

**COUNSELLING AND GUIDANCE  
PROGRAMME  
RESEARCH PROJECT HANDBOOK**

**253.800**

**RESEARCH PROJECT IN COUNSELLING  
(45 credits)**

**PAPER COORDINATOR:  
DR KAREN FREWIN  
(k.e.frewin@massey.ac.nz)**

**2016**

### **Acknowledgement**

Thanks to Laurie Marshall, IOE  
for the formatting of this material.

THIS MATERIAL IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND HAS BEEN COPIED BY AND SOLELY FOR THE EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES OF THE UNIVERSITY UNDER LICENCE. YOU MAY NOT SELL, ALTER OR FURTHER REPRODUCE OR DISTRIBUTE ANY PART OF THIS COURSE PACK/MATERIAL TO ANY OTHER PERSON. WHERE PROVIDED TO YOU IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT, YOU MAY ONLY PRINT FROM IT FOR YOUR OWN PRIVATE STUDY AND RESEARCH. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THIS WARNING MAY EXPOSE YOU TO LEGAL ACTION FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND/OR DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY.

# CONTENTS

Haere Mai and Welcome to Counselling Research!.....	1
Research Projects .....	2
1.0 General Information .....	3
2.0 Schedule of Key Dates and Actions.....	6
3.0 Resources .....	7
4.0 Submission of Research Proposal Outline .....	7
5.0 Examples of Research Topics.....	8
6.0 Supervision .....	9
7.0 Supervision Procedures.....	10
8.0 Ethical Considerations .....	11
9.0 Presentation of the Project.....	14
10.0 Examination of the Project.....	17
11.0 Intention to publish.....	18
Appendix 1 – Examples of Previous Projects Submitted.....	22
Appendix 2 – Information to contributors: New Zealand Journal of Counselling.....	24
Appendix 3 – Annotated Bibliography Procedures.....	25
Appendix 4 - Article Facing Sheet .....	30
Appendix 5 – Information and Guidelines for Examiners .....	31
Appendix 6 – Nomination of Supervisors for Project (Counselling).....	36
Appendix 7 – Supervision Record.....	38
Appendix 8 – How to Access Stream.....	40
Appendix 9 – Massey University Library.....	41
Reading 1 .....	45
Reading 2 .....	50
Reading 3 .....	52



# HAERE MAI AND WELCOME TO COUNSELLING RESEARCH!

This paper, 253.800, is the 45 credit research paper that forms a compulsory component of the Master of Counselling Studies degree.

**By the time you are reading this Handbook you may have already established contact with staff who are supervising counselling research (see Section 6.0) and you might have a research project outline planned and approved in general terms. If not, you need to contact the paper coordinator, Dr Karen Frewin, as soon as possible so we can get the process underway.**

At the successful completion of this paper, you will be able to:

1. Design, manage, complete and present a sustained piece of individual research that demonstrates a sophisticated operationalisation of a research question relevant to professional counselling.
2. Demonstrate a reflective and critical approach to the practice of research, applying appropriate ethical considerations.
3. Collect, analyse and synthesise information from a range of sources and demonstrate the ability to interpret complex information.

The broad definition of research adopted for this paper, drawn from John McLeod's (2003) work is

'A systematic enquiry, leading to valid propositions and communicated to interested others' (p. 4).

Empirical research with multiple human participants is **NOT** encouraged for the 253.800 project. This is because the ethical approval required for such research is complex, and the time limit for completing this project is short. The kind of research project you are required to complete is:

- a critical and substantive systematic literature review

Ethical issues are described by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC), see:

[http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/research-ethics\\_home.cfm](http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/research-ethics_home.cfm).

# RESEARCH PROJECTS

In the library there are examples of previous counselling projects which you can search and borrow in the usual way. We do not encourage students in this paper to choose a topic and a research approach at random. This is because it is too difficult to produce empirical research of any value in the time allowed for this paper.

A critical systematic literature review is an appropriate form of research in a project of this size. Over time, the various reviews completed by students will form a critical mass which will be of professional use in the counselling field in Aotearoa New Zealand.

We invite you to think about the following:

## **CRITICAL SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

A critical systematic literature review will be a valuable addition to current knowledge about a specific topic, especially if based on local studies in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Generally, a critical systematic literature review will critically examine the literature available on a chosen topic. Summaries and comments on appropriate literature will be included, alongside a critique of the literature, research, and studies, that constitute your review. Your project will include an introduction to your topic, a methods section (how you have searched and decided upon your literature), a review (i.e. a presentation) and critique of the chosen studies, a discussion that can include recommendations, and a conclusion.

A critical systematic literature review can include, when appropriate, personal, evocative writing about your own experience of that chosen topic. This can be appealing to people who tend to reflect on the ups and downs of life via writing. There are good examples of this kind of study in the library in the Masters of Counselling Projects section. To illustrate the academic literature using personal examples is particularly consistent with the goals of counselling. You can read more information about this particular approach below in General Information.

# 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

## Contemporary Research

This research project involves approaching a counselling and/or guidance issue with an enquiring mind and the intention to examine its nature and implications.

Research into counselling and psychotherapy has tended to reflect the epistemologies, and therefore the methods, of the natural and medical sciences (Etherington, 2000; McLeod, 1999). Until the mid-1990s, quantitative methods predominated, especially in research emerging from the USA where most counsellors and psychotherapists would have a first degree in psychology (Polkinghorne, 1999). Counselling research based in Aotearoa New Zealand, sits within these international trends, although unique indigenous and critical influences are of course a powerful part of any research undertaken here.

One of the leaders of the radical shift towards qualitative and new paradigm research in counselling in the UK is John McLeod (McLeod, 2011, 2003). This shift reflects similar (and earlier) movements in the social sciences generally. Increased interest in qualitative studies since the mid-1990s is illustrated by the launch of the *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research* journal (CPR), of which John McLeod was the first editor. CPR is now circulated to over 20,000 members of the *British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy*. Its 'Notes for Contributors' page, emphasises that, unlike the majority of journals in the field, CPR welcomes articles that are reflexive, contextualised and practitioner-orientated.

To enable you to acquire a practitioner-researcher-disseminator orientation to your work, **the presentation of the 253.800 research project is in the form of a journal article.** It is our belief that constantly improving practice requires an investigative stance and the sharing of ideas and findings. We want students to orient themselves towards publishing material, to increase the stock of ideas and research findings in Aotearoa New Zealand. Undertaking research and publishing findings should be part of the ongoing performance of professionals in the guidance and counselling field.

Recent moves to increase awareness of the politics of knowledge (Denzin & Giardina, 2007) have led to major debates in education, health disciplines, and even in cognitive behavioural practice and research, where until fairly recently, only empirical, positivist research has been 'acceptable'.

Traditionally, as previously mentioned, research in the talking therapies (counselling, coaching, psychotherapy) has been dominated by the medical model and more recently by 'evidence-based practice'. What constitutes 'evidence' is controversial and Cooper (2008)

provides a very accessible way into this debate, as does McLeod (2000) who weighs up various philosophies of knowledge and the dominance of the logical and scientific. This dominance has led to an over-valuing of quantitative, and some qualitative approaches, where objectivity is the goal. Through this dominant standpoint subjectivity, context, and lived experience, were largely discounted.

This is no longer the case and as part of the shift towards qualitative research in the talking therapies (McLeod, 2011), the ideal of reflexivity (Etherington, 2004) and the postmodern emphasis on subjectivities has moved some practitioner-researchers towards using themselves and their experience in research (Lang, 2011, Wright, 2009). Known as auto-ethnography, this is a challenging option and is not easy (Chang, 2008). Consult with one of the team before taking up this approach.

### **Specific Guidelines for Paper 253.800**

Paper number	253.800
Credits	45
Word length	6500 maximum
Annotated Bibliography in Supplementary Materials	15 annotations minimum/20 maximum
Project Type	Critical Systematic Literature Review
Ethics Application	Low Risk Notification made to Supervisor

### **How to Make a Start**

#### **Step one – explore your approach**

Select a topic area and discuss it with the paper coordinator or a potential supervisor you have already identified. Some supervisors have specific topic areas of interest. Via the paper coordinator, check out whether these areas are of interest to you. This will give you a ready-made topic that will add to existing literature. You do not have to identify your own supervisor, it is simply an option. Relevant and experienced supervisors will be allocated to students who have not organised a potential supervisor.

Refine your topic - it is almost always the case that Masters students start out with ideas of a size which would be appropriate for several PhDs or even Nobel prizes! It is likely that the paper coordinator and/or your supervisor will suggest you reduce the size of the project.

You might want to ask yourself some questions:

- ? Is there a single, clear research focus?

- ? Why is it worth your energies to research this topic for a year?
- ? What are the benefits of the proposed research and for whom?
- ? Who will benefit/potentially be harmed, and what are the cultural implications of such ethical questions?
- ? How will I benefit as a researcher?
- ? Is the research manageable in the time I have available?

**Step Two - Begin a search of the relevant literature and peer reviewed, published research.**

This initial or provisional literature review is useful in a number of ways:

- Development of a theoretical perspective, which may influence the research design.
- Avoiding duplication of research in the field.
- Contextualising the research.
- Before you can decide if there is a gap in the topic area you have chosen to research, you must complete an initial literature survey. Where are the gaps? What makes this particular project worthwhile in order to fill those gaps?

Make an appointment by email, phone, or in person, to contact the paper coordinator or potential supervisor to discuss your ideas.

**Step Three - More library research.**

Check links and materials on Stream.

**Step Four - Consider the ethical issues.**

**NB:** Once proposals are accepted and the project is underway, students need to liaise with their research supervisor in order to complete a Low Risk Notification (Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC)). This is **lodged with the supervisor only** and is subsequently included in the Supplementary materials.

**Step Five - Complete your Research Proposal Outline and submit it by 1<sup>st</sup> February.**

**Please note: These can be accepted from 1 December 2015.**

## 2.0 SCHEDULE OF KEY DATES AND ACTIONS

The following are key dates and actions:

By 1 <sup>st</sup> February	Submit Research Outline Begin Ethics Low Risk Notification
By 1 <sup>st</sup> March	Notification of Assigned Supervisor
By 14 <sup>th</sup> March	Supervisors response to Research Outline
By 4 <sup>th</sup> July	Completed Progress Report from student due at Institute of Education
By 11 <sup>th</sup> November	If you wish to be assured of graduating at your chosen ceremony, submit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) Article (with: Facing pages - see Appendices 2 and 4)</li><li>(ii) Supplementary Materials with:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Supplementary Notes (see 9.3)</li><li>○ Candidate's Statement (see 9.5)</li><li>○ Supervision Diary (see 7.4. and 9.3)</li><li>○ Annotated Bibliography (see 9.3 and Appendix 3)</li><li>○ Low Risk Notification (see 8.0)</li></ul></li></ul>
By 25 <sup>th</sup> November	Absolutely final date for submission of materials.

### Notes:

- (i) The Project should be able to be completed within the academic year of enrolment.
- (ii) A research outline for the Project may be submitted at any time in the year preceding enrolment but **must** be submitted at the latest by 1<sup>st</sup> February in the year of enrolment. Outlines submitted in the preceding year (while you are completing your chosen methods paper) must show evidence that the outline has been monitored and approved by the staff in that paper. (It is expected that students submitting outlines during the year they are taking 267.782 or 267.783 will not be in a position to present a formal proposal for 253.800 until **close to the end of the year before enrolment**, when outlines have been commented on and approved as satisfactory for course requirements.)

- (iii) If a student wants to **graduate** in the Auckland, Palmerston North or Wellington ceremonies (April/May) the completed project must be submitted by 11<sup>th</sup> November in the year of enrolment.
- (iv) In **exceptional circumstances** an application can be made for a delayed submission, up until January 30<sup>th</sup>. Apply with the support of your supervisor to the Postgraduate Administrator: ([IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz](mailto:IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz)).

## 3.0 RESOURCES

Within the research methods paper previously undertaken, you will have been introduced to resources that will be helpful to you in undertaking this research project.

### Some key titles are:

McLeod, J. (2011). *Qualitative research in counselling and psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). London England: Sage.

McLeod, J. (2003). *Doing counselling research*. London England: Sage.

There are multiple copies of these titles in the library.

## 4.0 SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL OUTLINE

For the critical systematic literature review research, the 5-7 page research proposal outline is straight forward. The outline should follow 267.782 or 267.783 guidelines and needs to cover the main features of the Project. It is acceptable to submit an outline that was submitted as part of your previously undertaken methods paper. This is on the proviso that you have made any modifications based on the assessment feedback you received for that piece of work, and that you have reformatted it as being a proposal for this Project rather than just the exact layout sent in for your methods research proposal assignment.

For critical systematic literature review research an outline will normally contain the following:

- A working **title**.
- A statement of the **aim(s)** of the research - incorporating a description of the problem or issue to be examined.
- A list of the **research questions to be examined** in the study.
- An outline of the **major databases** to be consulted and reviewed.

- A suggested **time frame** to be followed throughout the Project.
- The **names of possible supervisors** at the University (see Section 6.0 on Supervision and the enclosure on Staff Research Interests).
- A statement of **expected outcomes**.
- A tentative **outline of the structure** of the final report (article) and a time line.

An electronic version of the research proposal outline, accompanied by the Research Outline Summary Sheet, must be uploaded to the Stream dropbox by 1<sup>st</sup> February.

While 1<sup>st</sup> February is the date for submission of a research proposal outline it is obviously more satisfactory if you and your supervisor can communicate with each other before this date. Your proposal is a preliminary outline of the topic and both you and your supervisor may wish to explore alternative possibilities before settling on an agreed approach. This will only be relevant if you have already organised a supervisor.

Complete a Research Outline Summary Sheet (See Appendix 6) and upload with your research outline to the Stream dropbox.

