware of the spaces where their intent as te Tiriti partners can be seen being *practised consistently* in the public environment.

I challenge GLAM to prioritise Kaimahi Māori to fill onsite ELT positions. They can authentically represent the space and advocate kaupapa Māori decisions and kaupapa Māori initiatives. It makes sense to prioritise speeding the kaupapa māori 'transformation' process . There is nothing to stop the GLAM sector from doing this, other than sheer lack of obligation and commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

I also challenge GLAM to ensure there's sufficient numbers of tangata whenua included in the ELT decision-making so the GI has the cultural resilience to be an ongoing dedicated Tiriti partner. If numbers are low, ELT would benefit from having a good hard look at themselves and reflect on *why*.

Limitations

- The method merely provides an overview of the current situation in GLAM space like what's not there, but it cannot necessarily address *why/why not*.
- On its own the scope of the method might not tell the whole story. It is limited because it only addresses what the researcher can see in the public space and not what is going on internally.
- Stability cannot always be measured this way as restructure brings change to certain aspects of GLAM - physically and virtually. My hope though is that values remain stable despite changes that might occur through restructure. This is justified by Te Tiriti of Waitangi being a living document which should be actually lived by and honoured in action.

Future research possibilities

This wero has provided an overview of what kind of values and principles are tangible when visiting GI. There is still a lot of scope for investigating the gaps at a much deeper level. This wero could potentially be included in wider more comprehensive qualitative mixed (braided awa) methods research. Potential future research might include asking questions such as the following:

- How much does GLAM *actually* know about how hapori Māori want to access items of interest (IOI)?
- Whānau-led: What do whānau Māori want to know about IOI in GIs?
- Why are significant policy or mission statements missing from the public interface but present behind an internal/restricted wall?
- Who are the GIs that have flourishing relationships with mana whenua and an iwi Māori-led institution and how have they been able to flourish that way?.
- How can GLAM or hapū encourage and support more whānau Māori into lead GLAM roles, including succession plans for Indigenous staff?

Conclusion

Hineahuone was the first wahine Māori to sneeze life into action, she was the first mana wahine. She is a mother, grandmother, daughter, granddaughter, wife, and aunty. She's an activist and advocate too; she drives things forward with mana and might. Her spine is her strength. It's the backbone that uplifts Maori values allowing life force to run through her veins. Her blood runs red through the whenua and awa, over the mountains. Without her strength, there would be nothing to challenge the status quo.

Hineahuone is not intended to sleep while life passes by. Memories, matauranga and stories fill her puku and nourish her spirit. Whānau connections, memories and knowledge lovingly tend to her like mārakai. This deliberate and careful mahi is vital else Hineahuone erodes away till her earth is no longer red, nor fertile. Such values are the basis of her existence. Even if the ground erodes away, we could at least rebuild from a backbone of memories, connections and knowledge that she provides. Values enable tikanga. Without this, there will simply be no backbone and no mauri.

Neoliberal restructures are not the kind of transformative solution we should 'bank on' to transform Indigenous institutions or environments. Neoliberalism is only accountable to budgetary outcomes - *not* wellbeing. Profit before people is not conducive to a healthy, equitable or resilient community. Neither is it conducive to state-funded welfare-minded cultural sectors which actually exist to provide inclusive space for Indigenous communities. Neoliberalism in GLAM will never bring transformation. Rather, it is a form of raupatu. It confiscates the rights of Hineahuone.

Graham Hingangaroa Smith (cited in Hoskins and Jones, 2012) reminds us not to get too comfortable with the status quo. When we get too used to things, we tend to stop thinking critically. And if this is the case, we'll not likely be practising reflectively and initiating meaningful significant improvements. The point of this wero is to challenge GLAM in 2023. Please set unashamedly higher expectations for the way our sector responds to whānau Māori. While there has been some progress, since

the publication and challenges set by Te Ara Tika report, this progress has not been quick enough nor consistent enough. This bear needs to be poked with a stick.

Mana wāhine have traditionally and historically been the folk to do this. Dame Whina Cooper and Saana Waitai Murray from Ngāti Kuri led the charge from Tai Tokerau down to parliament in Wellington. There have been many more mana wāhine who have led the way. Whina Cooper and Saana Waitai Murray are just a drop in the ocean full of kick ass wāhine toa. These staunch wāhine never let the status quo carry on unchallenged. God forbid if they had.

In the spirit of wāhine toa, the message to the GLAM sector would be to challenge the status quo more than it is doing. It's also important for the sector to acknowledge its own bias for it to achieve a more equitable space for Indigenous communities. This is critical for the wellbeing of hapori Māori. Honouring and understanding te Tiriti o Waitangi, a living breathing document, is essential because our bicultural nation was founded on and agreed to its terms. We need to do better, particularly in the following:

- Bilingual signage and text
- Acknowledging mana whenua
- Context
- Privacy and repatriation policy transparency for whānau
- Whānau spaces that adhere to tikanga and are uplifting places to be

Some of these issues are quicker and more simple to fix than others. For instance, improving relationships with hapori Māori would take longer than changing a sign. Nonetheless, GLAM needs to act more on its intentions. The lack of progress in Māori response seen since Tui McDonald's report up till this one, suggests disconnect in the sector. Tūpuna Māori and wāhine Māori have waited long enough. It's time for the GLAM sector to act on its Tiriti obligations and intentions.

