

*Embracing Indigenous Culture in Military Organizations:
The Experience of Māori in the New Zealand Military*

Grazia Scoppio

Since the pioneering work by Dutch social psychologist Geert Hofstede in the early 1980s (Hofstede, 1981), cultural diversity in organizations has been the subject of many studies both within national contexts and across nations (e.g. Amaram, 2007; Jung et al., 2009). Over the years, several scholars and researchers have looked at cultural diversity within military organizations (e.g., McDonald & Parks, 2011) and a few have focused on Indigenous people in the military (e.g., Maclaurin, 2004). Building on a previous study on Indigenous peoples in the New Zealand Defence Force and the Canadian Armed Forces (Scoppio, 2010), this article further investigates the successful participation of Māori in the New Zealand military. It uses organizational culture theory as a framework to analyze the 'key mechanisms' (the strategies, approaches and practices) adopted by the New Zealand military which have facilitated this partnership and mutual understanding between Māori and Pākehā (Māori term for people of European descent). These mechanisms, supported by the external and internal environments, have created an open and inclusive organizational culture that has enabled the organization to embrace Indigenous culture on the one hand, and has empowered Māori on the other.

Background

The previous research was a comparative study conducted during a visit to New Zealand, as part of an exchange between the Canadian and New Zealand Departments of Defence, in October 2007. The objective of the exchange was for the Canadian delegation to visit various military bases and establishments in order to observe firsthand the approaches and initiatives used to integrate Māori culture into the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF). At the same time, the Canadians had the opportunity to illustrate to their NZDF colleagues all the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) Indigenous programmes aiming to increase participation of Indigenous people in the CAF, such as Bold Eagle. This summer employment programme gives Indigenous youth “a taste of military training with the option to join the CAF” by combining “Indigenous culture and teachings with military training, that will help [youth] develop valuable skills such as self-confidence, self-discipline, teamwork, time management, respect and fitness” (Canada, Government of Canada, National Defence, 2018a p.1, and 2018b p.1). The results of the observations captured during the visit were summarized in an article comparing “the experiences of New Zealand and Canada’s militaries in order to identify similarities, differences, potential lessons, and best practices in the area of organizational diversity” (Scoppio, 2010, p.36). The article also brings to light some lessons and best practices from New Zealand upon which Canada could draw to enhance participation within the CAF of Canada’s Indigenous people, namely North American Indians (or First Nations), Inuit and Métis (people of mixed Indigenous and European ancestry). Some of the best practices identified in the NZDF’s unique approach toward Māori include:

- Creating synergies between Māori culture and military culture;
- Encompassing the Māori warrior ethos as part of Army ethos;
- Harmonizing Māori ceremonials with military ceremonials;
- Going beyond ceremonials by creating a Marae on military bases;
- Offering Māori cultural programmes and Māori language training to NZDF members;
- Demonstrating leadership support for Māori culture;

- Drawing upon Māori role models at high levels of leadership; and,
- Creating partnerships with Māori communities (Scoppio, 2010).

Purpose and methodology

As a follow-up to the previous research, this paper further investigates the main approaches and practices that have enabled a positive partnership with Māori and the successful inclusion of Māori culture in New Zealand's military, using organizational culture theory as a framework.

The methodology adopted to inform the paper is mainly qualitative, aside from some numeric data on Māori representation. To begin, a review of the literature was conducted. Specific websites were also searched, including those of the NZDF, New Zealand (NZ) Army, Royal New Zealand Navy (RNZN) and Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF). Limited literature and information as well as some statistical data relevant to this study were identified, consisting of some statistics on NZDF personnel, and Statistics New Zealand 2013 Census data¹, as well as a handful of recent articles on Māori in the NZDF. Mostly, these searches generated historical literature, such as the New Zealand Wars (Cowan, 1955), Māori participation in the First World War (Pugsley, 1995), the Second World War Māori Battalion (Soutar, 2008), and New Zealand Indigenous people's rights and self-determination (Tomas, 2008).

The conclusion drawn is that there is not an abundance of updated data and recently published academic literature and research on current participation of the Māori people in the modern-day New Zealand military. As such, informal emails were sent to select points of contact in the NZDF seeking updated statistical data on Māori representation in the NZDF and specific services as well as recent information on potential new policies, strategies and programmes regarding Māori culture and language. The points of contact were various persons in the NZDF known to the author either through the previous visit to New Zealand, or through academic networks, namely the New Zealand Defence College; the Halifax International Security Forum; NZDF uniformed members who were former students of the author; as well as NZDF

¹ The 2018 Census data was not yet released at the time of writing this article.

uniformed members and international scholars personally known to the author. Through the snowball effect, additional points of contact were generated including Māori Liaison Officers. Initially, 11 individuals were approached, of whom five provided information via email. In addition, one of the former students engaged the NZDF Headquarters (HQNZDF) and, consequently, the Office of the Chief of Staff of the HQNZDF sent a letter containing recent demographic data on the NZDF and on each service. To further inform this research, three NZDF Officers subsequently were asked to review the paper and provide their perspectives and feedback.