★ **Do not send your outline directly to the person you are expecting to supervise your research.**

## 5.0 EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH TOPICS

Some examples of research projects already undertaken for 253.758 and 253.800 are listed in Appendix 1. A full list can be obtained from the Institute Secretary and the library holds some of the projects. At various points through the year you may find it helpful to borrow some completed projects to assist you with developing yours. Take advice from your supervisor on this, who may also be able to recommend which projects may be most helpful.

These past projects may still be informative for 253.800 students; though be aware of revised conditions, i.e. 258.758 projects were shorter (5,000 words; 30 credits), and projects are now required to be in journal article format.

## 6.0 SUPERVISION

### **Staff Interests**

An indication of staff members' fields of interest can be identified through the Institute of Education Research site. Where your topic and a staff member's field of interest coincide there may be the possibility of organising supervision with them. However, as some staff will be more heavily loaded with graduate supervision and teaching than others, you may be allocated a supervisor other than the one you nominate.

### **Approaching a possible Supervisor**

Some students will have had contact with potential supervisors while preparing their final assignment for their research methods paper. In some cases this contact may be continued into the Project itself.

You may independently wish to approach a potential supervisor before firming up your proposal. You are welcome to make informal contacts with likely supervisors but eventually the allocation of supervision is the responsibility of the Research Coordinator.

### **Field Consultant(s)**

While this is not a requirement, you may find it very useful to locate an experienced person in your region who is willing to assist from time to time with the development of your Project. Suitable field consultants will be people who have had experience in conducting research projects as part of their own course of study or practice or in their everyday working context.

### **Cultural Consultation**

This is likely to be vital to your project if your topic is directly about cultural issues, to respect Te Roopu Kaiwhiriwhiri o Aotearoa/New Zealand Association of Counsellors (TRKA/NZAC) and Treaty of Waitangi commitments. See [www.nzac.org.nz](http://www.nzac.org.nz) for details.

### **Allocation of Supervisor**

Supervisors for all Masterate research projects in the Massey University Institute of Education will be allocated officially by the Institute. All students will receive official notification of their supervisor as soon as possible after early March in the year of enrolment.

NOTE: You cannot start your research until you have been officially notified of your supervisor.

## 7.0 SUPERVISION PROCEDURES

### **Supervisor's and Student's Responsibilities**

Supervision is a shared process. It is the supervisor's responsibility to offer suggestions, guidance and, where necessary, direction in order to create the conditions in which you can develop and complete your Project to your satisfaction, and in the time available.

It is your responsibility to seek guidance and advice from your supervisor, especially where uncertainty or options arise. From time to time your supervisor might offer suggestions and you must make decisions about whether to accept these or not. The capacity of students to evaluate supervision advice and to make sensible choices becomes part of the evaluation process.

### **Project Approval**

Once approval has been received you are expected to move generally along the time-line laid out in the proposal. Severe disruptions to the time-line for personal or other reasons must be communicated to the supervisor and the Project re-evaluated.

### **On-Campus Attendance and Supervision Schedule**

You could look to being on campus for supervision at some point in the undertaking of the Project. This may be at the same time as on-campus attendance for other courses, such as within Professional Development workshops. Students should contact their supervisor about availability then, and at other times during the year.

Note: Supervision online (using Skype or similar) is also a possibility, and is becoming more widely used.

### **Supervision Diary**

It is a requirement that students make formal contact with their supervisor at least **once a month** by telephone, letter, online or personal contact. This monthly contact and other involvement should be recorded in a supervision diary kept by you and may be substantive or simply a confirmation that contact around a certain issue was made. You should make a record of all contacts made with your supervisor.

The Supervision Diary should be submitted as part of the Supplementary material with the Project and will be taken as evidence that both parties to the supervision process have met their responsibilities. See Appendix 7 for suggested format.

### **Progress Reports**

A mid-year (July 4<sup>th</sup>) report from students on the progress of the Project will be requested by the Institute of Education. This report will comment briefly on the progress being made on the Project, the supervision contacts, and any on-campus interviews, etc. Supervisors will be asked to comment on the progress report's indication of progress. You will be contacted nearer this date with the forms for completion.

## **8.0 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The ethical guidelines below, and principles for the conduct of educational research, are based on similar guidelines developed by the New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE) and the Code of Ethical Conduct developed by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. Even though the scope of this Project does not permit you to pursue empirical research, understanding ethical considerations is vital for all researchers, so we have retained this section in the study guide.

### **Ethical Responsibility**

Responsibility for establishing and maintaining ethical practices in the conduct of research lies with you, and you should fully discuss with your supervisor all the ethical implications of the study.

There are four circumstances, where an application **must** be made to the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) through the supervisor:

- When participants are to be subjected to procedures that are potentially harmful to their physical or mental health.
- When specific advice is needed on the nature of ethical problems and their solution in a particular project.
- When, after discussion with the supervisor, unresolved ethical issues are apparent.
- When an external agency requires certification of ethical approval as a prerequisite for funding, for screening by their own ethical committee or allowing access to agency operations.

All students enrolled in 253.800 will work with their supervisor in order to create a Low Risk Notification which is lodged with the supervisor (not MUHEC).

See <http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/human-ethics/> for further information and the forms themselves.

## General Principles

Ethical principles are not to be confused with ethical rules. Rules are specific and prescribe or forbid certain actions. Principles, on the other hand, are typically general and need to be interpreted before being applied in a particular context.

The major ethical principles in the conduct of research are:

- **informed consent** of the participants;
- **confidentiality** of the data and the identity of individuals providing it;
- **minimising of harm** to all persons involved in or affected by the research or its outcomes;
- **truthfulness**, an avoidance of any unnecessary deception;
- **social sensitivity** to the age, gender, culture, religion, social class of the subjects.

In all cases research subjects have rights that supersede those of the investigator, irrespective of the age of the subjects. The interests of society in general, and the welfare of research subjects in particular, take precedence over the interests of the researcher.

## Specific Rights and Responsibilities

- Research subjects, or those who act *in loco parentis*, have the right to refuse to participate in the research without penalty, and the right to withdraw from the research without penalty.
- The researcher has a responsibility to ensure that no research procedure is used that may cause physical or psychological harm to the subject (e.g., research proposals involving 'timeout' or where interviews might prove upsetting to participants should be referred to the Human Ethics Committee).
- The researcher has a responsibility to ensure that the demand made upon the time of participants does not adversely affect them.
- The rights of particular ethnic or cultural groups should be acknowledged and respected. (For instance, in Māori and Pasifika cultures, 'knowledge' is regarded as the property of the group, and while it may be borrowed or shared, it may not be taken. Thus researchers must ensure that they do not use such knowledge as if it were their own; access to it must remain in the control of the appropriate group who will continue to determine who has access, under what conditions, and for what purposes.)

## Consent and Confidentiality

If a study involves human participants, consent should be obtained. See the MUHEC site for a template to be used for this purpose.

To ensure that such consent is **informed**, the researcher should:

- provide all participants with a comprehensible explanation of the nature and purpose of the research, including any features that may affect subjects' willingness to participate;
- answer all questions from participants to their satisfaction, and in terms that are appropriate to their comprehension;
- inform and obtain consent from parents, guardians and/or those who act *in loco parentis* where such consent is appropriate;
- ensure that participants understand that they may decline to participate or withdraw from the activity at any time without penalty of any sort and that their privacy and confidentiality will be protected.

Where the research entails gaining access to institutional records, the researcher should gain the consent both of the participants and of the institution concerned.

Participants should be assured that their identity will be concealed during the processing and reporting of the research, and should be informed of the measures taken to ensure confidentiality of information, including video and audio recording.

### **Feedback and Reporting**

At an appropriate time (i.e., when there is sufficient data and analysis to permit it) participants should be given feedback on the research and the opportunity provided for any misconceptions to be clarified and questions answered.

Researchers should acknowledge the co-operation and contribution of all concerned in the conduct of the research.

Normally a Project is a public document and should not contain any confidential or personal material unless permission has been verifiably obtained.

Researchers have a responsibility in reporting their research to ensure that due regard is given to the role and interests of all parties concerned, and the social, political and human implications.

This may necessitate:

- acknowledging any assistance received;
- stating the particular ethical concerns that have been considered and the principles that have been followed;
- reporting research even if the results conflict with the researcher's expectations.

This section has provided a brief overview of ethical considerations. Students **must** consult the Massey Code of Ethical Conduct

(<http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/human-ethics/>)

in constructing their proposal and then further developing the design.

All students need to prepare a Low Risk Notification form which is lodged with your supervisor (**not** with MUHEC).

## 9.0 PRESENTATION OF THE PROJECT

### Format

The Project is not a thesis and will not resemble a thesis in depth of inquiry or length of reporting. We are keen that the material presented is read rather than just being shelved. Therefore, **the projects are to be presented in the form of a journal article that potentially can be published as soon as possible after completion and assessment.**

### Notes:

- (i) Place your Acknowledgements in the Supplementary Material.
- (ii) Word length – 6500 words  $\pm$ 10%.

In Appendix 2, 'Information for Contributors' for the New Zealand Journal of Counselling is provided. This serves as the basic guidelines for article preparation. A number of projects already completed have been published in journals.

### Supplementary Materials

As we are now using Stream, we are asking you to submit the supplementary materials electronically. Even though the major project will be article length, it is still essential to develop and undertake the Project with appropriate scope and due regard for fundamental research principles.

To ensure that this happens, in addition to and separate from the article, you will need to submit the following:

- **Supplementary Notes** on methodology, results and analysis matters. These need to be sufficient to cover key procedures and issues and to clarify any likely points of contention.
- **where relevant**, illustrative materials, samples of letters or questionnaires, transcripts or other 'raw' data.
- **earlier drafts** and '**think pieces**', that illustrate the development of ideas.

- An **Annotated Bibliography** of major literature studied (some of which will be referred to in the article), with summary comments on themes and issues relevant to the project topic. It is expected that there will be at least 15 central literature sources included (see Appendix 3 for details of procedures for completing the Annotated Bibliography).
- **Supervision Diary**, including dates and outcomes from supervision.

Supervisors will assist in determining exactly what is required for this supplementary material. Note that the overall tasks of the supplementary material are to provide evidence of the writing stages of the Project and to demonstrate that the reported procedures were undertaken. **The Supplementary material is part of the Project and is assessed.**

### Writing Style

Your project article should be written in an appropriate 'academic' style that also suits journal publication. The supervisor should also be consulted about matters of style at an early stage in the writing.

As the writing of the research article develops, it is useful to keep asking the following questions:

- Is the purpose of the Project made clear and kept to the forefront at all transition points?
- Is there a clear focus and direction for each section?
- Could an intelligent reader make sense of what is written without having to (i) sift through unnecessary detail or (ii) guess the meaning of key ideas/terms?
- Are the procedures (methods) adequately described?
- Has the evidence been adequately reported?
- Are the conclusions warranted?
- Has the theory/literature been integrated with the methodology and the analysis and discussion?
- Are links made with other related research or guidance and counselling issues?
- Have the constraints and limitations of the study been sufficiently considered?
- Have all the ethical considerations been addressed?
- Does it meet the length requirement? (NB: The Abstract and Reference list are extra to this).

**Two (2) paper copies** of the article and **one (electronic) copy** of the Supplementary Material, and **an electronic version of your article**, must be submitted by **11<sup>th</sup> November** in the year of enrolment to be eligible to graduate at your chosen ceremony. The absolute final date for submission of your project is 25<sup>th</sup> November. One copy of your Supervision Record (Appendix 7) must be attached to the hard copies of your project). You should keep a

copy for yourself. The supervisor may retain a copy of the article and one copy will be held on file, and possibly catalogued in the library. Submit the electronic copies via the dropbox on the 253.800 Stream site.

### **Candidate's Statement**

You are required to include with the Supplementary Material a statement certifying that the Project submitted is the result of your own work, except where otherwise acknowledged, and that this Project or any part of the same has not been submitted for other papers or degrees for which credit or qualifications have been granted.

### **Binding**

The two paper copies of the article should be presented in plastic spiral-bound form with a clear plastic cover and an initial facing page with the information shown in Appendix 4.

**SEND TWO (2) PAPER COPIES OF YOUR PROJECT AND ONE SUPERVISION RECORD TO  
ARRIVE BY 11<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER TO:**

**The Postgraduate Administrator,  
Massey University  
Institute of Education  
Private Bag 11 222  
Palmerston North 4442**

**AND PLACE AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS AND  
PROJECT IN THE DROPBOX ON THE 253.800 STREAM SITE  
ALSO BY THE 11TH NOVEMBER.**

## 10.0 EXAMINATION OF THE PROJECT

The Project will be examined by two independent examiners. They may be Massey University staff members, or from another institution.

Assessment will include both a letter grade and a written report (see Appendix 5). In broad terms, the article will be worth 80% of the final grade and the Supplementary Material 20%. Official results will be notified through the normal examination process and are open to re-consideration in the same way as other results.

The examiner will be asked to provide a written report, which will usually include:

- an overall evaluation of the substance and quality of the Project;
- an indication of particular strengths or weaknesses of such features as research procedures, theoretical rigour, interpretation and argument, and professional significance appropriate to the nature of the Project; and
- comments on particular strengths or weaknesses in presentation and reporting.

Although there is no one set of criteria by which the material may be examined, the following set of broad guidelines (appropriate to the Project form and style) are used:

- **Format:** Is the Project presented in journal article format?
- **Focus:** Are the objectives and research questions clear?
- **Foundations:** Is the research connected to established knowledge or practice experience (demonstrated through literature sources and citing); this will also involve a critical approach to established theory?
- **Methodology:** Has the means for researching the research questions being adequately justified? Are issues of ethics, validity, reliability, suitably addressed? Are the procedures followed for data collection appropriate?
- **Results:** Are the results presented in a clear, concise and meaningful way? Has good use been made of such things as Tables, Figures, Data, Quotations, to illuminate? Is critique of the literature clearly visible?
- **Discussion:** Does the discussion link the findings to established knowledge or practice experience (either in support or challenge) and to the research aims? Is there an extension into implications?
- **Conclusion:** Is the material of the Project brought together in a concise manner with conclusions that are appropriate and that arise from the study without going beyond it?

