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How does evaluation incorporate cultural values when being applied to a programme derived from an indigenous ontology?
“Another challenge to psychology is to examine the discipline and its theory; training practices; methods employed, and their appropriate application to Aboriginal people (e.g. the use of Western tests on Aboriginal clients. It has been recognised that these tests were not ‘culture-fair’ but they are still being used.)”

Rob Riley (1995) Keynote speech to Australian Psychological Society Annual Conference, Perth, Western Australia
“For Maori, indeed for all indigenous people the issue is the identification of the trauma, as Post Colonial Traumatic Stress Disorder in order to site the issue in its proper historical, political and economic context. Does your training and education address issues like the nature of the Maori...?”

About “cultural-readiness”...

Abbott and Durie (1987) documented the monocultural nature of professional training programmes in psychology were using Masters-Awatere (2005) international analysis of evaluation professional groups to examine the extent to which cultural frameworks (and indigenous people) were included in standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who I engaged with</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emails, telephone, face to face meetings</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Indigenous evaluators</td>
<td>Relationship building/ Discuss values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui, wananga, focus group, and individual</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Indigenous communities</td>
<td>Discuss values &amp; recruit case study groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>Indigenous evaluators</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>Indigenous communities</td>
<td>Case studies data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Analysis</td>
<td>2005-09</td>
<td>Evaluation Agencies*</td>
<td>International context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback loop</td>
<td>2007-10</td>
<td>Case study groups</td>
<td>Give information of use and relevance back to sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Work</td>
<td>2006-11</td>
<td>Government groups</td>
<td>Understand frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis write up, conference presentations</td>
<td>2012-2014</td>
<td>Scholars, and practitioners such</td>
<td>Disseminate my ideas and get feedback while writing my thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Culturally blind evaluation
Scientific-objective with generalisable results

Kaupapa Māori programmes
He Oranga Marae, Whaia te Ora, Kia Maia, Kereru

Imported agenda
Funding & reporting structure
Māori agenda

Culturally embedded

Whitestream Evaluation
Culturally blind

Culturally Confident Evaluation
Culturally engaged

Generic agenda
1. Was the evaluation theorised through a historical/materialist framework, which considered the context of colonialism and imperialism?

2. Was there a conscious consideration of diverse cultural positioning in relation to the evaluation commissioner/funder?

3. Did the evaluation commissioner support a capitalist/colonialist perspective that privileged their informational desires over those that could empower a disenfranchised group?

4. Did the commissioner promote individual choice and impartiality over social transformation?
**Māori agenda**

- **Internal context application**
  - (e.g., Agenda & resources)

**Agenda interface**

- **Kaupapa Māori Programmes**
  - Kaupapa a Motu Programmes
    - (Nationwide focus)
    - National implementation
      - (e.g., He Oranga Marae)
  - Kaupapa a Iwi Programmes
    - (Regional focus)
    - Multi-regional
      - (e.g., Kia Maia)
    - Single region
      - (e.g., Whaia te Ora)
  - Kaupapa a Hapū Programmes
    - (Sub-region focus)
    - Specific hapū group
      - (e.g., Kereru case study)

**Culturally Confluent Evaluation**

- Culturally engaged

**Whitestream Evaluation**

- Culturally blind

**External context application**

- (e.g., Agenda & resources)
Culture in Evaluation

- How well has the evaluation considered the cultural diversity of those involved with the programme?
- How effectively does the evaluation capture and use evidence to determine key Māori health outcomes?
- How effectively has the evaluation incorporated the aspirations of the key stakeholder groups in its design?
- How well has the evaluation created opportunities for Mana whenua/taura here?
Where does this leave us?

- More than a passing glance at the effectiveness of programmes by, to, and for indigenous groups is needed.
- Homogenising – applying a region specific rule to the whole race/culture – needs to be deconstructed so that the privileged who deem what is appropriate and when for discussion are held to account.
- Without consequences for failures, rewards for culturally accountable work that focuses on successes and strengths, people will respond with indifference.
- Ignorance will not be tolerated.
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