In addition to the paucity of available scholarship in this domain, the author wishes to acknowledge that she is not Indigenous, which some may consider to be a limitation of this paper. Indeed, this may be the case for many other scholarly works. For example, Noah Riseman, an Australian historian whose research focuses on the social history of marginalised groups in the Australian military, writes: “The majority of historians writing about Indigenous military service are not Indigenous. This poses the question of whose histories we are writing, and do we have the authority to write such histories.... Based on my own experience, what is most important to Indigenous ex-service personnel and their families is that these long-forgotten histories be shared and commemorated” (Riseman, 2014, p. 908). With these words in mind, the role of a non-Indigenous scholar interested in Indigenous research can be seen as a ‘story teller’ who gives voice to Indigenous perspectives and knowledge, while acknowledging their positionality, namely “the stance or positioning of the researcher in relation to the social and political context of the study—the community, the organization or the participant group” (Rowe, 2014, p. 628). In the case of this author, as a Canadian female scholar from an immigrant background, with knowledge and experience in the area of culture and diversity in military organizations, the intent is to contribute to the scholarship on the relationship between Indigenous people and military organizations in a way that is culturally sensitive and appropriate towards the Māori people and culture.

Conceptual framework

To help us understand and make sense of the role that ‘organizational culture’ plays in this context, it is important to identify an appropriate conceptual framework.

However, there is no universally accepted definition of organizational culture and its dimensions. A research study on organizational culture by Mannion et al. (2008) revealed that a comprehensive review of the organizational culture literature conducted by Van der Post, De Coning, & Smit (1997) identified over 100 dimensions associated with the concept. Mannion et al. concluded that to overcome the challenge of this large number of cultural dimensions, the best approach is to cluster them into separate categories, each category representing different levels of culture. Mannion et al. selected Schein's (1989) model of organizational culture dimensions as it was deemed the most frequently cited of these approaches.

The work of Edgar H. Schein, one of the founders of organizational psychology and a world-renowned scholar and Professor of Management Emeritus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, provides a useful framework of analysis for this study. We can apply Schein's (2010) model of organizational culture and associated three levels of culture to military organizations. According to Schein, the culture of a group is "a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems" (Schein, 2010, p. 18).

Schein considers that there are three levels of culture within organizations: artifacts, espoused values and underlying assumptions. Within an organization such as the military, artifacts are the aspects that are visible, observable and explicit, such as military units, buildings, equipment, weapons, hierarchical structures, uniforms, regulations, rules, parades, formal functions and ceremonies, and published list of military values and ethics codes. At the same time, there are many "espoused beliefs, values, norms and rules of behaviour" (Schein, 2010, p. 23) that are shared by the group such as ways to solve problems, what approach will work or not work, and what is considered right and wrong behaviour. In a military context, examples would include the value that is placed on leadership and the chain of command, pride in the profession of arms, the belief in discipline, and team-work. Finally, basic underlying assumptions are those solutions and approaches that are taken for granted by a group because they worked well in the past and ultimately shaped the group's actions and

behaviour. These basic assumptions are often unconscious and usually not debated or questioned, so they are hard to identify and even harder to change. For example, in the past, many Western military organizations assumed that, to achieve unit cohesion and mission effectiveness, it was necessary to have homogenous units such as all units/teams of all Caucasian males. Although this 'basic assumption' had little or no empirical support, it historically led to formal and informal exclusion or discrimination towards various groups in many military organizations including women, homosexuals, ethnic minorities and Indigenous people.

Given the underlying assumptions and visible and invisible levels of culture in very traditional, formal and hierarchical military organizations, where achieving cultural diversity is very challenging, New Zealand provides a unique example of a more open and innovative military organizational culture, by embracing Indigenous values, integrating Indigenous cultural and language training, and supporting the participation of Indigenous groups in the military.

These achievements were possible partly thanks to the mechanisms put in place by the NZDF leadership and partly to the supportive *internal* and *external environments* of the organization, which will now be explored.

External environment: New Zealand and Māori relationship

Based on the 2013 Census, 598,605 people identified with the Māori ethnic group, constituting 14.9 percent of the 4,242,048 resident population, or one in seven people (New Zealand Government, Statistics New Zealand, 2013). The Māori ethnic group increased 5.9 percent from 2006 and almost 40 percent in the past 22 years.²

The Māori people arrived in New Zealand from Polynesia in about 800 CE, and in 1840 they signed the Treaty of Waitangi with Britain, whereby they ceded sovereignty to Queen Victoria while retaining territorial rights. During the colonial rule by the British Empire, there were a series of land wars between 1843 and 1872 dubbed

² The other main ethnic groups in New Zealand, namely New Zealander, European, Asian and Pacific Peoples (also referred to as Pasifika) are also experiencing growth, either due to migration (e.g. Asian) or driven by births (Māori and Pacific).

the New Zealand Wars, which New Zealand historian James Belich describes as “bitter and bloody struggles” (1986, p. 15). Māori served on both sides of these conflicts, and the end result was the loss of significant tracts of Māori land and strained relationships between the Crown and particular iwis (tribes) (Belich, 1986). New Zealand became an independent Dominion in 1907, was declared the Realm of New Zealand in 1953 and, in 1967, the first New Zealand-born Governor-General was appointed which was the start of independent governance by the people of New Zealand (Independence Day, 2017).