These points should be demonstrated in the article. Where the article does not allow full handling of an issue (e.g., a discussion of diverging theoretical stances in the literature or

examination of arguments for and against a particular methodology) this should be located in the supplementary material. Typically these might be in the form of 'think-pieces'.

**Writing/Presentation:** As well as the above, presentation of the article material is important. Matters of clarity, format, style, organisation, accuracy and readability should be considered, and the latest APA referencing style used (see Massey OWLL).

The guidelines indicate the length of the article to be written and this should be adhered to.

**The examiner will approach this issue as if they are the Editor of a journal and assess the extent to which the material is publishable as presented.**

This may mean that the criteria for length can be modified, within reason, for example, to accommodate an article that needs to incorporate qualitative data presentation or one needing extra essential Tables and/or Figures. However, going beyond the set length should be seen as the exception, rather than the rule.

### **Grades for Research Projects**

See Appendix 5

## **11.0 INTENTION TO PUBLISH**

Students are encouraged to pursue actual publication of the Project article **after** the submission and examination procedures are completed.

Because a supervisor is likely to be involved in an advisory capacity with the research and the production of the Project article, it is anticipated that any such publication submission will be in the form of a joint-authorship with you as first (senior) author and the supervisor as second (junior) author. However, where the degree of involvement in this initial phase has been light or by choice, the supervisor might waive that expectation.

After the examination of the Project is complete, the supervisor is able to get more fully involved in the work of preparation for publication. This may include some re-writing, editorial assistance, guidance about appropriate journals to submit to and/or some reworking of matters of substance. The relationship will be able to change from that of supervisor-supervisee to that of collaborative colleagues. It is envisaged that such involvement will be negotiated between the parties in the spirit of joint authorship.

## References

- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Cooper, M. (2008). *Essential research findings in counselling and psychotherapy: The facts are friendly*. London, England: Sage.
- Cooper, M., & McLeod, J. (2007). A pluralistic framework for counselling and psychotherapy: Implications for research. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 7(3), 135-143.
- Crocket, K., Agee, M., & Cornforth, S. (2011). *Ethics in practice: A guide for counsellors*. Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore.
- Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (Eds.) (2007). *Ethical futures in qualitative research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc.
- Etherington, K. (2000). *Narrative approaches to Working with Adult Male Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse: The Clients', the Counsellor's and the Researcher's Story*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley.
- Etherington, K. (2004). *Becoming a reflexive researcher: using ourselves in research*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lang, S.K.W. (2011). Bicultural Responsiveness in Aotearoa New Zealand: an immigrant counsellor's perspective. PhD Thesis Massey University: Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa: Aotearoa New Zealand.
- McLeod, J. (2010). *Case study research in counselling and psychology*. London, England: Sage.
- McLeod, J. (1999). *Practitioner Research in Counselling*. London, England: Sage.
- McLeod, J. (2000). The contribution of qualitative research to evidence-based counselling and psychotherapy. In N. Rowland & S. Goss (Eds.), *Evidence based practice in the psychological therapies* (pp. 111-126). London, England: Routledge.
- McLeod, J. (2010). *Qualitative research in counselling and psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- McLeod, J. (2003). *Doing counselling research* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Moewaka Barnes, H. (2000). Kaupapa Maori: Explaining the ordinary. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7, 13-16.
- Moewaka Barnes, H., McCreanor, T., Edwards, S., & Borell, B. (2009). Epistemological domination: Social science research ethics in Aotearoa. In D. M. Mertens & P. E. Ginsberg (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics* (pp. 442-457). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1999). Traditional research and psychotherapy practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55(12), 1429-1440.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, England: Zed.
- Wright, J. K. (2009). Autoethnography and therapy: Writing on the move. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 15(4), 623-640.

- Wright, J. K. (2005). Writing therapy in brief workplace counselling. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 5(2), 111-119.
- Wright, J. K. (2003). Five women talk about work-related brief therapy and therapeutic writing. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 3(3), 204-209.

# **APPENDICES**

# APPENDIX 1 – EXAMPLES OF PREVIOUS PROJECTS SUBMITTED

*A full list is available from:*

Postgraduate Administrator

Institute of Education

[ioe-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz](mailto:ioe-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz)

- A Description of the Critical Features of Whaanau Whakapiripiri, a Meaningful Activity Programme for Tangata Whaiora.
- The Effectiveness of a Career Counselling Intervention on ACC Rehabilitation Clients - A Consumer Perspective.
- North Shore Secondary School Guidance Counsellors: An Examination of Settings, Attributes and Role.
- 'Eight Angry Mothers' - An Evaluation of Parentline Manawatu's Group Intervention Programme.
- The Early Indicators of Potential Breakdown in Intimate Relationships.
- One School's Approach: Evaluation of an Anti-sexual Harassment Programme.
- Beyond Disillusionment.
- Attitudes of Cook Islanders in Porirua to Sources of Help - An Ethnographic Study.
- Stress in the New Zealand Police: Five Front-line Officers.
- Needs, Resources and Initiatives for Helping Troubled Young Students.
- Families' Perception of the Mental Health System.
- Performance Appraisal of School Guidance Counsellors.
- How Some Young Samoan People Found Out about Sex and Sexuality: A Study of Students in a Large Urban Co-educational School.
- On the Cutting Edge of Two Cultures: Cultural Adaptation and Areas of Tension of Samoan Girls in a Metropolitan High School.
- 'Chopping and Changing in My Views': A Reflexive Study of the Dilemmas of Working and Mothering.
- Violence in Junior Classrooms: A Descriptive Study.
- An Evaluation of Experimental Staff Training Workshops in Industry.
- Assistance, in Auckland, Offered to Adolescents Coping with Loss.
- An Evaluation of the Peer Support Programme at Stratford High School.
- A Family Therapy Team in Pursuit of Enhanced Functioning: An Action Research Project.
- Counselling and Psychotherapy - Are They the Same or Are They Different?

- Mind the Gap: A Study Of Six Secondary School Form Teachers.
- Christian Counselling: A Survey of Practices and Perceptions of Effectiveness.
- 'Putting it on Paper': Using Interactive Drawing Therapy with Adult Clients.
- Mapping Postnatal Depression.
- Working with Clients Who are Depressed: Counsellors' Perspectives.
- Homophobic Attitudes and Feelings in a New Zealand Secondary School: The Effect of an Intervention Workshop.
- Aspects of Dean-Provided Guidance: A Case Study Within a Small, Rural Secondary School.
- A Client's Evaluation of a Community Counselling Agency.
- Restructuring: What Some Employees Think Employers Should Know.
- Living and Dying: Narrating the Self.
- Moving on From Feeling Suicidal: A Narrative Study of Past Recollections.
- Choosing a Counsellor: An Exploratory Case Study.
- Social isolation and loneliness in late adulthood and implications for counselling: A literature review.
- An Examination of the Impact of Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (programmes) on Adolescents (in/who attend) Learning Institutions
- Integrating change after the adventure is over – A critical literature review of the transition process in Adventure Therapy with Adolescents.

## **APPENDIX 2 – INFORMATION TO CONTRIBUTORS: NEW ZEALAND JOURNAL OF COUNSELLING**

### **Relevant Extracts Adapted From Guidelines for Contributors**

The overriding criteria for selection are that material is relevant and inviting to read.

- The text should not exceed 6,500 words (13-15 pages double spaced) unless special arrangements have been made with the editors.
- The title and abstract (no longer than 150 words) should appear on the first page of the article. The abstract should cover the intent, scope, general procedures and principle findings of the article.
- Authors should consult articles in recent issues of the Journal on general matters of style, e.g., conventions regarding headings, indentation of paragraphs, form of references, tables and graphs, etc.
- The location of tables and graphs in the text must be clearly indicated. They should be submitted on separate pages.
- Footnotes should be avoided.
- Referencing in the text and reference list should follow the latest APA (American Psychological Association) style. See Massey OWLL.

See the link below for more details about the New Zealand Journal of Counselling:

[http://www.nzac.org.nz/new\\_zealand\\_journal\\_of\\_counselling.cfm](http://www.nzac.org.nz/new_zealand_journal_of_counselling.cfm)

**Be aware that, although many counselling and psychotherapy journals no longer have this as a specific requirement, you must include a Method section in your project/journal article.**

## APPENDIX 3 – ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY PROCEDURES

You are required to submit an annotated bibliography surveying the major literature published on the topic you are researching.

The purpose of the annotated bibliography is to produce a report that will be an up-to-date compendium of resources on the selected topic.

The annotated bibliography can include books, chapters in books, journal articles, monographs, reports, etc, and ideally covers a range of these.

The annotation should be your own commentary on the content of the resource, providing key information, description and explanation. It should provide a clear description summarising the article. You need to briefly mention any significant methodological features, findings, limitations and implications. The objective is to give a concise picture of the focus of the material and its particular relevance to your topic. Would you advise someone else interested in your topic to read this source? You need to take a critical position on whether or not the reference is a useful one, mentioning both positive and negative aspects of the reference (it may have more of one than the other), and connecting the relevance of those aspects to your topic. The annotation should make sense to an informed reader, and is more general than an abstract (which requires more detail about research design, statistical procedures, etc.). Each annotation should be able to fit on one page. **The commentary should be no longer than 200 words.**

**Following the annotated references, provide a brief synthesised commentary on the references overall.**

You will find an annotation template for you to follow below, and some examples of commentary. When completing each annotation, delete the helpful notes currently attached to the template.

## ANNOTATION FORM

**Name:**

**Date:**

**TOPIC:**

---

**Form No: ? of 15 or 20 (however many you have)**

*[NOTE: Leave the Form No. until all of your annotations are completed. Once annotations are finished, arrange by author' s last name and then number in sequence, also showing the total number of annotations. You will have 10 annotations so the first will be '1 of 20' , the second '2 of 20 and so on].*

**Reference:**

*[NOTE: see Massey OWLL for APA referencing. Do a full and correct APA reference for your publication, whether it be a journal article, a book chapter, a web page, a report, etc].*

**Keywords:**

*[NOTE: Enter up to 4 words that you think cover the main topics in this resource. These will sometimes be found on the 'detail' page of a book (e.g. 'adulthood, learning, cognitive styles) but with journal articles and other sources you will have to decide yourself on the key concepts or categories discussed. Their purpose is to provide a variety of sub-categories for compiling bibliographies].*

**Relevance rating: \_\_\_ %**

*[NOTE: Estimate the relevance of the reference as it relates directly to your topic.*

*Note that this is not a judgment of the publication as a whole, but your judgment about its relevance to your specific topic].*

**Annotation:**

*[NOTE: no more than 200 of your own words.*

*Write clearly and succinctly.*

*Single space.*

*This is not an abstract. Make it useful.*

*Remember...to include your critique!]*

**EACH ANNOTATION SHOULD FIT ON ONE PAGE**

## Sample Annotated Bibliography – four stage content.

The thesis and scope of the study. Name the hypothesis of the study and what population was studied

Weissman, A.M., Jogerst. G.J., & Dawson, J.D. (2003). Community characteristics associated with child abuse in Iowa. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 27(10), 1145-1159.

Methodology and main points. Mention if the study was a survey, case study, type of experiment, etc, who the subjects were and how they were recruited

Data from the state of Iowa county level child abuse reporting system was used to explore various demographic and community characteristics associated with child abuse rates. Specific data from three urban elementary schools in the Midwest were examined to find the relation between the experience of being bullied in school, and school absences. Using multivariate stepwise regression analysis the authors examined population-adjusted rates of reported and substantiated child abuse with rates of children in poverty, single-parent families, marriage and divorce, unemployment, high school drop-outs, median family income, elder abuse, birth and death, health care access, and number of available caseworkers. A survey of 300 boys and girls between the ages of 7 and 10 was undertaken and school records were examined. The findings point to rates of single parent families, divorce and elder abuse of being most predictive of child abuse. In other words, familial structure was more significant statistically than poverty and other socioeconomic factors. The author found that school absences correlated only with reports of high degrees of bullying, suggesting that children may be able to tolerate certain levels of bullying. This article underscores the importance of comparing single and two-parent families, which is the focus of this paper. The study did not yield separate results for boys and girls but did point to an important area of research in bullying.

Conclusion of findings

Evaluation of the study. Evaluate work's relationship to other works in this area of study

# ANNOTATION FORM EXAMPLE 1

**Name:** Jane Doe

**Date:** October 2017

**Topic:** Developments in Counselling

**Form No:** 6 of 20

**Reference:**

Fiet, S.S., & Lloyd, A.P. (1990). A profession in search of professionals. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 29 (4), 216-219.

**Keywords:**

Counselling, Professionalism, Continuing Professional Development

**Relevance rating:** 90-100%

**Annotation: (your own words):**

The authors argue that counselling has developed to the point where it meets the long-standing criteria for being called a profession. They identify, from the literature, three main characteristics of a profession: specialized training; ethical standards; and a strong identity with the field as a profession or vocation. An assessment of counselling in relation to these characteristics leads them to proclaim: "*Counselling is a profession*" (p. 218).

Having come to this conclusion, they move on to a related question: the extent to which people who call themselves counsellors act as professionals. They focus on being licensed and/or certificated (with implications for identifying with a code of ethics) and continuing education issues in particular, and consider that many counsellors fall short in these elements of professionalism. They conclude: "The genuine counselling profession is much smaller than is the general field of counselling that surrounds it" (p. 218). They see this as the next major issue to be addressed with regard to the counselling profession.

An interesting paper – though not as comprehensive as that of Ritchie in relation to judgment about counselling being a profession.

## ANNOTATION FORM EXAMPLE 2

**NAME:** Jane Doe

**DATE:** October 2017

**TOPIC:** Developments in Counselling

**FORM NO:** 11 of 20

**REFERENCE:**

Ritchie, M.H. (1990). Counselling in not a profession – yet. *Counselor Education and Supervision*. 29 (4), 220-227.