Mauri ora

Appendices 1

Key

Hineahuone throws shade and light over the participating GIs

- Tone 4 is when *all* pou and panels are consistent in all Māori values, principles and rights, this is the shade they will be. *This* is the tone GLAM should be aspiring to ❤
- Tone 3 meets the *minimum* expectation of Māori values/rights practised
- Tone 2 allows room for reflexivity or unconscious biased interpretation
- Tone 1 means māori values/rights are barely noticeable
- Tone 0 *values* or *rights* are absent or intangible

The six glam institutions have been assigned easy pseudonyms:

- *Tahi,* an art gallery
- *Rua,* an academic library
- *Toru,* a public library
- *Whā,* a non-profit arts library
- *Rima,* a tertiary education library
- *Ono,* a museum

Appendices 2

In-person

VALUES & RIGHTS: WHAT'S THERE?	tahi	rua	toru	whā	rima	ono
VALUES: Does GI acknowledge land where	2	1	2	1	1	3
Does GI acknowledge tangata whenua?	2	0	2	2	2	3
Does GI acknowledge Mana Whenua?	0	0	2	1	1	3
Is context provided?	2	1	1	2	2	3
Is dual language used in signage?	2	1	1	1	1	3
Is dual language used in text?	2	1	1	1	2	3
Are terms used tika?	3	1	0	3	0	3
Are terms arranged beside each other?	2	0	0	2	0	3
Is reo rua consistant?						
Is GI polyvocal?	2	0	2	3	2	3
Is adverserial language/concepts avoided?	2	0	1	3	1	2
Are there clear safe spaces for hapori?	2	0	1	2	1	3
Does GI provide a whanau space?	1	1	1	2	2	3
is vibe of space and service friendly/warm	3	0	3	3	3	2
Does staff acknowledge customers in te re	3	0	2	3	1	3
RIGHTS: Is Te Tiriti acknowledged?	0	0	2	2	3	1
Is there a tangible repatriation policy?	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indigenous Mission Statement visible?	0	0	1	3	3	1
Are things in the right space?	2	0	2	3	2	2
What's not there?	casual whanau space	Manaakitanga, Reo, context, whanau friendly spaces	space for kai and whanau groups, horohu acknowledged	Dewey (yay)	appropriate placements of bins, matua collection is near social table, lacks bilingual signage, clear space for mums	lacks transparent policy, not many staff to talk to, amzing whanau friendly space

Appendices 3

Digital space

State of Wellbing for Hineahuone

VALUES & RIGHTS: WHAT'S SEEN ONLINE?	tahi	rua	toru	whā	rima	ono
VALUES: Does GI acknowledge the land?	1	2	0	2	0	3
Does GI acknowledge the people of the land?	2	0	0	3	0	3
Does GI acknowledge mana whenua?	0	0	0	0	0	3
Is context provided?	1	2	0	3	0	3
Is dual language used in signage?	1	2	1	1	0	3
Is dual language used in text?	1	1	1	1	0	3
Is bi-lingual text/signage arranged appropriate	2	1	0	2	0	3
Is reo rua consistant?						
Are terms used tika?	2	2	1	2	0	3
Is GI polyvocal?	2	2	1	3	0	3
Avoids adverserial language/concepts?	2	1	1	3	0	3
Are there clear safe spaces for hapori?	2	2	1	3	0	3
Does GI provide space to listen?	2	3	3	3	3	3
Is ol space Indigenous service friendly?	1	1	1	3	0	3
RIGHTS: Does GI acknowledge Te Tiriti	3	0	1	3	0	3
Are things in the right space?	2	1	1	3	0	3
Indigenous mission statements/policy visible?	1	1	1	2	0	3
Is repatriation rights policy tangible?	1	0	1	1	0	3
Recruitment	1	0	0	2	2	2
Social Media	2	1	1	2	1	2
What is missing?	Mana Whenua nod	Open Access implications	Pages, context	links to Indigenous socials & sites		links missing
What's notably positive?	Whanau permission for reprints	Better than inperson vibe		Article 2 throughout		Strong
Links						

Bibliography

Adichie, C.N. (2009, October). Danger of a Single Story. TED Talk.
https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single
_story/transcript?language=en

Atuahiva, S., Jorgensen, A. (2023, 30th September). "What is Māori Heritage",
Auckland Libraries Heritage Talks Series 2023.