Historically, the Māori people have similar experiences of colonization to Indigenous groups in other settler nations, such as Canada, Australia and the United States, resulting in loss of culture and language for the Indigenous people (see e.g. Patrick Wolfe’s defining work on colonial studies, 1999). Since The Waitangi Tribunal was established by the *Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975*, the Tribunal provides at once a legal process by which Māori Treaty claims are investigated and contributes to the reconciliation of outstanding issues between Māori and the Crown (New Zealand Government, Ministry of Justice, 2017). During the last decades, the government of New Zealand, and in particular the Ministry of Māori Development (Te Puni Kokiri), has worked to address Māori grievances, settlement of land treaties, as well as the loss of culture and language. In 1987, the *Māori Language Act* came into force and Te Reo Māori (the Māori language) became one of New Zealand’s official languages, along with English and sign language. Through these efforts, New Zealand has been successful in reducing some socio-economic inequalities between Māori and Pakeha, although work still remains to be done in some areas, such as reducing gaps in employment and unemployment rates, and in income, as documented in a study led by Business Professor Lisa Marriott from Victoria University of Wellington (Marriott & Sim, 2014). Recent statistics demonstrate that greater numbers of Māori are achieving higher educational levels and participating in the workforce. Based on the 2013 Census, “36,072 Māori stated a bachelor’s degree or higher as their highest qualification, compared with 23,070 in 2006 (up 56.4 percent)” (New Zealand Government, Statistics New Zealand, 2013, p. 13). Labour force participation statistics show that Māori employment rates have increased significantly; in 2017, Māori employment rates were up 21,900 (constituting 7.6 percent) (New Zealand Government, Statistics New Zealand, 2017).

More importantly, greater value has been placed over the years on the Treaty of Waitangi, which is viewed as the foundational document for setting the terms of the relationship between the Māori people and the Crown. Based on this foundation, New Zealand has developed a unique approach toward Māori in that the country is considered 'bicultural,' and Māori are not viewed as a 'minority' and Pākehā as a 'majority,' but rather, as partners; as such, many believe that "what is good for Māori is good for New Zealand" (Scoppio, 2010, p. 42).

Historical background: Māori military participation

Australian historian Noah Riseman begins his comparison of 20th century Indigenous military histories in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the United States, by stating that the "role of war in shaping nations' identities is unparalleled" (2014, p. 901). Through this comparison, Riseman determines that there were more academic accounts of Indigenous military histories published in New Zealand than in other countries prior to 1970, and he cites various authors from the mid-1900s to modern times who traced the history of Māori military participation in the First World War Māori Pioneer Battalion (Cowan, 1955; O'Connor, 1967; Pugsley, 1995) and in the Second World War 28th Māori Battalion (Coady, 1956 – republished in 2012; Soutar, 2008). Riseman deems that the wider scope of written work on Indigenous history in New Zealand is due to the fact that "Māori political and social status within New Zealand was comparatively better than that of Indigenous people in other Anglo-settler societies. They were also a larger percentage of the population than in other cases. Thus, they were not so marginalised from national historical narratives" (2014, p. 902). While acknowledging that there are still some gaps in the scholarship on Māori military service, Riseman emphasizes "the significance of the Māori Battalion to Māori identity – and indeed to all of New Zealand's national identity" and the "importance of military service as a contemporary manifestation of Māori warrior traditions" (2014, p. 905).

Renowned New Zealand historian Claudia Orange examines the relationship between the evolution of the Māori War Effort Organization and Māori autonomy. Orange illustrates how, in 1939, the infantry formed a Battalion of Māori recruits and

the “28th Māori Battalion, organized on tribal basis in four companies, departed overseas in May of 1940” (Orange, 2007, p. 239). In 1942, Māori leaders and the New Zealand government came to an agreement to create the Māori War Effort Organization, run by Māori people to assist with recruiting and also co-operate regarding Māori manpower. Over time, this Organization grew in scope and its operations included Māori labour and social welfare. These are considered by Orange as examples of the New Zealand government providing the Māori people the opportunity to take responsibility for their own affairs at an unprecedented level since colonization.

A more critical perspective is provided by Corinne David-Ives, who researches reconciliation policies concerning Indigenous people in the Commonwealth countries. On the one hand, David-Ives describes the creation of specific Māori military units as giving visibility to the Māori people and proving their loyalty to the nation. On the other hand, in the aftermath of the Second World War there was a growing “individualistic approach which was to ease the integration of Māori individuals within Pakeha society” (David-Ives, 2017, p. 378). As such, integration policies clashed with the notion of a separate Māori battalion which some commentators saw as racial segregation. In contrast, David-Ives sees the integration of Māori recruits in the army as “assimilation” (2017, p. 384).

New Zealand’s researcher Debbie Hohaia also contributes to the scholarship on Māori participation in the NZDF (2016a; 2016b). She states that: “Other than rugby, the military is one aspect of New Zealand society that can claim to be truly shared by Māori and Pākehā alike” (Hohaia, 2016a, p. 79). Hohaia also provides a brief overview of Indigenous people’s participation in the military in the late 19th and 20th century, explaining that historically, in major overseas conflicts, Indigenous people and people of colour participated at higher rates than those of European ethnicity, although this over-representation was often in particular ranks and trades. At the same time, “many Indigenous people and people of colour also viewed military participation as a way to legitimize native citizenship” (Hohaia, 2016b, p. 48).