**KEYWORDS:** Counselling, Professionalism, Continuing Professional Development

**RELEVANCE RATING:** 90-100%

**ANNOTATION: (your own words):**

Ritchie says professional status cannot be claimed, others must ascribe it to an occupation. He looks at counselling in relation to 10 criteria for a profession - based on criteria established by McCully (1962).

- (1) A service of great social value (Counselling = ++)
- (2) Performance rests on intellectual techniques (C=++)
- (3) Members possess a strong commitment/calling (C=+)
- (4) Based on a body of knowledge/theory/skills not generally known to the public; on scientific research unique to the profession (C= - Queries research and uniqueness)
- (5) Service unique (C=--)
- (6) Entry requires extensive specialized training (C=++)
- (7) Must demonstrate minimum competency by examination and supervised apprenticeship/ internship (C=+ Needs minimum standards)
- (8) Legally recognized through certification, licensure laws (C=-- Major difficulties)
- (9) Bound by an ethical code with enforcement (C=+ Counsellors outside of associations a liability)
- (10) Members possess broad authority over practice and profession possesses autonomy over internal operations (C=- Problems over funding and requirements of outside bodies especially insurance bodies).

Recognises gains but identifies gaps - research, training & legal recognition. Thorough & has potential to be used to examine where things are in New Zealand.

# **APPENDIX 4 - ARTICLE FACING SHEET**

**MASSEY UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION**

**Te Kura o te Mātauranga**

**COUNSELLING AND GUIDANCE PROGRAMME**

**RESEARCH PROJECT  
253.800**

**[Title of Project]**

**[Student Name]**

**[Month/Year]**

**Completed in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Master of Counselling Studies Degree**

# APPENDIX 5 – INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS

## Contribution of Research Projects

The Masters Research project contributes 45 credits (253.800) within a 240 credits Masters programme. The project, a critical systematic literature review, is in two parts: a review in the form of a journal article (80% of the final grade) and Supplementary Material (20% of the final grade). The Project requires the practical application in the students own professional context of skills and ideas developed in their Masters programme. The research projects are not theses and should not resemble a thesis in depth of inquiry or length or reporting.

## Examiners Report

Research project examiners often review these Projects from their own disciplinary background. Consequently the points made below about criteria for assessment are intended as broad guidelines. You should not feel obliged to respond to all of these points in detail or limit your report to just these points. If you find the research project inadequate in any respect, please be specific about the shortcomings of and omissions from the study. Please indicate what you think should have been included or amended.

**Examiners should note that students are encouraged to publish their recent findings in academic and professional journals. Accordingly, examiners should indicate in their report the publication potential of all or parts of the research project.**

The examiners report is generally one to two pages long. However the length of reports will vary.

## Confidentiality

Examiners reports provide constructive and useful feedback to a candidate. It is the policy of the Massey University Institute of Education to release the reports to the candidate minus the names of the examiners and the recommended grade. However, your attention is drawn to the fact that the University is subject to the provisions of both the Official Information Act (1982) and the Privacy Act (1993). Opinion from both the Ombudsman and the Privacy Commissioner indicates that your report will be considered to be personal information about the candidate. The candidate could request access to your report under the provisions of the Privacy Act and a third party could request access to it under the Official Information Act.

## Criteria for Assessing a Project and Providing a Written Examiners Report

Examiners are asked to read the research project (80% of the final grade) and provide a written report that will usually include:

- i. an overall evaluation of the substance and quality of the research project;
- ii. appropriate to the nature of the study, an indication of particular strengths or weaknesses of such features as research procedures, theoretical rigour, interpretation and argument, critique, professional significance; and
- iii. comments on particular strengths or weaknesses in presentation and reporting.

## Guidelines for Assessment

The following broad set of guideline examples can be used (where appropriate to the form and style of the project).

### *Focus*

- Evident and maintained in clarity of purpose, in research question or problem, in objectives, and in explanations of professional significance.

### *Literature Review/Theory*

- Study is linked with established knowledge and/or practice as illustrated in relevant literature.
- Presents findings of the review in a logical, systematic and coherent theme based discussion (rather than being just an annotated bibliography);
- Includes relevant details of particular studies and **critically comments** on the relative quality of studies;
- Synthesizes in-depth findings in answer to the research topic and questions;
- Implications are teased out;
- Strengths and limitations of the review (including procedures used) are identified;
- Reference list – complete, accurate.

### *Procedures*

- Appropriate to the research questions;
- Adequately explained;
- Clearly justified;
- Applied correctly;
- Ethical issues addressed appropriately;
- Provide a satisfactory base for interpretation, conclusions or generalisations;
- Data and analyses are linked appropriately.

### *Results/Findings/Outcomes*

- Are presented meaningfully;

- Are authentic, reliable;
- Provide a well-grounded base for interpretation.

#### *Discussion/Conclusions/Links*

- Findings are linked with established knowledge;
- Findings are shown to be warranted, fair, open to scrutiny;
- Links shown to be logically (theoretically) consistent with developments in previous studies, reviews, arguments, theories;
- Or divergence from previous studies is clearly identified and explained, if appropriate;
- Links with concurrent or possible future projects identified.

#### *Writing/Presentation*

- Presented in journal article format;
- Clarity and consistency of format, style, organization;
- Meets the length requirement;
- Quality of writing accuracy and readability (e.g. sentence and paragraph structure, spelling, punctuation).
- Coherence and logic of overall organisation;
- Abstract – accurate reflection of article.

#### *Contribution*

- As related to stated purposes and justifications, at what level does the project contribute: e.g. to theory, research, methodology, to professional practice, as an information base.

#### *Overall*

- Satisfactory replication;
- Accurate reporting;
- Novel application;
- Well organized and maintained argument;
- Critical flair;
- Coherent analysis;
- Original;
- Quality of solution to a problem or answering of a question.

## Grades for Research Projects

The grade awarded within each level is dependent on judgments based on the complete set of evaluation guidelines. The following classifications will be used in grading research reports and projects:

A Level (A+, A, A-)	An outstanding piece of work, which shows originality of design method or insight and which makes a significant contribution to knowledge in its field, with potential for publication in its current form.
High B Level (B+)	A substantial piece of work of high quality which demonstrates both a mastery of knowledge and methodology in its area, and makes an important contribution to knowledge in its field, which with some additional work may have potential for publication.
B Level	A sound piece of work that demonstrates skill and initiative in the design, conduct and reporting of research.
B-/C+ Level	An acceptable piece of work that demonstrates competence in the design, conduct and reporting of the research.
C Level	A passing grade, but one that nevertheless reveals inadequacies in design, structure or style.
D Level	Work, which is unacceptable in its present state but that with revision as suggested by Examiners, could be acceptable. (i.e. C Level).
E Level	An unacceptable piece of work.

## **Supplementary Materials**

The Supplementary Materials section (20% of the final grade) is designed to be a receptacle for all those parts of the research that do not have a place in the final project. The Supplementary Materials may contain: the original research proposal; the low risk ethics application; a version of a Research Journal ( a record of the research journey the student has followed, which may include ‘Think Pieces’ where a student records their processing of ideas, plus a record of supervision, sometimes called a Supervision Diary, that contains dates of supervision and brief descriptions of content – these will include the emails shared with the supervisor); the Annotated Bibliography, plus a paragraph of synthesis (which summarises the Annotated Bibliography). Optional extras to include are cuttings from Newspapers or magazines etc. that have appeared relevant along the way, plus mind maps (if these have helped the student scope the project along the way), plus project drafts, where the student has made a significant shift in direction rather than the successive refinements that are invariably made towards completion of the final project – this might include some writing about the methodology whilst the student has been working it out.

### **Guidelines for Assessment of New Paradigm Research**

See Reading 1.

# APPENDIX 6 – NOMINATION OF SUPERVISORS FOR PROJECT (COUNSELLING)

IOE 2 Nomination of Supervisor–Project (Counselling)



## NOMINATION OF SUPERVISORS FOR PROJECT (COUNSELLING)

Student ID number:

First name: \_\_\_\_\_

Surname: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme of study: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme credit value:

Project credit value:

Project Paper number: \_\_\_\_\_

Campus:  Albany  Palmerston North  
 Wellington  Distance Learning

Project title: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Research Methods paper/s completed:

Paper Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Possible Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Outline of discussions with potential supervisor  
 (Attach relevant correspondence)

Attach Research Outline.

### NOTES:

For the critical systematic literature review research, the 5-7 page research outline is straight forward. The outline should follow 267.782 or 267.783 guidelines and needs to cover the main features of the Project. It is acceptable to submit an outline that was submitted as part of your previously undertaken methods paper. This is on the proviso that you have made any modifications based on the assessment feedback you received for that piece of work, and that you have reformatted it as being a proposal for this Project rather than just the exact layout sent in for your methods research proposal assignment.

For critical systematic literature review research an outline will normally contain the following:

- A working **title**.
- A statement of the **aim(s)** of the research - incorporating a description of the problem or issue to be examined.
- A list of the **research questions to be examined** in the study.
- An outline of the **major databases** to be consulted and reviewed.
- A suggested **time frame** to be followed throughout the Project.
- The **names of possible supervisors** at the University (see Section 6.0 on Supervision and the enclosure on Staff Research Interests) in Research Project in Counselling Handbook.
- A statement of **expected outcomes**.
- A tentative **outline of the structure** of the final report (article) and a time line.



**Submitting Your Research Outline:**

Prepare an electronic copy of your research outline. Scan and send your outline with this form (IOE 2- Nomination of Supervisors for Project) to:

[IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz](mailto:IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz) with the subject line: Attention Roseanne MacGillivray – Research Outline (Counselling).

Also upload a copy of the outline and IOE 2 into the Stream 253.800 dropbox.

On receipt of your research outline, your details are recorded on the Institute of Education database and one copy is stored in your file. The Research Coordinator and Counselling team consider the outline and the proposed supervisors.

Please note that the appointment of a supervisor is ultimately the responsibility of the research coordinator, who takes into account staff availability and expertise, as well as staff workloads. When confirmed, you are notified of the names of your supervisor and their contact details. We encourage you to make contact immediately with your supervisor, so that you can get underway with your investigation under their guidance.

**(NOTE: You cannot start your research until your supervisor has been formally confirmed).**

To assist the co-ordinator in appointing a supervision team best matched to a student research proposal you are encouraged to:

- Align your research with the research interests and expertise of staff.
- Connect your research with previous postgraduate studies you have undertaken.
- Submit your research outline along with this form (IOE 2) by the deadline of **1 February 2016** to:

[IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz](mailto:IOE-postgraduate@massey.ac.nz) with the subject line: Attention Roseanne MacGillivray – Research Outline (Counselling) and the Stream dropbox.

\_\_\_\_\_

**OFFICE USE ONLY:**

**SUPERVISOR**

The Supervisor is responsible for full supervision.

First name: \_\_\_\_\_

Surname: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic unit: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

I \_\_\_\_\_ agree to supervise  
(Supervisor name)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Student name)

For \_\_\_\_\_ (Project number and credits)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**RESEARCH CO-ORDINATOR:**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# APPENDIX 7 – SUPERVISION RECORD



**MASSEY UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA**

**EDUCATION RESEARCH PROJECT  
SUPERVISION RECORD**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper Number & Title: \_\_\_\_\_

It is a requirement that students make formal contact with their supervisor at least once a month by telephone, skype, email or in person. This sheet must be attached to your final report or project.

<b>Date</b>	<b>How Contacted</b>	<b>Outcome</b>

<b>Date</b>	<b>How Contacted</b>	<b>Outcome</b>

## APPENDIX 8 – HOW TO ACCESS STREAM



**Please log in to Stream  
as soon as possible!**

You can access Stream via any computer connected to the internet. If you have an internet connection at home or elsewhere, you can access the Stream site for this paper at any time.

It is also possible to access the online environment from work (seek permission first if from work as there may be access issues, e.g. firewall protection), friends' computers, libraries or similar public access points such as internet cafes.

You can access Stream from the Massey homepage or directly at <http://stream.massey.ac.nz>.

The screenshot shows the top navigation bar of the Massey University website. The 'Courses' menu item is highlighted with a red arrow. Below the navigation bar, there are several sections: 'COURSES', 'DISTANCE LEARNING (EXTRAMURAL)', 'EXAMINATIONS', 'ONLINE LEARNING', 'ACADEMIC TEACHING TIMETABLES', 'CENTRES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING', 'ACADEMIC RECORDS', 'COLLEGES', and 'DEPARTMENTS'. The 'ONLINE LEARNING' section contains links for 'Stream login', 'Guide to Stream', and 'Stream browser checker'. A red arrow points to the 'Stream login' link.

The screenshot shows the Stream login page. At the top left is the Massey University logo, and at the top right is the Stream logo. The main content area contains a 'Welcome to Stream' message and a login form with fields for 'Student ID' and 'PIN'. There is also a 'Log in' button and a link for 'Forgotten PIN?'. Below the login form, there are links for 'Student Information' and 'Staff Information'. At the bottom, there is a social media link for 'Follow @MasseyStream' and a footer with 'Disclaimer | Privacy Statement' and 'Massey University 1959 - 2014'.

## APPENDIX 9 – MASSEY UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The Library provides resources and help to support your study. Please contact us if you need help finding information or requesting Library material.

Phone: 0800 MASSEY (0800 627 739) ask for the Library

OR

call direct +64 6 350 5670 ext. 2880

Email: [library@massey.ac.nz](mailto:library@massey.ac.nz)

There are three key ways to access Library help and resources while studying at a Distance:

- **Distance Library Service** – our delivery system especially for you.
- **Library Website** – access to our resources and services.
- **Visiting the Library in person** – make the most of any visits to campus.

### Distance Library Service

The Distance Library Service delivers course-related Library materials to students who are eligible (students studying predominantly distance or block mode courses in a semester). For information about using the Distance Library Service, see *The Library for Distance Learning* section of our website (<http://library.massey.ac.nz>). If you are uncertain about your eligibility please contact the Distance Library Service.