Battiste,M. (2014). Research Ethics for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and
Heritage: Institutional and Researcher Responsibilities. *Handbook of Critical
and Indigenous Methodologies*.(p. 497-) SAGE publications. Inc.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483385686

Doyle, A.M., Dupont,S.,Lawson, K. (2015). Indigenization of Knowledge
Organization at the X̱wi7x̱wa Library. *Journal of Library and Information
Studies* 13(2), 107-133. http://doi.org/10.6182/jlis.2015.13(2).107

Durie, M. (2016). Mauri Ora: Indigenous Human Flourishing. *Nga Pae o te
Maramatanga 7th Biennial International Indigenous Research Conference*
https://www.maramatanga.ac.nz/node/1654

Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora : The Dynamics of Māori Health*. Auckland, N.Z:
Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiora : Māori Health Development* (2nd ed.). Auckland, N.Z:
Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1999). Marae and Implications for a Modern Māori Psychology:
Elsdon best memorial medal address polynesian society annual general
meeting, 1999. *Journal of the Polynesian Society, 108*(4), 351-366.

Hoskins, C. T. K., & Jones, A. (2012). Kaupapa māori : The dangers of
domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 10-20.

Husband, D. (2023, 22nd August). Interview with Shona Rapira-Davies - Contemporary Artist. Radio Waatea. https://waateanews.com/2023/08/22/shona-rapira-davies-contemporary-artists/

Inu, S., Miller-Kareko, D. (2021, 9th November). Responding to the call of Whānau Māori: Indigenizing Library Practice. *LIANZA Conference*.

Lee-Morgan, J., Penetito, K., Mane, J., & Eruera, N. (2021). Marae Ora Kāinga Ora: Indigenous Health and Wellbeing Solutions via Time-Honored Indigenous Spaces. *Genealogy (Basel), 5*(4), 99. doi:10.3390/genealogy5040099

Lilley, S. C. (2016). Ko Aotearoa Tenei: Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights in Aotearoa New Zealand. In C. Callison, L. Roy, & G. LeCheminant (Eds.), *Indigenous Notions of Ownership and Libraries, Archives and Museums* (pp. 107-125). Berlin, Germany: DeGruyter.

Lilley, S.C. (2019). The Role of Libraries in Indigenous Language Revitalization: A te Reo Māori perspective. *Book 2.0*, 9(1 & 2), 93-104. http://doi.org/10.1386/btw0_0009_1

Lilley, S.C. (2017). Developing Māori Collections. *Collection and Curation*, 38 (1). 15-18. http://doi.org/10.1108/CC-09-2017-0041

MacDonald, T. (1993). *Te Ara Tika : Māori and Libraries : A Research Report*. Wellington N.Z: New Zealand Library & Information Association.

Mead, S. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori : Living by Māori Values*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Mikaere, A. (2003). *The balance destroyed : The consequences for māori women of the colonisation of tikanga māori*

Mila - Schaaf, K. (2010). *Polycultural Capital and the Pasifika Second Generation: Negotiating Identities in Diasporic Spaces.* [Doctoral Thesis. University of Auckland].https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/1713

Peters, R.J. (2021). Papatūānuku's progeny: Foremothers of Māori women's poetry written In English [Doctoral thesis, The University of Auckland]. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/58569

Pihama, L., Smith, L. T., Simmonds, N., Seed-Pihama, J., & Gabel, K. (2019). *Mana wahine reader. volume II, A collection of writings 1999-2019.* Hamilton, Aotearoa/New Zealand: Te Kotahi Research Institute.

Pohio, N. (2023, July 29). *Ever Present: First Peoples Art of Australia.- Artist Talk*. Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki.

Porter, L., et al (2017). Indigenous Planning: From principles to practice - Being Ourselves and Seeing ourselves in the City: Enabling the conceptual space for indigenous urban planning/U. *Planning Theory & Practice, 18*(4), 639-666. doi:10.1080/14649357.2017.1380961

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Smith, L.T. (2001). Decolonising Indigenous Knowledge. *International indigenous librarians' forum : Proceedings*. Wellington, N.Z: Te Rōpū Whakahau.

Taiapa, K., Barnes, H. M., & McCreanor, T. (2021). Marakai as Sites of Ahi Kaa and Resistance. *MAI Journal: A New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Scholarship, 10*(2), 149. http://doi:10.20507/MAIJournal.2021.10.2.8

Taunga, K. (2023, March). Te Paataka Koorero o Takaanini, Takaanini library & Community Hub (Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland). A Whānau Centric Library and Community Hub. *IFLA LBES Mid Year Seminar - Building Excellence: Global and Indigenous Trends in Library Design.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UAURpZb6F6I

Tuhou, T.M.P. (2011). *Barriers to Māori Usage of University Libraries : An Exploratory Study In Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand. School of Information Management.

Yates, A. (2016). Mauri-Ora: Architecture, Indigeneity, and Immanence Ethics. *Architectural Theory Review, 21*(2), 261-275. doi:10.1080/13264826.2017.1288638

Waitere, H., & Johnston, P. (2009). Echoed Silences : In Absentia : Mana Wahine in Institutional Contexts. *Women's Studies Journal, 23*(2), 14-31.

Waru, S., & Popata, D. (2021). Mauri ora : Creating a Model of Practice Using Indigenous Tikanga. *Te Kaharoa the E-Journal of Indigenous Pacific Issues, 14*(1)

Worth, S. (2018). This Library Takes an Indigenous Approach To Categorizing Books. *Yes Magazine* https://www.yesmagazine.org/social-justice/2019/03/22/decolonize-western-bias-indigenous-library-books