Table 1: NZDF Regular Force Ethnicity Data

NZDF Regular Force	Jun 2003	Jun 2004	Jun 2005	Jun 2006	Jun 2007	Jun 2008	Jun 2009	Jun 2010	Jun 2011	Jun 2012	Jun 2013	Jun 2014	Jun 2015	Jun 2016	Jun 2017
OFFICERS	1661	1689	1707	1811	1880	1897	1963	2025	2014	1874	1866	1902	1972	2027	2106
NEW ZEALANDER	378	365	362	451	507	550	584	617	649	622	647	663	709	731	765
NZ EUROPEAN	811	835	842	815	805	741	762	777	756	694	673	675	692	695	701
MAORI	73	71	73	82	89	100	107	114	116	106	106	110	110	113	123
PACIFIC ISLANDER	20	19	18	22	25	25	27	28	26	24	19	19	20	20	25
ASIAN	6	6	10	11	13	15	15	15	17	20	18	25	29	35	39
OTHER EUROPEAN	151	173	183	224	255	293	300	310	305	277	280	300	292	299	310
OTHER	4	5	5	7	9	13	16	22	21	22	26	20	19	25	25
NO ETHNICITY DECLARED	218	215	214	199	177	160	152	142	124	109	97	90	101	109	118
OTHER RANKS	6999	6992	6907	7168	7171	7385	7746	7648	7525	6648	6638	6939	6979	7043	71103
NEW ZEALANDER	1000	1027	1007	1206	1546	1777	1954	1956	1960	1799	1956	2161	2222	2305	2390
NZ EUROPEAN	3101	3068	2983	2899	2591	2468	2560	2490	2499	2160	1976	1995	1960	1930	1887
MAORI	1507	1518	1437	1559	1580	1603	1670	1630	1563	132	1274	1307	1261	1249	1220
PACIFIC ISLANDER	198	215	215	243	259	300	313	314	298	281	290	320	339	343	331
ASIAN	34	38	42	49	51	64	77	76	76	76	87	99	109	110	133
OTHER EUROPEAN	476	556	633	717	760	823	839	850	825	732	759	783	758	755	770
OTHER	23	27	28	40	52	69	72	84	88	83	99	84	85	85	89
NO ETHNICITY DECLARED	600	543	512	425	332	281	261	248	216	196	197	190	245	266	283
Total	8660	8681	8614	8949	9051	9282	9709	9673	9539	8522	8504	8841	8951	9070	9209

Internal environment: the New Zealand military and the Māori people

Given the small size of New Zealand, its military is equally small. Based on publicly available data, the overall NZDF as of May 2017 includes three primary personnel groups: 9,249 Regular Force, 2,418 Reserve Force, and 2,865 Civilians, for an overall total of 14,532 personnel (New Zealand Defence Force, 2017a). The statistical data provided by NZDF Chief of Staff (see Table 1) goes more in depth, and shows data by ethnicity starting from June 2003, the year when the NZDF began capturing this data, broken down by Officer Ranks and Other Ranks (Non-Commissioned Ranks). As of June 2017, the total number of Regular Force personnel was 9,209 (New Zealand Defence Force, 2017b).

Historically, the Māori people had a high propensity to join the military. This is rooted in their warrior tradition demonstrated through their active participation in many wars, going back to the New Zealand Wars, the First World War Māori Pioneer Battalion, and the Second World War 28th Māori Battalion. As such, the proportion of Māori in the military has been traditionally higher than in the overall New Zealand population. This is not unlike other Indigenous populations such as Native Americans,

as epitomized by Tom Holm, Professor of American Indian Studies at the University of Arizona, who intimated “that American Indians have legitimized themselves as American citizens through military service. Many American Indians, however, would argue that they served not to legitimize their American citizenship; but because they are links in a chain of warriorhood extending back to pre-Columbian times” (1997, p. 472).

Looking at the data set provided by the NZDF Chief of Staff (Table 1), the rates of Māori uniformed members in the NZDF from 2003-16 were higher than in the overall New Zealand population; however, in 2017, the percentage of Māori in uniform in the NZDF was about the same than in the overall New Zealand population. The year with the highest representation of military members of Māori descent was 2009, when the total NZDF also reached its peak strength of 9,709, of which 1,777 were Māori (18.3 percent). The year with the lowest representation of Māori was 2017, where Māori members represented 1,343 (14.6 percent) of the total NZDF Regular Force population of 9,209. While there are higher rates of Māori among the Other Ranks, Māori representation in the Officer Ranks is increasing while it is decreasing in the Other Ranks. Looking at trends from 2003 to 2017, Māori representation consistently increased from 2003 to 2009 in the Other Ranks, then started decreasing from 2009 to 2017, while in the Officer Ranks, Māori representation has been slowly increasing from 2003 to 2017. For example in 2009, there were a total 9,709 members in the NZDF, of which 1,963 Officers and 7,746 Other Ranks; of these, 107 Officers (5.5 percent) and 1,670 Other Ranks (21.6 percent) were of Māori descent. In 2017, within the Officer population, 123 (5.8 percent) are of Māori descent, while within the Other Ranks, 1,220 (17.2 percent) are of Māori descent. Looking at data by service, the highest rates of Māori are found within the NZ Army and RNZN, followed by the RNZAF. For example, in 2009, 1,140 (22.8 percent) soldiers in the NZ Army, and 461 (21.9 percent) sailors in the RNZN were of Māori descent, compared with only 176 (6.8 percent) of Māori airmen and airwomen in the RNZAF. In 2017, 813 (17.7 percent) soldiers in the NZ Army, and 375 (17.7 percent) sailors in the RNZN were of Māori descent, compared with only 155 (6.2 percent) of Māori airmen and airwomen in the RNZAF (New Zealand Defence Force, 2017b).

Although Māori representation is significantly lower among the Officer Ranks, it is also the case that some Māori achieve higher Officer Ranks. For example, a former

Chief of the NZDF, Lieutenant-General J. (Jerry) Mateparae, was of Māori descent. Notably, after retiring from the military in January 2011, Lieutenant General The Right Honourable Sir Jerry Mateparae was sworn in as New Zealand's 20th Governor-General for a five year term on 31 August 2011 (New Zealand Government, The Governor General, 2017). Other notable military leaders of Māori descent include Major-General Brian Poananga, the first Māori to be Chief of General Staff, NZ Army (1978-81), and Major-General Peter Kelly, Chief of Army (2015-2018) (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 28 November 2018).