We will:

- **Send** books to you and provide access to journal articles.
- Note: The Library must comply with the Copyright Act which restricts the amount that can be copied or scanned (normally one chapter or article, or 10 percent from any one publication).
- Help you to find information that you need for your study.
- Teach you how to use databases and resources effectively to do your own research.
  - **Undergraduate students** get help from professional librarians over the telephone (use the 0800 number), email or live via the Internet. We will talk you through finding articles, books and other research on your topic.
  - **Postgraduate students** book a Research Consultation. This is training with a subject specialist librarian and can be by telephone, email or live via the Internet.

Details and Contacts are available on *The Library for Distance Learning* section of the website.

**Studying outside New Zealand?** We will supply materials to help you with your studies, but there may be some restrictions. Please contact us for more information or look for the Services to Offshore students part of the Library for Distance Learning pages.

When you are using the Library from a distance it is especially vital to plan ahead to allow plenty of time just in case the material or assistance you need is not immediately available.

### **Library Website (<http://library.massey.ac.nz>)**

You can use the Library website to find resources by:

- Searching **Discover** – search across our physical collections and a large proportion of our electronic resources (article databases, e-journals, e-books and more) – so you get both books and a selection of articles and other resources in the one search.
- Searching the **Catalogue (using Encore or Classic)** to find and request books, theses, DVDs and other items held at any of the Massey Libraries.
- Using **Subject Guides** – a quick way to the key resources in your subject area.
- Searching individual **Article Databases** to find journal and newspaper articles on a topic. This will provide access to our full range of databases.
- Printing copies of past exam papers – sorry we do not have the answers!

You can also log in to your **MyLibrary** record to check your due dates, renew your books, view your reading history, and request items from the Catalogue.

There are request forms on the website to request resources and help – look under the *Quick Links for Forms*.

For advice on finding information see the **How to Find** section. These pages include onscreen demonstrations of key information skills that will help you get started.

As well as *The Library for Distance Learning* page, use *The Library for Undergraduates* or *Postgraduates* (whichever is appropriate), *Subject Guides*, *Article Databases*, and check out our blog *Library Out Loud* (LOL), follow us on Twitter or Facebook for the latest news from us.

### **Using the Library in Person**

You are welcome at any of the Massey Campus Libraries – in Albany, Palmerston North and Wellington. Services available from these libraries include Information Desks where you can get help in using Library resources, research consultations for postgraduate students and EndNote support, access to computers and photocopiers, wireless network from your laptop (setup is required). All Massey libraries provide help and support, but not all resources are held in every Library.

All the details about our libraries, including opening hours, locations and services are available on the Library website, under *About Us*.

When you are visiting, why not take advantage of our professional help (at the Information Desks) or if you are a postgraduate, book a Research Consultation with a subject specialist Librarian. Details are on *The Library for Postgraduates* page.

### **EndNote**

EndNote is specialised software for organising the research and articles you find. It allows you to:

1. Create, store, and manage your references
2. Import and store references from electronic databases
3. Annotate, sort and search your references
4. Create bibliographies instantly in a variety of bibliographic styles
5. Insert citations into your Microsoft Word documents.

See the Library's *EndNote* webpage (under *Quick Links* on the website) for further information on ordering the software, and our training and help materials. EndNote is now available to all students for free!

# READINGS

# READING 1

'New paradigm' research – guidelines for assessment.

## **Research Project in Counselling 253.800**

### **'New Paradigm' Research, for example, arts-based research, autoethnography, collective biography, narrative inquiry**

These notes, intended for Counselling Research Project Examiners, will indicate quality criteria for a range of different 'new paradigm' approaches to research.

Most research in the world of counselling, which is a profession aspiring towards scientific respectability, uses quantitative data. Some qualitative research also makes positivist assumptions about evidence - cause, effect and proof. (An aside: If any of these words are new or confusing to you, look them up now and start a Glossary of your own. By choosing to study at Masters level you are entering the wonderful world of academic apprenticeship. Just as plumbers need to know the jargon of pipe fitting, you need to know the jargon of 'philosophies of knowledge'.)

All research and 'knowledge production' is political: Who funds it, what do funders retain the power to use that research for etc. Since the 1960s and the impact of feminism (Lather, 2008), which challenged traditional ways of 'knowledge production' that excluded or marginalised women, the working classes and people of colour, not to mention gay, lesbian and people with disabilities, change in the politics of research has gathered pace. For example, just as feminists pointed out gender bias in research in the mid-twentieth century (see for example Gilligan, 1982), Maori researchers have taken a lead in highlighting the 'silencing' of indigenous people in Aotearoa (Smith, 1999). However, it would be unwise to throw away the benefits of reductionist, positivist traditional research and so we take a pluralistic view.

The narrative turn in the social sciences has been the backdrop to an ongoing debate between social constructionism and positivism (Chase, 2005). Stories help express the particular, all parts of ourselves, fully, in relation to other people and with emotion, a word which for years was not allowed into psychology or sociology. Stories also allow for the telling of local and embodied experience. Some feminist research, for example (Lather & Smithies, 1997) talks about statistics representing people with the tears wiped away. This is contested by other feminist researchers (see for example Oakley, 1999).

There has been an opening up to what we are calling 'new paradigm', innovative or 'non-traditional' approaches to research in some disciplines, including counselling. Offering a

pluralistic model might mean you could choose to conduct a survey of supervisors in New Zealand, or you might write an autoethnographic account of your experience in supervision. How those different studies would be assessed for validity, rigour and so on would need to be carefully considered. This list is intended to indicate how 'new paradigm' research is assessed.

Jeannie Wright, 2011

**Assessment Criteria:**

1.	<p><b>Overall Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Structure</li> <li>▪ Word count</li> <li>▪ Referencing</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p><i>Purpose:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Details of what the study set out to do/explore/understand</li> <li>▪ <i>Context:</i></li> <li>▪ Methodology/methods employed</li> <li>▪ Results and implications</li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b>Literature Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Search strategy clear</li> <li>▪ Critical review of previous research and/or theories, providing context and background for current study</li> <li>▪ Relevant studies obtained</li> <li>▪ Breadth and depth of review</li> <li>▪ Synthesis and links to students study</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Aims and Purpose</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aims and purpose of the study clearly specified</li> <li>▪ Explanation of researcher's interest</li> <li>▪ Background and context of study</li> <li>▪ Reflexivity statement could be introduced here or in section 9</li> </ul>	

	<p>below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Originality of the work</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Explanation of overall philosophical stance and choice of methodology or approach</li> <li>▪ Definitions of terms</li> <li>▪ Limitation</li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b>Authenticity and Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does this resonate with me?</li> <li>▪ Does this affect me emotionally/intellectually?</li> <li>▪ Does this generate new question/more me to write?</li> <li>▪ Move me to try new research practice?</li> <li>▪ Move me to action?</li> <li>▪ Does it transgress taken for granted assumptions?</li> <li>▪ Make a difference?</li> <li>▪ Implement an emancipatory agenda?</li> </ul>	
7.	<p><b>Trustworthiness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does this text seem "truthful" – credible account of a cultural, social, individual, or communal sense of the "real"?</li> <li>▪ Are the claims to truth and knowledge embedded in multiple criteria that address issues of race, sex, cultural class and "lived experience."</li> </ul>	
8.	<p><b>Substantive and Original Contribution to Knowledge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses a research area not previously address in the specific setting</li> <li>▪ Focuses on a different aspect of</li> </ul>	

	<p>previous research, e.g. NZ based, not US or European</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contributes to a deeper understanding of the area.</li> </ul>	
9.	<p><b>Reflexivity and Participatory Ethics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How the author came to write this text?</li> <li>▪ How was the information gathered?</li> <li>▪ Which community's interests does the text represent?</li> <li>▪ Are ethical issues discussed and fully considered?</li> <li>▪ Does the contribution made outweigh the ethical dilemmas/pain for participants and readers?</li> <li>▪ Is there adequate self-awareness and reflexivity by the author for the reader to make judgements?</li> </ul>	
10.	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were the research questions or exploration supported by the findings?</li> <li>▪ Were findings and inconsistencies explored?</li> <li>▪ Were findings reflected upon and discussed with relevant literature?</li> <li>▪ Any limitations?</li> <li>▪ Recommendations for practice and/or further research?</li> <li>▪ Dissemination discussed and specified, e.g. where might this study be published?</li> </ul>	
11.	<p><b>Summary and Conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Only conclusions that can be justifiably drawn from the research.</li> <li>▪ Succinct and clear</li> </ul>	

12.	<p><b>Appendices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Copies of research instruments (if relevant)</li> <li>▪ Letters</li> <li>▪ Information sheets &amp; MUHEC documents</li> </ul>	
-----	--	--

<b>Grade/Mark:</b>
--------------------

**Notes for Examiner/s**

Creativity and innovation in qualitative research is to be encouraged but academic 'rigour' still applies.

A 'new paradigm' study may not follow conventional structures but must demonstrate scholarly research conventions.

The above Assessment Criteria are adapted from Laurel Richardson, Heewon Chang, Ruthellen Josselson, Kim Etherington, Jane Speedy and others.

**References**

Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 651-679). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and womens development*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Lather, P. A. (2008). (Post)feminist methodology: Getting lost, OR a scientificity we can bear to learn from. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and the politics of evidence* (pp. 182-194). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Lather, P. A., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Oakley, A. (1999). People's ways of knowing: Gender and methodology. In B. Hood, M. S. & S. Oliver (Eds.), *Critical issues in social research* (pp. 154-169). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London/Otago, New Zealand: Zed Books/ University of Otago Press.

## READING 2

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

68

Autoethnography as Method

### Ethical Issues

Since most autoethnographies focus primarily on self, you may feel that ethical issues involving human subjects do not apply to your research design. This assumption is incorrect. Whichever format you may take, you still need to keep in mind that other people are always present in self-narratives, either as active participants in the story or as associates in the background (Morse, 2002). If your study engages others as interviewees or the observed, you should treat your study in the same way as other social science research requiring an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. Even when you are the primary source of data, your story often includes others—others of similarity, difference, and/or opposition. Some of them are more intimately interwoven into your story than others who are mentioned only in passing. Therefore, it is advisable to check with the IRB of your learning institution about its approval requirements for autoethnographic research.

The IRB is “a committee made up of faculty members who review and approve research so that the rights of the participants are protected” (Creswell, 2002, p. 160). The creation of IRBs, required by “the OPRR published regulations (45 CFR 46), most recently revised in 1991” (Best & Kahn, 2003, p. 50), intends to oversee research processes to ensure that research practices adhere to the principles of “informed consent,” “right to privacy,” and “protection from harm” (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 662). “Informed consent” refers to “receiving consent by the subject after having carefully and truthfully informed him or her about the research”; “right to privacy,” to “protecting the identity of the subject”; and “protection from harm,” to protecting human subjects from “physical, emotional, or any other kind [of harms].”

Even when your research proposal is exempt from a formal review process, you should consider the code of confidentiality in all steps of your inquiry. Protecting the privacy of others in autoethnographic stories is much more difficult than in other studies involving human subjects. Because your identity is already disclosed, the identities of others connected to you sometimes become transparent to the broader audience and other times to smaller circles of your acquaintances. For example, Foster, McAllister, and O’Brien (2005) expose Foster’s mother’s psychosis by the natural mother-daughter association; Ronai’s “retarded” mother (1996) and Olson’s abusive ex-husband (2004) are also exposed to the public through the authors’ writings. To protect the privacy of others connected to you, you might use pseudonyms for some or all, create composite figures based on factual details to obscure their identities, or let voices of others tell your story.

Morse (2002), Editor of *Qualitative Health Research*, suggested the use of a “publishing *nom de plume*” (p. 1159). If none of these options is ideal for you, you simply have to use the real identities of others with their consent. Although perfect protection of privacy is not always possible, you should model an honest and conscious effort to adhere to the ethical code of research.

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) challenge all self-narrative writers with a poignant question: “Do they own a story because they tell it?” As you play a multi-faceted role as researcher, informant, and author, you should be reminded that your story is never made in a vacuum and others are always visible or invisible participants in your story.

## Summary

This chapter has laid out four initial steps that you need to consider as you undertake an autoethnographic study. First, identify a research topic, whether narrowly defined or multi-dimensional. Second, determine your position (role) in relation to others in your study. Will you be the primary subject of the study with others in the background? Will you include others along with yourself as co-participants in your study? Or will you study only others on the topic that has a personal connection to you? When the focus and topic are determined, you need to begin methodological planning for data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting. Along with the methodological design, you are expected to adhere to ethical standards of research to protect the privacy of human subjects involved in your study.

Having taken care of the preliminary planning, you are ready to delve into the practice of data collection, management, analysis, and interpretation. The following chapters in Part II are designed to help you experiment with different data collection strategies. With the understanding that ethnographic process is not rigidly sequential, you may mix and match strategies of data collection, analysis, and interpretation to find the ones that best serve your research goal.

## EPISTEMOLOGICAL DOMINATION

### *Social Science Research Ethics in Aotearoa*

◆ Helen Moewaka Barnes, Tim McCreanor,  
Shane Edwards, and Belinda Borell

In Aotearoa, now widely known as New Zealand, the sovereign territory of indigenous Maori, explored and colonized by Britain and other Western nations from the 1800s onward, the ongoing impacts of the processes of illicit and unjust domination continue to reverberate (Reid & Cram, 2005). There have been profound consequences in terms of damage to Maori economy and culture (especially from land confiscation and alienation), to population health and well-being and the loss of potential and actual development. In turn, these have had a negative impact on social cohesion, justice, and equity against a background of serious disparities on all social indicators (Ajwani, Blakely, Robson, Tobias, & Bonne, 2003; Durie, 2004; Ministry of Social Development, 2006; Spoonley, Macpherson, & Pearson, 2004; Te Puni Kokiri, 1999; Walker, 1990).

On the other hand, the social agenda in this country has been substantially influenced by resurgent Maori development that has sought redress and culture change from the paternalistic colonial roots of our contemporary society. From the earliest encounters and as embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi,<sup>1</sup> Maori have operated from an ethic of self-determination that has historically, and in the contemporary setting, fuelled tensions between Maori and non-Maori over what form that

sovereignty should take (Orange, 1987; Sharp, 1990). By warfare, diplomacy, petition, protest action, via the courts and the Waitangi Tribunal,<sup>2</sup> through the development of affirmative policy agendas across the spectrum of social concern, through initiatives in indigenous education and development, Maori have battled for shared power and a more equitable social order. These challenges have not been allowed to pass unimpeded by entrenched settler<sup>3</sup> interests. A raft of mainstream measures, in the military, legal, political, and ideological domains have been enacted to maintain colonial domination (Durie, 2004).

The tension between renaissance and resistance has been obvious in the field of social research, where the past two decades have seen an efflorescence of work in Maori theory, epistemology, and research (Bishop, 1996; Cram, 2001; Jahnke & Taiapa, 1999; Moewaka Barnes, 2000; Smith, 1999). Huge effort has gone into shifting Maori knowledge and research from the status of invisible, derogated folklore to authoritative and valued understandings that can be used in policy development and implementation, legal settlement of historical injustices (especially land\*claims), and in support of Maori innovation and development. Established systems of ethics regulation and monitoring, from legitimating overarching paradigms to the conduct of research, remain an impediment in the struggle to articulate and enact Maori ways of knowing, research practices, knowledge creation, and transfer.

In this chapter, we examine how Maori ways of finding out about and knowing the world have been subordinated to Western/settler epistemological traditions. By scrutinizing emergence of a particular set of ethical paradigms and practices and the ways in which these are imposed, we highlight the irony that, in this branch of epistemological endeavor, which is so concerned with sensitivity and safety, Maori approaches are still an adjunct to a rationalist model, the main purpose of which is

sustaining the status quo. We provide a brief sketch of the political economy of Maori/Pakeha<sup>4</sup> relations in Aotearoa, outline the history of ethics in this context, and provide narratives from our research experience to illustrate ways in which dominance is created and reproduced. We refer to the importance of mundane, microlevel research processes and practices as well as tensions within the broader field of social science research ethics (Cram, McCreanor, Smith, Nairn, & Johnstone, 2006) and a wider agenda for social change within New Zealand society (Dew & Davis, 2004; Kelsey, 2002; Spoonley et al., 2004). Our conclusions draw these together to argue for strong recognition of the contributions Maori research and ethical approaches are making to social equity here and to call for change and development in ethical practices.

#### ◆ *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*

We begin with a brief account of the development of social science ethics in Aotearoa, which contextualizes the concerns we have about how Maori research ethics have been marginalized. It also contributes to the theme of “studying up” in this volume by scrutinizing the colonial system that regulates our research and practices.

In Aotearoa, Government responses to Maori claims for more involvement in decision making and resource allocation have been to engage in diverse processes of consultation. However, there is a perception that such exercises are mainly about being seen to be behaving appropriately rather than changing behavior toward more equitable power sharing (Walker, 1990). As a result, pressure has grown for fairer and more progressive engagements between Maori and Pakeha in areas such as resource management, environmental protection and sustainability, health service provision and promotion, and Maori development in

general. Research has been a key mechanism for informing policy and action in these areas.

In Aotearoa, we have a very strong and complex network of health and social ethics committees that work to apply national and uniform standards (Ministry of Health, 2006) to the conduct of research in a wide range of fields (Campbell, 1995; Goodyear-Smith, Lobb, Davies, Nachson, & Seelau, 2002; McNeil, 2002). Their early roots lie in the efforts of hospital committees, modeled on the British system (Richmond, 1977). The contemporary system has arisen out of concern with emerging medical technologies in fertility and genetics in the mid-1980s (G. Jones & Telfer, 1990), but especially out of a major inquiry (the Cartwright inquiry) into informal, unregulated cervical cancer research at National Women's Hospital in Auckland. This research involved observing the effects of nonintervention in women with abnormal cervical histologies. It resulted in preventable deaths from cervical cancers, illnesses, and disabilities (Cartwright, 1988; Coney, 1988; McNeil, 1989), required support and compensation for those who suffered, and brought strong censure on the researchers involved. The inquiry gave rise to a set of national ethical standards that effectively shifted practice toward the more systematic (and litigation conscious) American model (Gillett, 1989) and has reverberated throughout university, research, legal, professional, and political communities ever since (Campbell, 1991, 1995; Daniels, 1989; Poutasi, 1989; Rosier, 1989).

As research ethics emerged onto the national agenda in the early 1990s, the academy, both funders and providers, began to invest in ethical requirements and processes, motivated by a need to manage risk to researchers, to participants, and to institutions themselves. Research proposals must now address potential risks that had hitherto been a matter of unscreened professional practice. Universities and hospitals require that research be vetted by committees that apply implicit and explicit

standards. In practical terms, requirements include written participant information and consent forms, complaint processes, and provision of supports for participants in the case of possible trauma (including psychological distress) arising from the research.

There are currently three broad systems of ethical committees that may be used by researchers depending on the focus and scope of their projects: university, area health board, and the National Health and Disabilities Ethical Committees. Ethical approval is now a requirement for release of funding from external bodies and critical to career advancement of researchers. Both experience and research show some discontent with these requirements among researchers (Harris, 1988; Mitchell et al., 1994; Neutze, 1989; Paul, 1988, 2000). However, there is also general acceptance of these processes, and it is fair to say that research ethics represent an important and developing strand within social science research (Campbell, 1995; Edwards, McManus, & McCreanor, 2005; Park, 1994; Tolich, 2002).

In national ethical guidelines, Maori interests are represented via a focus on broad principles derived from institutional and legal readings of the Treaty of Waitangi that attempt to enact partnership, participation, and protection for Maori and Maori communities. Overall, the guidelines require that research relating to Maori be undertaken "in a culturally sensitive and appropriate manner" (Ministry of Health, 2006) that emphasizes consultation, inclusion, and knowledge sharing, and may specifically provide for the use of *te reo Maori*, *tikanga*, relevant Maori theoretical frameworks, and Maori concepts of well-being (e.g., Durie, 1994; Pere, 1991).

The disjuncture between Maori frameworks and the rationalist Western/settler epistemological system is stark. Maori epistemological and ethical schemata are essentially other and, despite advances and ambiguities, remain add-ons, widely seen as politically forced rather than critical and vital alternatives to the status quo.

The medical origins of the research ethics system in Aotearoa in part explain the mismatch with Maori research practices. Biomedical models of health operate from within positivist scientific traditions of the West (Antonovsky, 1996; Beaglehole, 2002), evoking the power relations of the objective observer operating within an impeccable methodology that ensures realist, generalizable truths. Such rationalist methodologies are incommensurable with, and intolerant of, other approaches and theories of knowledge creation and accumulation. Traditions, approaches, and methods from outside the Western epistemological frame are regarded with skepticism and hostility and are regulated, undermined, and marginalized.

Most social science research in this country is conducted within positivist frameworks with a minor deviation due to theoretical poststructuralism permitting a brittle endorsement of certain qualitative styles (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Park, 1994). At a national *hui* of Maori social scientists convened in 2006, it was clear that, while there are a number of vital nodes of Maori social science activity, they are under-resourced, overworked, and fragmented (Whariki, 2007) and, therefore, not strongly positioned to join and carry debates over issues of research ethics in the face of resourced, legislated, and established settler theory and practice (S. Clarke, 2005; Gillett, 2005; Moore, 2004).

There are multiple examples, before, during, and following first European contact, of innovative Maori development from within their own cultural resources and epistemologies that could be cited here. The point is that strengths eroded by colonial processes, particularly if provided with resources and support, are available for application to many contemporary issues of importance to Maori and the public good. In critiquing settler practices, our aim is to further open a space already spoken to by many Maori thinkers and writers to encourage wider debate and understanding of Maori contributions to social science

research ethics development for Aotearoa. The rationale for this analysis turns on political considerations around self-determination of indigenous peoples, a principled support for epistemological diversity, the need for equity and justice in our social order, and a broadly pragmatic approach that seeks to ensure the best possible outcomes of research through ensuring that the ethical issues are dealt with in culturally appropriate ways.

### ◆ *Tikanga and Research*

Partially in response to the National Women's Hospital scandal, Te Awēkotuku (1991) stressed the importance of research responsibility and accountability to the Maori communities that it works within, warning that breakdowns would result in findings of dubious validity and jeopardize future studies.

Despite the challenges and developments led by Maori and the movement and intent shown by Pakeha, powerful mechanisms of ethical control and guidance fall well short of embracing Maori epistemologies despite having encompassed the need to shift beyond rationalist, positivist practice. This tension has some important implications for ethics and conventional ethical procedures. Both ethics committee and research funder application forms are designed from the perspective that the research design, processes, analysis, and dissemination will not be controlled by Maori but will involve Maori in some way. Applicants are asked for detailed information about specific population groups aside from Pakeha, including consultation processes, the research team's knowledge and proficiency in relevant languages and customs, ongoing involvement of groups consulted, and dissemination practices. For Maori, the perception is that these requirements are intended to engage non-Maori researchers in efforts to make their practices safe for Maori and other groups they might work with.

As a result of this emphasis, Maori members on ethics committees work within particular paradigms and references that are not necessarily very meaningful or relevant to a Maori research ethic. These dominant ethical epistemologies are not only applied to non-Maori working with Maori but also to Maori working with Maori.

What speaks to how indigenous people should conduct themselves and whose realm this is? In the climate of research ethics development described above and through the theorizing of Kaupapa Maori research<sup>5</sup> (Smith, 1995, 1999), a number of Maori concepts have been articulated and incorporated into Maori research practice. Contributing to these discussions, Cram (Chapter 20, this volume) outlines a number of areas that Maori may consider to be central to a Maori research ethic. Several papers (Edwards et al., 2005; R. Jones, Crengle, & McCreanor, 2006) point out the implications of these approaches for researchers and participants, arguing for processes to protect both parties.

Through the practice of research, ethical processes are evaluated by Maori and non-Maori. In a Maori worldview, many of the non-Maori practices (and in some cases also Maori) are evaluated as unethical, and it is not uncommon for us to start a research relationship by trying to rebuild some of the trust that has been lost. Although all researchers are evaluated by the people they work with, non-Maori working with Maori usually have more choice about what level of evaluation they accept from Maori and the level of detachment they feel from this evaluation.

An overriding understanding among Maori is that, if indigenous researchers do not conduct themselves with accountability to Maori ways of operating, the comeback will be much greater and more devastating than any censure that an ethics committee could deliver. As Cram concludes and we illustrate in our stories from the field, transgressions can reverberate throughout families and through generations.

As Maori, we are used to walking in at least two worlds—the diverse environments

that stem from Maori worldviews and the world of the colonizer, which surrounds us. As researchers, we negotiate these worlds and the spaces between them. Meeting institutional ethical requirements is about fitting into the dominant processes, knowing what is required, and ensuring that when we come to carry out the research we will not be hamstrung by these requirements. This means that we often fill in ethics proposals in ways that keep our options open; we can then act appropriately in the Maori world without being limited by what we have written on the ethics form.

In Maori worlds, we carry out research with many ethics requirements acting as a kind of *white noise*. We work in ways that we know to be appropriate for Maori but still make sure that we fulfill institutional ethics requirements. We acknowledge that areas ethics committees focus on are useful to think through, but the processes that are central to institutional ethics are rarely of central concern to Maori.

When carrying out research, the first information that we give as Maori is who we are and where we are from, that is, our affiliations, tribal and otherwise, including our research organization. Maori who we engage with generally want to know the purpose of the research, who owns and benefits from the information, and what the dissemination processes are. The purpose of the research is also an important institutional requirement, but, for Maori, it is seen as more than what the researchers want to know and encompasses why the researchers are doing the research; what their agendas are and whether they are to be trusted (see also Cram, Chapter 20, this volume).

An example of the different importance placed on ethical processes is attitudes toward informed consent and confidentiality. Maori (researchers and participants) frequently view consent forms as a known requirement of universities; “something we fill in for Pakeha,” independent of any expectations that the participant has about the acceptability of the research process. Expectations about the research relationship

and our communication and accountability processes are separate and may be unspoken. This relationship-based ethic may clash with an ethics committee approach, for here relationships are in an ongoing process of negotiation, rather than a one-off decision.

Maori understand these differences and negotiate them with regular monotony acutely aware of the difference that attaches. But, when you are of the dominant culture, there is little need to question your own worldview or sometimes even to acknowledge that you have one. The pragmatic approach that Maori take to gaining ethics approval and then acting ethically (not necessarily the same thing) enables the system to function and apparently work for Maori—Maori researchers carry out projects and regularly gain ethics approval for them. As such, it presents few challenges to the dominant way of viewing ethics.

Our experiences as a Maori research group reflects the importance of processes and building relationships over time. Research proposals are often developed over many years of engagement, informal and formal. However, since community connection and involvement in research including design, implementation, and dissemination are built into the ongoing practices of our research group, we do not fit with funder expectations and requirements, despite strongly meeting ethical obligations. Proposal forms from the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand (2006) ask for evidence and documentation of consultation and networking with Maori as well as descriptions of the cultural skills and competencies of researchers. First, our immersion in Maori communities means that the dynamics do not lend themselves to such documentation. Second, we are only able to undertake the work we do because of these competencies while non-Maori researchers are able to proceed (with negative or unknown impacts) by meeting the instrumental requirements of an ethics committee. Non-Maori groups are not required to provide equivalent credentials for knowledge of English language or specific Pakeha cultural practices.

The following stories from the field illustrate ways in which the glacial pace of change affects Maori social research practice. From these examples, we have learned much about the ethics apparatus and can discern a number of states that prevail, including blocking and falling short of Maori ethical requirements. Responding to Maori challenges, we draw these insights together in our conclusions.