These trends are not unique to the New Zealand context and are historically rooted. This is well documented by Riseman (2014) and by Hohaia, who concludes that there has been historically “an over-representation of Indigenous people and people of colour in particular rank and trade categories and an under-representation among others” across various nations (Hohaia, 2016b, p. 48). Similarly, the higher participation of Māori in the NZ Army than in other services can also be linked back to history and particularly to the 28th Māori Battalion (Soutar, 2008). Many Māori also served in the RZAF during the Second World War in Europe and the Far East, and a smaller number of Māori served in the Navy or the merchant marine. Indeed, it was a Māori Sergeant, B.S. Wipiti, who “shared the honour of shooting down the first Japanese bomber in the battle for Singapore” (New Zealand Government. Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2014, Achievements, p.3). Moreover, “Māori participation in the armed forces, particularly during World War II, was not restricted to the non-commissioned officer ranks,” unlike the “restrictions placed on Indigenous Australian enlistment in Australia, at the same time” (Hohaia, 2016a, p. 81).

Some of the key reasons behind these trends include the fact that, historically, the military was more attractive to particular groups of Māori youth such as those with lower educational levels, or who had less opportunity to access meaningful employment. “While leaders such as Apirana Ngata stressed the 'price of citizenship' line, ultimately many Māori enlisted for a mixture of reasons – to escape poverty or life in the backblocks or to follow their mates” (New Zealand Government. Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2014, Introduction, p. 1). In many countries the military provides secure jobs, social mobility, education, training, and good benefits to youth. However, it appears that the number of people joining the NZDF who identify as having Māori

descent has decreased over the years. Over the same period, the number of NZDF members identifying as New Zealander European has also decreased, while those identifying as New Zealander are increasing. This declining trend in Māori representation in the NZDF may be attributed to the fact that “since 2006 New Zealander has been included as a category in the NZ Census, with many Māori and non- Māori choosing to identify themselves as such, therefore affecting the percentage of those who identify as either Māori or European” (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 28 November 2018).

Various initiatives have been undertaken by the NZDF to recognize the importance of Māori culture and knowledge within the organization. These include:

- The NZDF Bi-Cultural Policy “which recognizes Māori cultural interests and the special place of Māori within the NZDF. It helps meet the NZDF obligations to recognise the aims and aspirations of Māori people, to respect and honour Māori language customs and items of cultural significance within NZDF, and enhance military ethos, fighting spirit and camaraderie” (New Zealand Defence Force, 2017c);
- Bi-cultural policies developed by the RNZN and RNZAF and a cultural policy pertaining to protocols or kawa on the NZ Army Marae (NZ Army does not currently have a bi-cultural policy);
- Establishing a Marae, the Māori meeting place, for each service; the NZ Army Marae was opened in 1995 in Waiouru Camp, followed by the RNZN Marae in 2000 in Ngataranga Bay, and finally the RNZAF RNZAF Tūrangawaewae, which does not hold Marae status, recently established on Base Ohakea (New Zealand Defence Force, 2017c). The military Marae and Tūrangawaewae are at the centre of Māori ceremonies, cultural training and other learning;
- Instituting Māori Cultural Advisors positions for each service to support and advise the leadership and other personnel;
- Creating Māori Cultural Groups (Kapa Haka);
- Providing Māori language training and cultural training to members; and,
- Having a Haka, the Māori dance, for the NZDF and each of the services, performed in various occasions, as expression of pride, welcome, farewell, sorrow or joy.

Based on email information provided by an Instructor at the NZ Army's Tactics School, Indigenous cultural training is introduced at all ranks:

On the last week of each course the students, including the foreign students, attend the NZ Army Marae at Waiouru to learn about the NZ Army's ethos, the NZ Army's whakapapa (genealogy), the NZ Army's values and how our Māori customs/culture fit into the modern NZ Army. All soldiers and officers joining the NZ Army now undergo the same training at their respective command levels, and enlisted rank promotion courses also have similar programs to ensure that a commander at each rank has the ability to understand, apply, give advice about and if applicable carry out the required Māori customs at any event that Māori protocols would be expected to be carried out (Email by Instructor at NZ Army's Tactics School, 16 November 2017).

This recent initiative started in 2016, when it was identified that "officers were not getting formal exposure to Māori customs and protocols other than that received during initial training as a cadet. Other ranks were receiving regular formal training on All Arms Recruit Training, Senior NCO [Non-Commissioned Officers] and Warrant Officer courses. There was a clear disparity" (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 28 November 2018).

Despite these initiatives, challenges remain. For example, "there is evidence to suggest that there is not a consistent approach within the three services in delivery of training and education," a colonel in the NZ Army explained. "The NZDF Bi-Cultural Policy is vague and requires significant review (currently underway), and until this is completed I suggest there will continue to be an ad hoc approach across the NZDF" (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 28 November 2018).

There are also challenges with regard to women in the NZDF (and particularly to female leaders), as well as to Māori customs and lore, as the following quotes indicate:

There are challenges and conversations that need to continue including education on the role of women and the changing environment we are in. I think open and honest discussion is key and having an open mind to how to accommodate evolution without disrespecting cultures. We need to continue to challenge how and why we do things and have robust

discussions that are transparent. This has started but I would suggest will need to continue (Email by Colonel B., NZ Army, 03 December 2018).

These challenges are very real, and will continue to be discussed as more females take up roles in the future NZDF that have only been held by men e.g. service chiefs. The NZ Army has only recently adapted its policy governing formal matters on the Marae, in turn providing our first female TRADOC [Training and Doctrine Command] Commander the right to speak on the Marae while upholding tikanga Māori (correct customs within the culture) (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 03 December 2018).