### ◆ *Stories From the Field*

#### LESSONS FROM THE FIELD: EDWARDS

In a Maori sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) study (Edwards et al., 2005; McManus, Abel, & McCreanor, 2005), we carried out the requirements of the funder (HRC) and host institution (Auckland University), committing to the standard provisions of informed consent and confidentiality. However, we were acutely aware that gathering data from the Maori parents who had lost a baby to SIDS required far more. The project was driven by completely different concerns that turned on the safety and well-being of the researchers and our participants who, apart from their obvious loss, were frequently subjected to grueling and adversarial police and coronial inquiries that in many cases cast the tragedy as a crime to be solved, damagingly disrupting and prolonging grief processes and resolution (E. Clarke & McCreanor, 2006).

From the outset, the project was developed as a partnership between the researchers and members of the National Maori SIDS Prevention Team (MSPT; Everard, 1997; Tipene-Leach, Abel, Haretuku, & Everard, 2000) to understand the contexts in which Maori SIDS occurs so as to strengthen prevention efforts. We based our approach firmly in Maori ethical practices that considered the inherent sacredness of the objectives (to reduce preventable loss of babies) and the significant affects on the

well-being of parents. These orientations to the situation and the *mana* of the people involved arose from MSPT praxis and the values of Maori research team members and guided the development of the research design and implementation.

MSPT care workers discussed possible contributors from within their caseloads and made selections based on their perceptions of readiness of the bereaved parents to give interviews and on sample diversity criteria. Care workers approached possible participants with whom, as a matter of established MSPT practice, they had firmly established and ongoing relationships, in a staged process, a minimum of 18 months after the death of the baby. Where parents agreed to participate, the individual care workers set up the meetings, attended the interviews, and provided follow-up to encompass any reactions and distress arising from revisiting the trauma.

A number of participants commented that they achieved a kind of closure through provision of a safe, secure environment in which to tell their own story from beginning to end without interruption, pressure, or deflection from investigative authorities or family members with different perceptions of events. We obtained data of the highest quality about the social and environmental antecedents of Maori SIDS and its sequelae and disseminated widely through *hui*, reports (McManus et al., 2005), and publications (Edwards et al., 2005; Edwards, Tipene-Leach, & McCreanor, in press) locally and internationally; the study has significantly contributed to understanding determinants of indigenous SIDS.

*LESSONS FROM THE FIELD:*  
EDWARDS AND MCCREANOR

“*Hauora Tane: Health of Maori Men*” was another HRC-funded project that involved authors Edwards and McCreanor. In the face of entrenched health disparities

that saw Maori men, as a group, experiencing worse health than other demographic subgroups within Aotearoa, we sought to understand the social determinants of these outcomes through life story data gathered as individual interviews (Jones et al., 2006).

The university ethics committee required the usual provisions for confidentiality and informed consent. In practice, we found that these forms were at best irrelevant “red tape” and, at worst, a source of suspicion, disrupting the expected Maori processes of research and evoking questions about what would happen to the forms and who really controlled the research.

The impetus for the study arose from the work of Maori researchers who had carried out a replication of *Rapuora*, a national survey of Maori women’s health (Murchie, 1984), in partnership with the Maori Women’s Welfare League (MWWL). They were challenged to carry out an equivalent study of the health and well-being of Maori men and the funded research included capability building and skills development among Maori men in recognition of the low profile of the issue on official horizons and the scarcity of Maori male researchers. We knew that the issues around Maori men’s health would be sensitive and not easy to articulate. We therefore adopted an approach that relied on matching interviewers and participants on both geographic and gender variables and also drew strongly on *tikanga* to guide and manage the project. Through the MWWL, we recruited men with *whakapapa* or community connections, most of whom had no research training or experience, to gather the data within each of the League’s administrative regions. We provided live-in training at *marae* in Auckland, regular e-mail contact and mentoring while they were in the field, and gatherings to debrief and discuss data analysis. We engaged the male researchers we had trained to pilot test a national survey that was developed from the qualitative research and made use of the established networks to facilitate the return of the research findings

to audiences in each of the districts as well as a major report (R. Jones et al., 2007) and published paper (R. Jones et al., 2006).

Because the project was set against the background of a well-regarded study, responded to Maori calls for research, and was conducted through Maori networks and processes, it was able to proceed and collect data of outstanding quality. Initial suspicion of the project, which threatened participation, was able to be allayed, not through institutional ways of proceeding with the research, but in spite of the institutional requirements that had given rise to the suspicion in the first place.

#### LESSONS FROM THE FIELD: MOEWAKA BARNES

In the late 1990s, I put in an ethics research proposal to a university committee, covering evaluation of Maori projects in several communities, run by four Maori service providers. We had been selected by the providers and were working with them throughout the evaluation as well as jointly appointing and supporting community researchers. Evaluation plans had been worked through and agreed to by each of the providers. This was detailed in the ethics proposal.

One comment from the ethics committee was that we could not telephone and make arrangements to carry out interviews with Maori participants; our process should be to ring, introduce ourselves, make an appointment to visit, and further explain the project. If the participant agreed, make an appointment to return to carry out an interview. These processes had not been suggested for another project we were working on with mainly non-Maori participants. This requirement was mentioned at a *hui* where we were discussing evaluation processes. A Maori researcher from another university said that they had been told the same thing and had told the committee that this is what they would do, even though

they were unsure whether this would work in practice. Our response had been to write a detailed letter to the ethics committee explaining why this process would not necessarily be appropriate.

We explained that the researchers were selected in collaboration with their *iwi* and would follow appropriate processes for each situation. For example, it is not uncommon to interview someone and then be told who you are going to interview next. One elder said to me, “You should talk to our *kaumatua* down the road. I’ll ring and see if he’s home, then I’ll take you down.” Under set rules of encounter, this approach would not be possible. The prescribed ethical approach would take precedence over the wishes of these two *kaumatua*. This is not to say that flexibility is not acceptable to ethics committees, it is more that ethics forms guide one to write in a particular way, filling in set sections with set practices. It is simpler and easier to say to ethics committees “this is how we will do it” (as our *hui* participant did) rather than to explain that there will be a range of ways, and we may not be able to describe the full list of possibilities. Our explanation was accepted by the committee.

At a later date, and to another ethics committee, we filled in an ethics form in a way that left the research process open for communities and participants to have their *tikanga* needs met. This was a time-consuming process, and it would have been much simpler to fill in the form in a straightforward, one-size-fits-all approach.

Each section required some detail and an open range of possibilities. For example, to refer to the issue in the previous story, in the section asking who would make the initial approach to participants, we wrote,

This will depend on the entry point into the research project. Some will already be involved through the collaborating *iwi* groups, some will attend the *hui* and some will be suggested by others . . . some participants will directly contact

the researchers. The researchers are known in their communities. If an approach is to be made to someone who has been suggested, then the most appropriate way of contacting this person/*whanau* will be determined. . . . We will very much follow a process that is appropriate for the situation, for the potential participant and for their role in the community.

Issues of confidentiality also required some explanation. We wrote that we would discuss these issues in the consultation and collaboration processes and would develop protocols for identifying what information is of a more sensitive and locational nature. We undertook to look at different levels of knowledge sharing; some information could be held by the *iwi* in each site and decisions made as to what is *iwi* owned and held and what and how information is to be dispersed to wider audiences. Although confidentiality is often a cornerstone of ethics, we suggested that, in some cases, it might be unethical not to name or identify some organizations; for example, if there are particular issues that a *marae* group has with their *whenua*, the research may be used to highlight and develop strategies to deal with the issue.

In other sections, the way in which various *hui* and discussions would guide the *tikanga* were detailed. The information and consent sheets provided multiple options, to be selected at a later date, depending on the process to be followed. However, the ethics proposal also stated that written consent might be seen as inappropriate or some participants might wish to provide oral consent as a point of *tikanga*. We described how we wanted to be able to offer a range of consent options to each community and to work within their *tikanga*, consistent with the principles outlined by our university.

These principles included partnership, respect, and individual and collective rights. We felt this directed researchers to be flexible and responsive in working with Maori, rather than following a set way of conducting the research. An aside to this story is

that, when working with a non-Maori researcher who was requested by a *hapu* group to carry out research using their particular *tikanga* practices, the non-Maori researcher's response was that this breached ethics. This researcher was following the preordained, individual process that had been described in the proposal, rather than one that was respectful of participants' collective approaches. In this example, it is possible to see how one set of ethics directly challenges another.

It was uncertain how the ethics committee would view our proposal. To their credit, they were very positive, and the proposal was accepted. It is likely that their trust in the process was due to some particular circumstances—the people on the committee, previous proposals by the applicant, and the applicant being known to the committee and having discussed ethics, Maori, and the Treaty with them on their invitation. Since implementation, one of the *iwi* groups we were working with wanted to incorporate the project as part of a wider strategic research direction. Because our ethics proposal had built these types of processes and possibilities into the project, we were able to be responsive and develop this direction with minimal problems. A straightforward notification to the university ethics committee followed.

One further comment on this project came from a funding committee, which felt that we had not thought through the ethical implications fully enough. This was despite the fact that this was a joint proposal put forward by researchers and *iwi* who had worked together for a decade. We had explained our longstanding *whakapapa* and research connections, our process of working together through negotiation and individual and collective decision making, but we did not have a predetermined ethical standard. Thinking through the implications would be integral and ongoing as the research progressed; it was our perception that this reliance on a relationship ethic, rather than a procedural ethic, saw our approach judged as unthought through.

A related story, illustrating the serious way we as Maori view transgressions, came about in my role as a support person for a Ph.D. student. In my master's program, the student had developed a trusting relationship with a Maori person of high *mana* who had contributed to the student's thesis. The student had found much wisdom in their conversations (interviews) and was planning to further discuss the subject for the doctorate, when the *kaumatua* died. The student sought the permission of the family to include the previous material, outlining possible processes.

The family response was supportive; they understood that there was a trusting relationship and also noted that the student would need to heed the *mana* of the deceased in any use of the data. The ethics committee would, because of institutional requirements, need to give approval before the processes could be implemented.

On the face of it, this might seem a relatively straightforward situation, but the student was aware of deep implications. To refer to our previous point about transgressions, any inappropriate use on the student's part could bring censure from the committee. This is negligible<sup>8</sup>, however, in the face of what it would mean in the Maori world, where the *wairua* of the student, the student's family, and even wider could be affected for generations. To include this information is a daunting prospect, but not to include it can be unethical; the knowledge was given to be shared, in the hope of others learning and benefiting. The task with which the researcher is charged is to do it, fully understanding these issues and responsibilities.

These experiences highlight a tension between filling out a proposal in the commonly expected way and following principles such as the ones in the Treaty of Waitangi, which lead the research process to be a more flexible, iterative one.

It could be argued that confidentiality is not necessarily a Maori issue. However, confidentiality issues are illustrative of where worldviews and concepts may clash.

There is a pervasive standard of anonymity in mainstream research. In ethics forms, a researcher doesn't have to ensure anonymity but needs to explain any departure from this assumed standard. Anonymity and identity are interlinked and are a complex matter for Maori. In some *hui* (e.g., *Hui Whakapiripiri*), Maori have described anonymity as unethical and a nonstandard practice; being able to front up, face-to-face, and having stories attributed is the standard. If research is going to make a difference, then anonymity may be counter-productive—how do you tell the story of your *hapu* and colonization if you can't name and identify yourself?

If *tikanga* is about processes, then the main role of external groups such as ethics committees is to safeguard the *tikanga* of others, rather than prescribing what *tikanga* is and how it is applied in advance, implying that there is a universal right or wrong way of doing things. *Tikanga* is about ensuring that relationships and processes are in place to enable the research to follow paths that work for each participant and for each situation, many of which cannot be anticipated. The more closely that researchers are involved with the researched, the more likely it is that they will need to be responsive and adaptable and the greater the likelihood that they will be able to do so; close relationships with the local community, for example, can ensure that the appropriate people will be on board and able to provide expertise, endorsement, and guidance for the research. In this way, prescribing a right and wrong way of carrying out research may not be ethical for the participants involved.

In relation to ensuring ethical ways of conducting research and ethical implications, if we live within a Maori worldview, how *could we* as researchers transgress without serious reverberations? The care and respect (and bravery) that is needed to tread these paths is at the forefront of our minds, possible censure by the academy is truly white noise by comparison.

LESSONS FROM THE FIELD:  
EDWARDS

*Tikanga*, described as wise action and thought, draws on theory and practices validated by Maori. The most interesting and challenging ethical dilemmas are not where right and wrong are clear but rather where they are conflicted.

The following example arose in the context of a doctoral study that required university ethics approval. My research practice is informed by my personal ethics; what is wisest given my knowledge level of particular situations. The greatest concern I had was the effects that my activities would have for all concerned, on the *mana* of my participants, my people, and myself. In Maori communities that I am familiar with, the consequences to the individual and their *whanau* can remain for generations.

My personal ethics were informed by my knowledge of my own tribal (*Ngati Maniapoto*) context, having resided, watched, listened, and practiced over years of inclusion and involvement. The knowledge of the potential effects on long-term collective and personal *mana* and responsibility, together with the shame that would touch my family possibly well into the future, was foremost in my mind.

In my doctoral research, I am recording and studying the extant knowledge of elders with whom I share *whakapapa* connections. These kinships have been forged into relationships over many years and many interactions. Interestingly, actions of earlier ancestors that neither I nor the participants have known resonated through these relationships with vividness and clarity during the course of our (re)connections. The scope of our relationships meant that, as well as the topics of the research, the elders regularly discussed my development as part of their care for, and of, me and my family. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this resulted in high levels of mutual trust and my elders were supportive of me engaging in the study; when I talked to them about the possibility of interviewing them, all agreed.

However, having received my elders' ethical approval to engage in this research, enrolling in a course of doctoral study at a university meant that I was also required to apply for research ethics approval via that system; I effectively needed two sets of ethical approval. As part of my ethics application to the university, I was keen to maintain a *Ngati Maniapoto* epistemological approach consistent with my cultural grounding and the theme of my research.