In my personal opinion, the implementation of policies and ideas ...sets the NZDF in high standard both globally, and in comparison to wider NZ society. However, I believe there is a way to go in order for the benefits of diversity to be seamlessly integrated within the Defence Force. I agree that in order to fully understand the achievements and issues at hand, opinions and references to individuals directly impacted would be beneficial. However, open and honest conversation... will aid in beginning the motions required in order to generate productive discourse (Email by Flying Officer, RNZAF, 11 December 2018).

Setting a paradigm for organizations

Other private and public sector organizations have adopted a similar approach to the NZDF. For example, New Zealand scholars Rigby et al. (2011) look at the growing recognition and integration of Māori culture and values in corporations using the case study of Air New Zealand, which undertook significant organizational change due to global events that negatively impacted the airline industry. The authors provide “an insight into how Māori traditional and cultural values are being introduced into Air New Zealand’s corporate structure and internal culture” (p. 116), arguing that the company “has adopted Indigenous Māori cultural values in its business as a corporate social responsibility initiative” (Rigby et al., 2011, p. 120). The study first looks at the change mechanisms implemented by the airline including creating a Cultural and Customer Ambassador role to meaningfully engage with Māori culture and knowledge. The Cultural and Customer Ambassador brings “aspects of the Māori culture to life within the business. The main objective of this role is to raise awareness, understanding

and engagement with Māori culture within the organization” (Rigby et al, 2011, p.121). The airline also introduced several brand characteristics describing Kiwi behavior that all employees are expected to model, such as having a welcoming and ‘can do’ attitude. Employees are provided with an Air New Zealand Cultural Kit with resources on Māori culture, language and history. Through surveys and interviews, the study shows that the majority of all Air New Zealand employees strongly agreed that Māori culture provided a unique point of difference to the airline. The New Zealand-based employees also strongly agreed that the airline takes pride in Māori culture, and the offshore employees agreed that they would like more Māori language and culture training. The authors conclude that “by introducing Māori culture, Air NZ has set a paradigm for other organizations to embrace Indigenous cultural values in business” (Rigby et al., 2011, p. 123).

Another interesting comparison can be drawn with the New Zealand Police, which has established programs to recruit Māori Police officers. As an Instructor at the army’s Tactics School explained, these programs reflect “a core value of Commitment to Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi,” including:

a program called 'Turning the Tide' that aims to reduce Māori over representation in crime stats as both victims and offenders, as well as having a specific department to increase diversity issues (Māori, Pacific and Ethnic Services) led by a Māori Assistant Commissioner. One of the Deputy Commissioners is also Māori. The Police also have Māori Inspectors (major equivalent level) at the 12 districts level specifically to develop Māori and the Turning of the Tides program. Māori staff also get time off to attend Māori development programs as well as up to six Māori members per year are paid to undergo a full Māori immersion course so that they can take the lead around Māori protocols upon return to their respective districts (Email by Instructor at NZ Army’s Tactics School, 16 November 2017).

Discussion

Having looked at how the NZDF and other New Zealand organizations have introduced Māori culture and embraced Māori cultural values, we can ask how effective

these policies and practices are and how other organizations can recognize and integrate Indigenous culture and values – and, specifically, how Indigenous practices and customs can be incorporated into local military systems and protocols.

Debbie Hohaia's (2016a; 2016b) work is valuable in identifying the effectiveness of the NZDF institutional policies and practices, particularly regarding biculturalism, in terms of influencing the learning experiences of military personnel. In her investigation of Māori knowledge inclusion within the NZDF curricula, she argues that the inclusion of Māori Indigenous knowledge in military education improves the military learning experience of all military members, whether Indigenous or non-Indigenous, and "contributes positively to organizational morale and operational effectiveness" (Hohaia, 2016b, p. 48). Hohaia's study uses institutional ethnography to explore through the experience of ex-serving members how NZDF institutional policies and practices were influencing their learning experiences. The findings emerging from the analysis of interviews and focus groups are grouped in three main themes. First, the 'journey' of the NZDF to include Māori Indigenous knowledge in military curricula has had a decolonizing effect by acknowledging respect for Māori knowledge. Second, 'organizational processes' implemented to achieve biculturalism – such as Te Reo language training, courses on Māori history, culture and protocols – have resulted in improved cultural understanding, connecting to the experience of others, and contributing to "a better understanding of the benefits that Indigenous knowledge systems offer for improving organizational cultures" (Hohaia, 2016b, p. 53). Third, the 'learning experience' of the personnel interviewed provides individual benefits, namely increasing Indigenous knowledge and appreciation of Māori worldviews, as well as organizational benefits in that Māori culture provides a "uniting factor ... brings people together, and makes the organization stronger" (Hohaia, 2016b, p. 54).

In terms of adoption of similar initiatives by other militaries, the Chief Instructor from the Defence Corporate Training School at the New Zealand Defence College believes that it is about "collaboration, mutual acknowledgment, understanding and respect" (email 18 October 2017). He further clarifies the behaviours that should accompany the adoption of local Indigenous customs and practices:

- Acknowledge the Indigenous people;

- Identify the appropriate Indigenous people and various networks that you need to engage with;
- Engage with Indigenous people in a genuine, open and respectful manner;
- Ensure senior leaders are involved in meetings;
- Learn about local Indigenous customs and practices;
- Allow local Indigenous people the opportunity to identify customs and practices that may be incorporated into military protocols and practices (funeral/parade/remembrance/overseas memorials/culture and diversity appreciation);
- Be prepared to pay for Indigenous support and have this built into the collaborative process;
- Educate and prepare military for the incorporation of Indigenous practices and customs;
- Be careful to avoid tokenism;
- Build enduring policy and expectations around the use of Indigenous customs and protocols;
- Build a positive and lasting relationship with the local Indigenous community;
- Be prepared for these conversations to take some time and avoid any quick fix approach mentality;
- Build trust through engagement, persistence and a willingness to learn; and
- You will not get a second chance to gain local trust (email by Chief Instructor, Defence Corporate Training School, New Zealand Defence College, 18 October 2017).