*Te reo Maori* is one of the official languages of Aotearoa, and I wrote my ethics application in *te reo Maori* and answered the questions concisely. For the ethics committee viewing the application, this was challenging as it was believed to be the first application they had received in *te reo Maori*; translation was required. Even so members not familiar with the Maori world were left with more questions than answers and I met with the full committee to discuss the application. I explained to them in English what I was doing; although they were happy with that, they said they needed to have something for their records. Once the discussion ended, the Chair of the committee said that my discussion had greatly enhanced their understandings. Members commented that they were clearly dealing with two different systems; for me it was two different worldviews and two different ideologies. At the conclusion, the Chair requested that I write my verbal iterations up and the committee would be happy to accept the application. I pondered for a minute and asked if I might be allowed to do so orally as this was the best way I could express myself and that it was exactly what my research was arguing for. Some members of the committee felt excited by this, with a lawyer member saying that, since oral evidence is acceptable in court, oral ethics should be given the same space. The Chair, on behalf of the committee, agreed, after requesting that I speak in English to expedite approval decisions. I agreed but informed him that it would not be as relevant and contextual in English, as regards

my *hapu* and *iwi* and our epistemologies. Ethical approval was granted after the Chair of the Ethics Committee had heard my tape.

We have since heard from a colleague that an ethics application in Maori to another committee was required to be resubmitted in English (J. Gavala, personal communication, June 10, 2006).

To be able to articulate something of what it means for me to work within Maori approaches, I developed a conceptual schema that encapsulates the ethical framework guiding my research. I suggest a set of *matapuna* (principles) and *uara* (values) that can be applied to Maori contexts and may have wider relevance for other settings. The three *matapuna* I propose are *tika*, *pono*, and *aroha*, terms often referred to in Maori settings. They are the researchers' accountabilities to *hapu* and *whanau*,<sup>6</sup> namely, to act in a manner that does not detract from, but maintains or enhances the mana of the *whanau* or *hapu*. Actions are based on correctness, truthfulness, honesty, and transparency, for the benefit of the research participants and, at times of conflict, the overriding responsibility for the researcher is to focus on others.

I also suggest a set of *uara* that detail the researcher's responsibilities, first to the participants and second, the researcher's *whanau* and *hapu*. Broadly speaking, the *uara* cover relationships, communication, reciprocity (benefits and hospitality), ongoing connections, bonds and interactions, mutual respect, the researcher's place, and their spiritual and physical well-being.

### ◆ Conclusions

Contrasting views exist on ethical theory and practice between Maori and non-Maori and within and between different groups of Maori. Acknowledging and enabling approaches that reconcile diverse worldviews is a challenge for this generation and those to come. Reconciliation lies

in the negotiation of ambivalence and contestation that is always present in journeys of development. This ambivalence and contestation is common to minority peoples who share histories where the "dominance of certain types of cultural form have had to be negotiated continually in the process of liberation and reclamation" (Ashcroft & Ahluwalia, 1999, p. 12).

These few stories plus the accumulated wisdom of the Maori literature in this area suggest that conventional ethical requirements are alien and alienating to Maori researchers and communities, and cannot provide or understand the kinds of protection and guidance needed for the successful and more equitable conduct of social research.

Ethics for Maori research takes many flexible forms and a variety of ethics frameworks and guides present themselves for consideration. These range from Western epistemologically based ethics proposals to frameworks developed by Maori, usually very strongly relationship based.

The stories that we have presented demonstrate that one size does not fit all, even within Maori research approaches. What they have in common is the commitment to honoring relationships and being guided by the researched in recognition that *tikanga* (ethics) lies with participants. This is in contrast to the dominant epistemological approach, which vests ethics with the researcher and is largely determined by preset requirements. What this lends itself to is the domination of one epistemology over another (e.g., non-Maori vs. Maori), the subordination of evolving ethical processes that would enable greater decision making and power to sit with participants and, lastly, the tendency to tread safe and preset paths rather than diverse journeys (between and within cultures).

For these reasons, some suggest separate ethics committees or processes for Maori; this is not an unlikely scenario. However, a change in focus for mainstream ethics approval may benefit both non-Maori and Maori. A greater

focus on relationships, power, decision making, and intentions would lead researchers to address more underlying ethical considerations that guide processes. Evidence of relationships and processes to guide ethics and *tikanga* is a legitimate basis for ethical approval, as is the understanding that Maori are being judged and evaluated within an incredibly powerful and relevant framework.

It is acknowledged that some actions are in themselves a cause for alarm and that a shift in focus would present those vested with approving research protocols with the tension of having enough information about actions to feel that the researcher understands safety and conduct issues while not requiring so much set detail that the ethics protocols are immutable. Currently, this balance is weighted on the side of prescribed action where participants' greatest power is the refusal to participate.

### ◆ *Maori Words Used in This Chapter*

<i>Maori</i>	<i>English</i>
Aroha	love, empathy
Hapu	kinship group of multiple whanau
Hui	meeting or gathering
Iwi	tribe
Pakeha	people of European origin
Marae	gathering places
Matapuna	principles
Kaumatua	respected elder, male or female
Mana	inherited or earned prestige
Pono	honest, true, transparent
Te reo Maori	Maori language
Tika	right, correct
Tikanga	Maori practices or processes
Uara	values
Wairua	spiritual
Whakapapa	line of descent from ancestors
Whanau	extended family

### ◆ *Notes*

1. The Treaty of Waitangi is an agreement between the British Crown and Maori signed progressively between 1840 and 1841. Contested interpretations range between cession and guarantee of Maori sovereignty.

2. This is a commission set up specifically to deal with historical and other grievances (Byrne, 2005; Orange, 1987) between Maori and the New Zealand Government.

3. Following Bell (2004), we adopt the term *settler* to encompass the wide range of European (mainly British) cultural groups who have colonized Aotearoa since 1840.

4. Definitions of terms are included at the end of the chapter.

5. *Kaupapa Maori* research is a theory of research and practice based in Maori worldviews.

6. In this context, *whanau* refers also to a group that shares a common identity or belonging, for example, a group of researchers working under the banner of a university.

### ◆ *References*

- Ajwani, S., Blakely, T., Robson, B., Tobias, M., & Bonne, M. (2003). *Decades of disparity: Ethnic mortality trends in New Zealand 1980–1999* (Public Health Intelligence Occasional Bulletin No. 16). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health and University of Otago.
- Antonovsky, A. (1996). The salutogenic model as a theory to guide health promotion. *Health Promotion International*, 11, 11–18.
- Ashcroft, B., & Ahluwalia, P. (1999). *Edward Said: The paradox of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Beaglehole, R. (2002). Overview and framework. In R. Detels, J. McEwen, R. Beaglehole, & H. Tanaka (Eds.), *Oxford textbook of public health* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 83–87). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, A. (2004). Cultural vandalism and Pakeha politics of guilt and responsibility. In

- P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata, Tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank, Victoria, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative research stories*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Byrne, B. (2005). Nation and identity in the Waitangi Tribunal Reports. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Campbell, A. (1991). Ethics after Cartwright. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 104(905), 36–37.
- Campbell, A. (1995). Ethics in a bicultural context. *Bioethics*, 9(2), 149–154.
- Cartwright, S. (1988). *The report of the committee of inquiry into allegations concerning the treatment of cervical cancer at National Women's Hospital and other related matters*. Auckland, New Zealand: Government Printing Office.
- Clarke, E., & McCreanor, T. (2006). He wahine tangi tikapa . . . : Statutory investigative processes and the grieving of Maori families who have lost a baby to SIDS. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 1, 25–43.
- Clarke, S. (2005). Two models of ethical committees. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, 2(1), 41–47.
- Coney, S. (1988). *The unfortunate experiment*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Cram, F. (2001). Rangahau Māori: Tona Tika Tona Pono. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research ethics in Aotearoa: Concepts, practice, critique* (pp. 35–52). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.
- Cram, F., McCreanor, T., Smith, T., Nairn, R., & Johnstone, W. (2006). Kaupapa Maori research and Pakeha social science: Epistemological tensions in a study of Maori health. *Hulili*, 3(1), 41–68.
- Daniels, K. (1989). The Cartwright Report and its implications for social work. *Social Work Review*, 2(4), 8–13.
- Dew, K., & Davis, P. (Eds.). (2004). *Health and society in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Maori health development*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2004). *Race and ethnicity in public policy: Does it work?* Paper presented at the Social Policy Research and Evaluation Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Edwards, S., McManus, V., & McCreanor, T. (2005). Collaborative research with Maori and sensitive issues: The application of tikanga and kaupapa in research on Maori Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 25, 88–104.
- Edwards, S., Tipene-Leach, D., & McCreanor, T. (in press). Love your woman cause it ain't nobody's fault: Maori men's grief around death of an infant from SIDS. *Journal of Death Studies*.
- Everard, C. (1997). Managing the New Zealand cot death study: Lessons from between the rock and a hard place. *Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific*, 4(2), 146–152.
- Gillett, G. (1989). Medical ethics: New ethical committees, their nature and role. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 102(870), 314–315.
- Gillett, G. (2005). Bioethics and cara sui. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, 2(1), 24–33.
- Goodyear-Smith, F., Lobb, B., Davies, G., Nachson, I., & Seelau, S. (2002). International variation in ethics committee requirements: Comparisons across five nations. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 3(E2), 1–8.
- Harris, E. (1988). The Cartwright Report and consent. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 101(865), 671.
- Health Research Council. (2006). *GA207 Application form*. Retrieved November 10, 2006, from [www.hrc.govt.nz/assets/doc/0809GA207form.doc](http://www.hrc.govt.nz/assets/doc/0809GA207form.doc)
- Jahnke, H., & Taiapa, J. (1999). Maori research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social*

- science research in New Zealand (pp. 39–50). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.
- Jones, G., & Telfer, B. (1990). National bioethics committees: Developments and prospects. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 103(884), 66–68.
- Jones, R., Crengle, S., & McCreanor, T. (2006). How Tikanga guides and protects the research process: Insights from the Hauora Tane Project. *New Zealand Journal of Social Policy*, 29, 60–77.
- Jones, R., Crengle, S., McCreanor, T., Aspin, C., Jansen, R., & Bennett, K. (2007). *Hauora o nga Tane Maori: The health of Maori men*. Auckland, New Zealand: Tomaiora Maori Health Research Group, University of Auckland.
- Kelsey, J. (2002). *At the crossroads: Three essays*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- McManus, V., Abel, S., & McCreanor, T. (2005). *SIDS Report*. Auckland, New Zealand: Maori SIDS Prevention Unit, Auckland University.
- McNeil, P. (1989). The implications for Australia of the New Zealand “Report of the Cervical Cancer Inquiry”: No cause for complacency. *Australian Medical Journal*, 150(5), 264–271.
- McNeil, P. (2002). Ethics committees in Australia and New Zealand: A critique. *Politeia*, 18(57), 113–119.
- Ministry of Health. (2006). *Operational standards for ethics committees. Updated edition*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author [government report, no specific author].
- Ministry of Social Development. (2006). *The Social Report 2006*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author [government report, no specific author].
- Mitchell, E., Hassall, I., Scragg, R., Taylor, B., Ford, R., & Allen, E. (1994). The New Zealand cot death study: Some legal issues. *Journal of Paediatric and Child Health*, 28(1), S17–S20.
- Moewaka Barnes, H. (2000). Kaupapa Maori: Explaining the ordinary. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7, 13–16.
- Moore, A. (2004). New Zealand’s Ethics Committees. *New Zealand Bioethics Journal*, 5(2), 3.
- Murchie, E. (1984). *Rapuora: Health and Maori women*. Wellington, New Zealand: Maori Women’s Welfare League.
- Neutze, J. (1989). A standard for ethical committees. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 102(863), 111.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Park, J. (1994). Reflections on project design: Experience with the “Place of Alcohol in the lives of New Zealand Women” project. *Sites*, 28, 44–54.
- Paul, C. (1988). The New Zealand cervical cancer study: Could it happen again? *British Medical Journal*, 297(6647), 533–539.
- Paul, C. (2000). Health researchers’ views of ethics committee functioning in New Zealand. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 113(1111), 210–214.
- Pere, R. (1991). *Te Wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Gisborne, New Zealand: Ao Ake Global Learning.
- Poutasi, K. (1989). An analysis of the key recommendations of the “Report of the Cervical Cancer Inquiry 1988.” *New Zealand Health Review*, 8(3), 3–6.
- Reid, P., & Cram, F. (2005). Connecting health, people and country in Aotearoa New Zealand. In K. Dew & P. Davis (Eds.), *Health and society in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 33–48). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richmond, D. (1977). Auckland Hospital ethics committee: The first three years. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 86(591), 10–12.
- Rosier, P. (1989). The speculum bites back. *Reproductive and Genetic Engineering*, 2(2), 121–132.
- Sharp, A. (1990). *Justice and the Maori: The philosophy and practice of Maori claims in New Zealand since the 1970s*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed.

- Smith, L. T. (1995, February). *Towards Kaupapa Maori research*. Paper presented at the Matawhanui Conference: Maori University Teachers Conference, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., & Pearson, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Tangata Tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank, Victoria, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *He Tikanga Whakaaro research ethics in the Maori community*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Maori Affairs.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (1999). *Progress towards closing the social and economic gap between Maori and Non-Maori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Tipene-Leach, D., Abel, S., Haretuku, R., & Everard, C. (2000). The Maori SIDS Prevention Programme: Challenges and implications for Maori health service development. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 14, 65–77.
- Tolich, M. (2002). Pakeha “paralysis”: Cultural safety for those researching the general population of Aotearoa. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19, 164–178.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tomu Matou*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Whariki Research Group (2007). Report to the BRCSS management group on the first National Maori Social Science Hui, Rotorua, 16–17 November, 2006. Auckland, New Zealand: Te Ropu Whariki, Massey University.