Finally, he states that: “It is important to adopt the local practices of your area and avoid a one size fits all approach. Land is everything to Indigenous people and it is vital to adopt and support the practices of those tribal groups that physically or symbolically own the land that the military are operating from” (email by Chief Instructor, Defence Corporate Training School, New Zealand Defence College, 18 October 2017).

A somewhat differing perspective is provided by an Officer in the NZ Army who states that:

As an iwi or tribe, the New Zealand Army or Ngāti Tūmatauenga (The tribe of the God of War), we can establish our own kawa or protocols on

the Marae, which we have done. While we have and will always work alongside the iwi/s who hold mana whenua status (territorial status, authority over land etc) for the land which our camps stand on, the final decision will ultimately rest with us. On the NZ Army Marae in Waiouru, the kawa is different to that of neighboring iwi. This also pertains to the NZ Navy Marae in Auckland, where they have adopted different kawa to that of Ngāti Whātua, the iwi with mana whenua status in that area. (Email by Colonel A., NZ Army, 28 November 2018).

In closing our discussion it is important to consider that although there are some similarities between New Zealand and comparable settlers' societies such as the U.S., Australia and Canada, there are also some contextual differences. While there are multiple iwis with distinct practices, Māori are culturally much more homogenous than Indigenous peoples in settler states such as Canada. Indigenous peoples in New Zealand and Canada have experienced: histories of colonization, including loss of culture, language, and identity; social challenges, including health, educational attainment, income, and unemployment rates; increasing urbanization, political activism and cultural assertiveness; and rising population (Scoppio, 2010). At the same time, some of the core differences between Canada's and New Zealand's Indigenous populations include: the Treaty of Waitangi which establishes the basis for the relationship between the Māori and the Crown, while no equivalent single document exists in Canada; Māori constituting a 'critical mass' in New Zealand's population; and Māori being a more homogenous group than Canadian Indigenous people³; the Māori language being recognized as one of New Zealand's official languages; and New Zealand being a bicultural country while Canada is a multicultural country (Scoppio, 2010).

³ Although within the Māori population some differences exist among various iwis, they share a common language and similar cultural and spiritual practices. In Canada, there is great diversity among and within the three main Indigenous groups, including: about 70 Indigenous languages; different cultural and spiritual practices; urban versus non-urban dwellers (i.e., reserves, remote areas); and status versus non-status First Nations.

Conclusion and implications of the inquiry

Using organizational culture theory as a framework, this paper analyzed the strategies, approaches and practices adopted by the NZDF as well as the external and internal environments, which have enabled the organization to embrace Indigenous culture.

In terms of the external environment of New Zealand, and despite a similar history of colonization as other countries, a unique relationship has developed between Māori and Pākehā whereby the country adopts a 'bicultural' approach. Māori are not considered a 'minority' and Pākehā as a 'majority.' Instead, a 'partnership' has been built on the foundation of the Treaty of Waitangi – although challenges still exist. Similarly, the internal environment of the New Zealand military includes biculturalism policies, Māori cultural programmes, training, and customs which have enabled the military to embrace Māori culture while at the same time empowering Māori. These findings are in line with Hohaia's research, where respondents indicated that Māori cultural training: increases the knowledge or ability to appreciate Māori worldview; enhances members' pride; improves their ability to open their mind to different perspectives/approaches to viewing problems and finding solutions across various jobs in the military; and encourages respectful relationships (2016b). For Māori members in particular, "the training was perceived as empowering" (2016b, p.54). One of Hohaia's major findings is that "the introduction of the bicultural initiatives has had a decolonising effect by acknowledging the long-awaited respect for Māori knowledge" (2016b, p.52).

Applying Schein's theory, these are visible and invisible "mechanisms" used to embed and transmit an organizational culture (Schein, 2010, p. 235). Embedding mechanisms can include leaders' role modeling, teaching, and coaching, organizational design, structure, procedures, rites, rituals, physical space, and organizational philosophy and charters. Thus, organizational culture theory not only helps to analyze and understand culture within a group, but it can also help to explain how organizations can be successful (or not) in fostering positive relationships with particular groups. In this case, it helps to explain the successful participation of Māori in New Zealand's military. Similar to Air New Zealand, which by introducing Māori culture "has set a paradigm for other organisations to embrace Indigenous cultural

values in business” and “has taken the lead in embracing Indigenous culture and traditions” (Rigby et al., 2011, p. 123) within the corporate sector, the NZDF can be considered a leader among military organizations in transforming the organizational culture, enabling the organization to embrace Indigenous culture, and empowering the Indigenous members within its ranks.

References

- Amaram, D. (2007). Cultural Diversity: Implications For Workplace Management. *Journal of Diversity Management*, Vol. 2, No. 4: 1-6.
- Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Canada. Government of Canada. National Defence. (2018a). Indigenous Summer Programs. Available at <https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/services/caf-jobs/indigenous-programs/training.html>
- Canada. Government of Canada, National Defence. (2018b). Bold Eagle. Available at <https://www.canada.ca/en/army/services/bold-eagle.html>
- Coady, J. F. (1956 – republished 2012). *28 (Māori) Battalion*. Wellington: New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, War History Branch.
- Cowan, J. (1955). *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period (2 vols, 1922–23)*. Wellington: R. E. Owen.
- David-Ives, C. (2017). Integration Politics and the New Zealand Army: The Fate of the Maori Battalion in the Wake of the Second World War. In R. Dickason and S. Belanger (Eds.) *War Memories: Commemoration, Recollections, and Writings on War*. Kingston, ON.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hofstede, G.H. (1981). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, Vol. 10, No. 4: 15-41.
- Hohaia, D. (2016a). The Potential Benefits to the Australian Defence Force Educational Curricula of the Inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge Systems. Doctoral Thesis. Retrieved from Charles Darwin University CDU eSpace Institutional Repository (CDU 60318).
- Hohaia, D. (2016b). In search of a decolonized military: Māori cultural learning experiences in the New Zealand Defence Force. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, Vol. 11, No. 1: 47-58.
- Holm, T. (1997). The Militarization of Native America: Historical Process and Cultural Perception. *Social Science Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 4: 461-474.
- Independence Day. (2017). Independence Day of New Zealand. Available at <http://www.123independenceday.com/newzealand/>

- Jung, T., Scott, T., Davis, H., Bower, P., Whalley, D., McNally, R., & Mannion, R. (2009). Instruments for Exploring Organizational Culture: A Review of the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 69(6): 1087-1096.
- Maclaurin, K. (2004). Organizational Values and Cultural Diversity in the Canadian Forces: the Case of Aboriginal Peoples. In F. Pinch, A. T. MacIntyre, P. Browne, and A. C. Okros (Eds.) *Challenge and Change in the Military: Gender and Diversity Issues*. Winnipeg: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.
- Mannion, R., Davies, H., Konteh, F., Jung, T., Scott, T., Bower, P.,...McMurray, R., (2008). *Measuring and Assessing Organisational Culture in the NHS (OC1)*. York: York Management School.
- Marriott, L. & Sim, D. (2014). Indicators of Inequalities for Māori and Pacific People. *Working Papers in Public Finance*. Wellington: Victoria Business School, Victoria University of Wellington.
- McDonald, D. P. & Parks, K. M. (Eds.) (2011). *Managing Diversity in the Military: The value of inclusion in a culture of uniformity*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- New Zealand Defence Force. (2017a). Personnel Summary. Available at <http://www.nzdf.mil.nz/personnel-records/personnel-branch/default.htm>
- New Zealand Defence Force. (2017b). New Zealand Defence Force Data provided by letter signed by NZDF Chief Of Staff. Wellington, New Zealand: Headquarters NZDF.
- New Zealand Defence Force. (2017c). Equity and Diversity. Available at www.nzdf.mil.nz/families/diversity/default.htm
- New Zealand Government. Ministry of Justice. (2017). About the Waitangi Tribunal. Available at <https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/about-waitangi-tribunal/past-present-future-of-waitangi-tribunal/>
- New Zealand Government. Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2014). Maori and the Second World War. Available at <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/war/maori-in-second-world-war>
- New Zealand Government. Statistics New Zealand. (2017). Labour Market Statistics: September 2017 quarter. Available at http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-

work/employment_and_unemployment/LabourMarketStatistics_HOTPSep17qtr.aspx

New Zealand Government. Statistics New Zealand. (2013). Quick Stats About Māori. 2013 Census.

New Zealand Government. The Governor General. (2017). Lt Gen The Rt Hon Sir Jerry Mateparae, GNZM, QSO. Available at <https://gg.govt.nz/biographies/lt-gen-rt-hon-sir-jerry-mateparae-gnzm-qso>

O'Connor, P. S. (1967). The Recruitment of Māori Soldiers, 1914-18, *Political Science*, Vol. 19: 48–83.

Orange, C. (2007). An Exercise in Maori Autonomy: The Rise and Demise of the Maori War Effort Organization. In P. Whitney, R. Lackenbauer, R. Scott Sheffield & Craig Leslie Mantle (Eds.) *Aboriginal Peoples and Military Participation*. Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy Press.

Pugsley, C. (1995). *Te Hokowhitu a Tu : the Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.

Rigby, C., Mueller, J. & Baker, A. (2011). The Integration of Māori Indigenous Culture into Corporate Social Responsibility Strategies at Air New Zealand. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, Vol. 5, No. 6: 116-126

Riseman, N. (2014). The Rise of Indigenous Military History. *History Compass*, Vol 12, no. 12: 901-911.

Rowe, W. E. (2014). Positionality. In David Coghlan & Mary Brydon-Miller, (Eds.) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research* (Vols. 1-2). London: SAGE.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Fourth Edition. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1989). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Scoppio, G. (2010). Indigenous Peoples in the New Zealand Defence Force and the Canadian Forces. *Canadian Military Journal*. Vol 10, no. 4: 36-45

Soutar, M. (2008). *Nga Tama Toa: The Price of Citizenship: C Company 28 (Maori) Battalion 1939-1945*. Auckland, New Zealand: David Bateman Limited.

- Tomas, V. (2008). Indigenous Peoples and the Maori: The Right to Self-Determination in International Law - from Woe to Go. *New Zealand Law Review* (Part IV):639-683.
- van der Post, W. Z., de Coning T.J. & Smit, E.V.M. (1997). An instrument to measure organizational culture. *South African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 28(4): 147-168.
- Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.